Royal Representations in Print: Charles II and the Exclusion Crisis (1678-1683)

Gregory D. W. Gifford

PhD
The University of Edinburgh
2006

Declaration

I declare that this is my own work, that any contribution made by other parties is clearly cited and that this work has not been submitted for any other qualification.

Contents

Acknowledgements

Abstract

The King as figure and image represented in polemical literature, is the central focus of the present research. This thesis offers a study in the semiotics of royal representation: a deciphering or de-coding of its imagery, symbolism and iconicity. From the creation of meaning displayed in these representational constructs, a new examination becomes possible of the mechanisms by which the concept and image of kingly power was being re-projected and received at a critical moment of English history.

Printed propaganda reveals the King, in his 'two bodies', to have been the nerve-point around which a whole constellation of political arguments, powerful emotional stimuli and evocations of national memory, were conjured up and deployed in persuasion and struggle. Tracing representations of the King through the period 1678-83 establishes not only how the language of printed propaganda developed over the period; it also reveals, more surprisingly, a permanent process of oblique or lateral reference which goes to the heart of the quest for national and cultural identity in this period.

Similar methodological approaches have been applied fruitfully in research treating Louis XIV and Oliver Cromwell; yet the present study is the first of this type to have been carried out in relation to Charles II and, via this central icon, used to renew our understanding of the Exclusion crisis itself. Beyond this, my thesis, it is hoped, makes a genuine contribution to our wider insight about the character of Restoration England, about kingly power at a time of major phase-change in the political mindset, and about the emergence of 'politicised media' recognizable in our own contemporary world.

Chapter One: Introduction

The present research focuses on the figure and image of the King, as represented in literature of a polemical nature. What is offered is a study in the semiotics of royal representation: a deciphering of its imagery and a de-coding of its symbolism and iconicity. From the creation of meaning displayed in these representational constructs, it is hoped that a new examination becomes possible of the mechanisms by which the image of kingly power was being re-projected and received at a critical moment of English history. By tracing representations of the King, in his 'two bodies'[1], through 1678-83 we may hope to establish not only how the language of print propaganda developed over the period, but also how symbols of cultural resonance in the early stages of the crisis evolved (or not) in response to the unfolding of political events.

The changing nature of the Exclusion debate will be situated within a nexus of polemic and propaganda, a closed circle of reaction and counter-reaction which characterises the early-modern public sphere. As this process is explicated, a distinct and fresh approach to the crisis itself is opened up. Similar methodological techniques have been applied fruitfully in research treating Louis XIV and Oliver Cromwell;[2] yet the present study is the first of its type to be carried out on Charles II and, via this central icon, used to renew our understanding of the Exclusion Crisis itself. Beyond this, it is hoped that this thesis will make a genuine contribution to our wider insight about the character of Restoration England, about kingly power at a time of major phase-change in the political and cultural mindset, and about the emergence of 'politicised media' recognisable in our own contemporary world.

What do we mean by the term 'image of monarchy'? For our purposes the 'image' (or images) in question are representations of Charles II found in the print literature of the Exclusion-era. All textual references to, and depictions of, the King may be relevant to this

---

[1] Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (1957)
[2] Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (1992); Laura Lunger Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait and Print 1645-61* (2000)

1

research: be they related to Charles's character, his actions, his person or his personal history. This research is not, in a sense, concerned with tracing the 'real' Charles II, whomever that may be said to have been. This is emphatically not a biography of the King.[3] Information from state papers and other such 'official' primary material has not been used to establish how accurately or inaccurately polemicists were being with their representations.[4] The Charles II that emerges from print literature is just that: the King as he existed in publicly available print, the King as he may have appeared to those with no insider knowledge of court intrigues. The bottom line is that at street level – where 'facts' about the King were hard to verify - it was verisimilitude that really counted in royal representations.

Yet, it may be objected that image/s of Charles II were porous; that elements of the 'authentic' King permeated through these representations, whatever their obvious bias. Such a proposition is not without foundation, but the problem lies in its rather charged conceptual dichotomies: whereby a printed representation of the King is either true or is false (with the historian as judge). It is more profitable to conceive of representations of Charles that, when they strayed too far from established perceptions of the monarch, risked losing their credibility and therefore their power (i.e. the ability to exert influence).

What factors were critical to giving form to opinions of Charles II among his subjects? The vast majority of subjects after all had never seen the King in person. We may identify the main points of contact with royal imagery and other such opinion-forming stimuli: pictorial representations of the King (portraiture, coins, satiric cartoons and pub signs)[5], textual representations (both in 'official' and unofficial publications), personal experience of

---

[3] The best biographical study of Charles II remains Ronald Hutton's *Charles II: King of England, Scotland and Ireland* (1989).
[4] My methodological approach receives full explanation in Chapter Two.
[5] The art history of royal representation is not an aspect dealt with in this thesis – an area which Lorraine Madway has, in any case, expertly mapped in relation to Charles II. For specialist treatments of the visual arts the best studies are: M. Dorothy George, *English Political Caricature to 1792: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda* (1959); David Howarth, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance 1485-1649* (1997); Antony Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain 1603-1689* (1998); Lorraine Madway, *Majesty and Mockery: Representations of Royal Power in the Reign of Charles II 1660-1685*, Unpublished PhD, Yale (1999).

the policies of the crown, and, perhaps most important of all, word-of-mouth assertions regarding the King. In a sense this research is a study about perception and the processes by which perception coalesced and altered – of why people in Restoration England came to conceive of their King in the terms that they did. The nature of any narrative is that the reader joins together various pieces of information, carefully selected and sequenced by the author, to form a logical order or pattern – if the reader cannot do this, the narrative seems fractured and the author has failed. A similar process applies to producing a portrait of the King's character. The canon of Exclusion pamphlets contained, as we will see, many disparate notions regarding Charles II which a Restoration readership attempted to collate into a unified whole. The greater the prevalence and effectiveness of each side's royal representations, the better the chance that the public would join-the-dots to form an understanding of Charles II beneficial to the cause of that side.

In staking out the ground for a study of this kind, it becomes clear that there are very many questions which have not been fully addressed by previous historiography; questions, it is hoped, that this thesis will go some way toward tackling. The identifying of a Kingly construct, produced by print literature, raises a number of important issues: how was the Kingly card played by polemicists in this political game? For what purposes could the name of Charles II be used? What arguments could it *not* be made to support? How did Whigs/Tories differ in their representations of the King? Which 'symbols' held cultural resonance in this highly partisan atmosphere? How did perceptions of Charles affect Exclusion debate and how did that debate, in turn, affect perceptions of Charles? Did different phases of the crisis correlate with different phases of depictions in the King's image? Ultimately, these questions (and others) are a means to investigate how ideas of what the monarch represented helped to change the environment in which the political drama unfolded; a drama, it must be remembered, that was highly sensitive to manifestations of public opinion.

Historical research does not exist in isolation (and, indeed, should not seek to do so). Rather research builds upon the foundations laid for it by existing historiography. In this introductory chapter my purpose is twofold: firstly, to provide an overview of the relevant scholarship and draw out the implications it holds for my research. And secondly, to place this project on the map of existing historiography and assess the impact that my arguments have on established historical knowledge. The intention is to review salient issues thrown up by historians so as to disengage and defend the original specificity of this thesis. My own methodological approach will then receive synthetic definition in Chapter Two. The position of the present research will appear progressively in relation to major historiographical issues: (i) the Exclusion Crisis, (ii) political parties, and (iii) the public sphere.

(i) Historians and the Exclusion Crisis

The obvious place to begin is with the term 'Exclusion Crisis' itself, which came under increased scrutiny in the scholarship of the 1990s. This debate is more than a matter of mere semantics; it concerns what this remarkable episode in English history was actually about, what the issues at stake actually were. The label Exclusion Crisis - "that superficial piece of historiographical reductionism"[6] - has been much criticised for focusing attention too narrowly on parliamentary efforts to exclude James, leading some historians to question its usefulness.

It is now accepted as historiographical 'gospel' that the period 1678-83 was a multi-dimensional crisis encompassing myriad issues of religious, constitutional and political complexion; 'exclusion' and its crisis really relates to a series of overlapping and intersecting anxieties best captured in Andrew Marvell's formula 'Popery and Arbitrary Government'.[7] After all, the period saw constitutional disputes between the two Houses, including heated

---

[6] Jonathan Scott, 'Restoration Process. Or, if this isn't a Party, we're not having a good time' in *Albion*, 25: 4 (1993), p622

[7] A similar point is made by John Miller; *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II* (2000), p121-122

exchanges over the army, the organisation of English trade, foreign policy, and judicial independence; it involved the passage of the Habeas Corpus Act, the end to press licensing, upheavals in many boroughs, efforts to revise the religious settlement, a Scottish rebellion, and, not least, attempts at exclusion.[8]

Mark Knights, who highlights a broad set of issues at play, has nonetheless acknowledged 'Exclusion Crisis' as a functional short-hand title; though one, in his opinion, best reserved for the brief period between the rejection of the bill in the House of Lords (November 1680) and the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament (May 1681).[9] He prefers the term 'succession crisis' for the years 1678-81, which envisages remedies other than exclusion for England's ills. If 'the Popery and Arbitrary Government Crisis' was not so cumbersome a designation, one senses historians could find a use for it.

If Knights has challenged the applicability of the term 'Exclusion', Ronald Hutton has queried that of 'crisis'.[10] Contemporaries, claims Hutton, over-reacted and were mistaken in feeling themselves buffeted by uncontrollable forces that were inexorably dragging them toward civil war. For Hutton the situation was always retrievable and the potential danger circumscribed. All the critical determinates to the ending of the 'crisis' remained in the Crown's control throughout; had Charles II not made a string of mistakes amounting to idiocy, subsequent generations would have paid scant attention to this storm-in-a-teacup. As it is, historians have followed contemporaries in over-playing its importance. For Hutton, the sorry episode disproves the maxim that there is no smoke without fire, he believes that the 'crisis' was essentially illusory.

What, then, is left of the 'Exclusion Crisis'? Do we still have a crisis on our hands or not? And if so, what place within that crisis should be attributed to exclusion as dynamic causality? The consensus among historians is that while contemporary reaction did lean

---

[8] As set out by Gary S. De Krey; 'The London Whigs and the Exclusion Crisis Reconsidered' in A. L. Beier, David Cannadine and James Rosenheim (eds) *The First Modern Society* (1989), p459
[9] Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81* (1994), p3-5
[10] Hutton, *Charles II*, p381-404

towards hysteria, Hutton goes too far in dismissing potential fallout from the crisis[11]: indeed, the perception of danger in such a febrile atmosphere could become a self-fulfilling prophecy since it expanded the realm of the possible alarmingly. In any case, even if one accepts Hutton's thesis, my own research makes a distinction between so-called 'high politics' (the actions of leading figures at court or in Parliament) and political print in the public domain - we should not assume that the latter axiomatically reflected or meekly followed the former. Which is to say that certain themes held, as will be shown, disproportionate prominence in print: the significance of propaganda lies less in attempts to prove the veracity or accuracy of its content, than precisely in the fact that it is released and had an impact on wider society. Print culture represented its own distinct front in the battles of 1678-83, and was partly governed by its own internal logic. Therefore if Hutton is correct in viewing contemporary reaction as an over-estimation of the danger faced, I would argue that this makes print culture more central to the story of the Exclusion Crisis, not less.

In relation to the centrality or otherwise of exclusion, a cautionary note has recently been struck by John Miller.[12] Miller has warned us not to throw the baby out with the bathwater: once the multi-facetted nature of the crisis has been properly appreciated, the issue of exclusion should be retained as one of several elements of the problem. Having embarked upon the policy it became a matter of self-preservation to continue on with exclusion. James was not renowned for his forgiveness, argues Miller, and fear of retribution acted as an engine driving the crisis towards its resolution. Miller defends the term 'exclusionist' and maintains that an individual's stance vis-a-vis this issue was a touchstone of party allegiance.

Alternative titles for the period have been mooted. De Krey proposes the 'Restoration crisis'[13] while Knights essentially argues for a 'succession crisis'[14] - though these have yet to

---

[11] As emerges in various articles; *Albion,* 25:4 (1993)

[12] Miller, *After the Civil Wars,* p245-288

[13] Gary S. De Krey, 'Reformation in the Restoration Crisis, 1679-82' in Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Stier (eds) *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England 1540-1688* (1996), p231-234

[14] Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis 1678-81,* p78-106

gain anything like universal acceptance. The 'Exclusion Crisis' has proven stubbornly resistant to being replaced. In part this is because the term captures something of the contemporary debate: a fear of impending disaster, a willingness to examine extreme options as a means of escape. The policy of exclusion did not represent the centre-ground or cover every aspect of complex debates, but, in a sense, that is the point. A lurch toward extremes is itself symptomatic of a 'crisis' situation; the efforts at exclusion dominate the period precisely because they were so 'radical' and so dangerous. It is best, in my view, to follow Miller in a cautious application of this flawed title than to allow a complete splintering of terminology, leaving us bereft of any term covering the overall period 1678-83, or, indeed, to replace it with alternative but equally imperfect terms such as 'Restoration crisis'. Once the limitations of the title have been recognised, 'Exclusion Crisis' still emerges as the most convenient short-hand available.

This leads to the question of when the label 'Exclusion Crisis' may appropriately be applied. Knights' study of the period moves from 1678 to 1681.[15] This approach sees the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament as the extinguishing of the exclusionist cause. Tim Harris, however, dates the crisis as running until 1683.[16] The timeframe of the present study is 1678 to 1683. The crisis did not have a starting shot or a closing ceremony, but these dates represent the best points from which to mark, respectively, the build up of frenzied excitement and the tapering off of the momentum that powered events.[17] If it is necessary to select seminal moments which demarcate the period, then the revelation of two plot discoveries – the Popish and the Rye House – best bookend the phase that we *identify* as the Exclusion Crisis.

If recent scholarship has downplayed the prominence of exclusion, what has replaced it at the core of the crisis? Research over the past fifteen years has brought religious concerns

---

[15] Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis 1678-81*, p3-16
[16] Tim Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715* (1993), p108
[17] Without implying that passions remained equally heated continually between 1678 and 1683 – because like any sustained period, there were certain peaks of particular intensity.

and motivations back to centre stage; a criticism of previous scholarship that one could make is its preoccupation with political/constitutional ideology at the expense of a religious dimension.[18] Jonathan Scott's work has contextualised and explained England's crisis as seen from a European perspective.[19] The Exclusion Crisis must be viewed within a counter-reformation framework, otherwise, argues Scott, Englishmen's reactions to the Popish Plot appear incomprehensibly panic-stricken. Most agitators saw their struggle primarily as a religious one: self-defence of both English and European Protestantism from persecution in general and popery in particular. For Scott these fears were well-founded, as evidenced by the King's private and public manoeuvres: "If Charles I had seemed an agent of the Counter-Reformation advance, Charles II was one."[20]

Gary De Krey and Mark Goldie have stressed domestic religious considerations, identifying religious subtexts behind the words and actions of the crisis.[21] De Krey sees the 'third Restoration crisis' as being about reformation.[22] An army of dissenting authors turned alarm over the Popish Plot into an opportunity for further reformation of the Church of England, which was endangered by straying so far from its Reformed roots. Liberty of conscience also became a central issue. Examining London's civic corporation, De Krey maintains that loyalist propaganda did not exaggerate the dissenting composition of the City's exclusionist movement; 'faction' and 'fanatic' being rightly interchangeable in the contemporary political lexicon. De Krey therefore argues that religious nonconformity was the very life-force of opposition during the crisis.

In a sense Mark Goldie has approached the same question from the opposite side. Goldie has given us a more complicated crisis, as much a crisis for the Episcopacy as one about

---

[18] For example, J.R. Jones, *The First Whigs: the Politics of the Exclusion Crisis* (1961), p211-217

[19] Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English political instability in European context* (2000), p182-205

[20] Jonathan Scott, 'England's Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot' in Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (eds) *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (1990), p116

[21] De Krey, 'Reformation in the Restoration Crisis, 1679-82', p231-248; Mark Goldie, 'Danby, the Bishops and the Whigs' in Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (eds) *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (1990), p75-105

[22] De Krey, 'Reformation in the Restoration Crisis, 1679-82', p231

popery or the constitution.[23]   He has shown how anticlericalism, at least on a par with constitutionalism, was the foundation of English Whiggism (giving rise to the new term of 'priestcraft').   He argues that such sentiments drew heavily from a drama inherited from Puritanism: whereby the temporal sphere, either embodied in the Godly prince or the Godly people, asserted its rights against the pretensions of a usurping clergy.[24]

Goldie maintains that it has been a mistake of past scholarship to view Anglicanism as a royalist auxiliary.[25]   The two were not identical: the Church formed a separate power bloc which could, and did, act as opposition to Charles II.   Nor should we lose sight of the religious undertones of Exclusion-era discourse: not merely its anti-popery, but the response of militant Anglicanism to escalating attacks upon it.   During the later 1670s the political landscape had been transformed by a new and fervent generation of high-church Anglicans under Danby.   Goldie argues that although this group was loyalist, fundamentally their priority was a hard-line defence of the church, whatever the cost, even at the expense of the King's prerogatives.   It was this group who formed the activist core during the Exclusion Crisis, engaging in political action including electioneering.   "By 1680 it was readily apparent that the backbone of resistance to both conciliation and exclusion was the church hierarchy, its Bishops, its Deans and the eager young aspirants whose pulpiteering and pamphleteering made straight their path to future promotion."[26]

Broadly, I intend to follow Goldie and De Krey in their interpretation of this Anglican-Dissent dynamic to the crisis - for such divisions are also detectable in the 'pamphleteering' of the era, with the King caught in the exchange between the two.   The argument that religious passions fuelled much exclusion debate is a convincing one.[27]   It is therefore

---

[23]   Goldie, 'Danby, the Bishops and the Whigs', p75-77. Also Goldie, 'Priestcraft and the Birth of Whiggism' in Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner (eds) *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (1993), p209-231
[24]   Goldie, 'Priestcraft and the Birth of Whiggism', p214
[25]   Goldie, 'Danby, the Bishops and the Whigs', p75
[26]   Goldie, 'Danby, the Bishops and the Whigs', p80
[27]   Gary S. De Krey, 'Radicals, reformers and republicans: academic language and political discourse in Restoration London' in Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (eds) *A Nation Transformed: England after*

worthwhile considering the relationship between Charles' imagery and faith-based (or religiously motivated) 'political' arguments. Obviously the King could be, as we shall see, painted as the champion of Church and State; yet the picture is not a simple one. A number of questions arise: how was it possible for Tory polemicists to rebuke Charles for his religious failures and yet hail James as defender of the Church (a deeply counter-intuitive position)? Could a 'favourable' rendering of the King be stretched to support religiously more contentious positions? In which circumstances did it become easier and more profitable, for both Whig and Tory, to simply attack Charles? Did representations of Charles II change from a King designed to be all things to all people, to a harder-edged explicitly and exclusively Anglican figure during 'the Tory reaction'? In seeking to answer these questions a fresh line of inquiry is opened up into the relationship between religious attitudes and political allegiances during the crisis.

Much of the scholarship of the 1990s should be seen as a response to the revisionist school which preceded it: that group of historians whose work emerged in the 1970s and claimed orthodoxy in the 1980s (whose raison d'etre was debunking the assumptions of earlier Whig histories).[28] In particular the works of J.R Jones, J.P Kenyon and John Miller provide an analysis of the period focused upon parliamentary activity: finding little political extremism, save for Shaftesbury, the first Whigs appear as an opposition created and controlled from Westminster by politicians attempting to advance a single cause - exclusion. After this revisionist demythologising, religious scruples were largely discarded as a motivating impulse of the Whigs (J.R Jones detected little involvement of dissent[29]). In the early 1990s a new generation of scholarship - Mark Knights, Tim Harris, Jonathan Scott and Gary De Krey, among others - challenged key revisionist tenets.

---

the Restoration (2001), p71-99, and 'Reformation in the Restoration Crisis 1679-82', p231-248. Goldie, 'Priestcraft and the Birth of Whiggism', p209-231, and 'The Hilton Gang and the Purge of London in the 1680s' in Howard Nenner (ed) Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain (1997), p43-74

[28] For a more detailed assessment of the work of these historians see De Krey, 'The London Whigs and the Exclusion Crisis Reconsidered', p457-461

[29] Jones, The First Whigs, p211-217

One of the definitive divides in Restoration historiography is the tension between continuity and change - a debate which stems from that over the 'long eighteenth-century' - the Exclusion Crisis has become the front-line of this historiographical battle. Richard Greaves and Jonathan Scott in particular have emphasised that the roots of ideological division in the Restoration are traceable back to the 1640/50s.[30] "In a sense, the Restoration era was a prisoner of the mid-century revolutionary upheavals, powerfully shaped by what Scott calls the 'power of public memory', and at least in this sense not the commencement of Jonathan Clark's 'long eighteenth-century'. People looked back, whether in horror or admiration...to the days of the republic; these potent memories stirred them to respond in powerful ways."[31]

Greaves points out that scholars of early-modern England have been prone to write their history in terms of opposites: Whigs Vs Tories, Anglicans Vs Puritans, Crown Vs Parliament.[32] The corrective which stresses consensualism has therefore been salutary. However, Greaves also observes that an inherent danger of such analysis is too static a rendering: minimising change in its anxiety to demonstrate continuity and enduring pattern.[33] In my view, the curtailment of the long eighteenth-century to the eighteenth-century proper rightly reclaims the Restoration period, conceptually, for seventeenth-century historical concerns (not least, as discussed, for seventeenth-century religious belief). Yet Scott goes too far in describing the crises of Charles II's reign as "Xerox copies"[34] of the early Stuart period: a major difference between the 1630s and 1678-83 was the shattering events of 1649. Scott's England ends up marching backward into the future.

Recently the pendulum has swung back again in the opposite direction: Alan Houston and Steve Pincus have argued for the essential 'modernity' of later seventeenth-century

---

[30] Jonathan Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis 1677-83* (1991), p26-49
[31] Richard L Greaves, 'Great Scott! The Restoration in Turmoil, or, Restoration Crises and the Emergence of Party' in *Albion,* 25:4 (1993), p613
[32] Greaves, 'The Restoration in Turmoil', p612
[33] Greaves, 'The Restoration in Turmoil', p612
[34] Gary S. De Krey, 'Party Lines: A Reply' in *Albion,* 25:4 (1993), p640

England.[35] They question the insistence of some historians that events, structures and issues after 1660 were in any sense 'copies' of the early Stuart period, and query Scott's suggestion that in pre-industrial societies only radical religious belief could generate change. Houston and Pincus suggest that the critique of modernising scholarship has been built on two strands: firstly that society after 1660 remained deeply committed to a religious worldview, implying that the Glorious Revolution was not part of a secularising Enlightenment, but of the spiritual concerns of an earlier period. And secondly, that if a new political ideology entered Britain in the later seventeenth-century, then it was backward-looking, not modernising.[36] "In the 1970s and 1980s, at the exact high point of revisionist scholarship in early-modern English historiography, modernisation theory came under fierce attack: modernisation was seen as an overly schematic, universalist, teleological and potentially imperialist schematisation (imposing a Western - American - model of capitalist development on the rest of the world)."[37]

Pincus calls for a new comprehension of 'modernity'. The picture he paints is of rapid and massive socio-political change after 1660. Modernisation, it is argued, need not imply simultaneous and unidirectional development across all areas of society, but rather emerges messily and uneven. Moreover the case for a uniform secularisation of society can only be allowed if we reject crude generalisations, and follow Blair Worden's sophisticated 'qualitative not quantitative' argument: whereby religious differentiation rather than religious decline is stressed.[38]

The Exclusion Crisis as viewed by current historiography is therefore the frontier-territory of this debate. For those, like Scott, who argue for substantial continuity post-1660, the

---

[35] Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, 'Introduction: Modernity and Later Seventeenth-Century England' in their *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (2001), p1-20
[36] This political ideology, whether called civic republicanism or neo-Roman, was committed to classical virtue rather than to modern political economy; Houston and Pincus, 'Modernity and Later Seventeenth-Century England', p5. Also see Quentin Skinner, *Liberty, Before Liberalism* (1998), John Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce and History* (1985)
[37] Houston and Pincus, 'Modernity and Later Seventeenth-Century England', p7-8
[38] Blair Worden, 'The question of secularization' in Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (eds) *A Nation Transformed* (2001), p20-41

episode provides evidence of a spiritual and religious mindframe haunted by the past. For those like Pincus, the crisis is a vital stepping stone on the path to modernity. I would argue that the case of either side if pushed too far can become tenuous. My own project is acutely aware of the powerful historical overtones present in the printed discourse of the Exclusion-era; yet I would contend that these memories of the past were marshalled in fundamentally novel ways.[39] We should remember that change often occurs using models of the past, or of the perceived past. The application of the King as symbol in the rhetoric of the period demonstrates that historical memory could equally act as an instrument of conservatism and of change. History has no single master.

(ii) The Emergence of Political Parties

One of the major themes of debate in Restoration historiography has been that of political parties. Older historiography tended to see the crisis that resulted from the Popish Plot as spawning two fairly cohesive parties, divided by divergent attitudes to the Catholic succession and by rival interpretations of the constitution.[40] The Whigs were populist champions of parliamentary sovereignty; the Tories were anti-populist defenders of hereditary principle and divine-right monarchy. Such views have come under increasing doubt in the scholarship of the last fifteen years.

This debate has been dominated by the dialogue between Tim Harris and Jonathan Scott.[41] Some scholars, with Scott at the forefront, have argued that the terminology of 'parties' is inaccurate and inappropriate; the political polarities that the term attempts to describe possessed little internal coherence, and considerable overlap existed between the two groupings in both ideology and personnel. If all is subdivided into two neat boxes, how do we interpret ambiguous figures such as the Earl of Sunderland or the Earl of Halifax, or,

---

[39] A point discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five.
[40] This older historiographical trend is discussed by Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, p 81-82
[41] See Scott, 'Restoration Process' and Tim Harris, 'Party Turns? Or, Whig and Tories get off Scott Free' in *Albion*, 25:4 (1993)

indeed, account for a 'party' embracing proponents of dissolution, exclusion *and* republicanism? For Scott political parties did not exist; rather we are dealing with polarities of belief within an extremely fluid political situation. Moreover, Scott maintains that the question of party has traditionally been formulated to seek anticipation of early eighteenth-century political structures: such a teleological approach, he argues, shifts the burden of proof and allows for the existence of party organisation largely independent of any evidence for it. In this vein Scott criticises historians such as J.R Jones and Richard Ashcraft for misusing contemporary examples of the word 'party'.[42]

Without doubt, Jonathan Scott's most controversial assertion is that the Whig (anti-court) majority of 1678-80 and the Tory (loyalist) majority of 1681-3 were one and the same.[43] Pointing to the similarity of language employed by both sides, Scott argues that the Tories successfully captured the centre ground, the moderate majority: that most people shifted their position as fear of a popish successor gave way to anxiety over threat to the Church of England from Dissent. Thus the Whigs of 1678-80 *were* the Tories of 1681-83.

Much of Scott's thesis has aroused energetic debate and rebuttal, not least from Tim Harris who has vigorously set out the counter-argument: that the years 1678-83 did indeed see the emergence of political parties.[44] Harris concedes that much depends on the definition of 'party' we adopt, that there continued to be fluidity in political allegiance, and that party-structures were less developed than in later periods. Nonetheless, the crisis did produce a polarisation between two fairly well-identified sides, both of which had distinct political ideologies and a rudimentary degree of organisation. By Restoration standards, says Harris, this can appropriately be described as a party conflict. Moreover, it would be a mistake to assume that involvement in a party precluded participation in factionalism, or was identical to broad movements or loose alliances such as the court/country divide.

---

[42] Scott, 'Restoration Process', p631
[43] Scott, 'England's Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot', p126
[44] Harris, 'Party Turns?', p590

The scholarly balance of opinion favours Harris - with Mark Knights, Richard Greaves, John Miller and Gary De Krey all accepting the presence of 'parties', in some form, during the Exclusion Crisis.[45] "If we recognise, with Harris, that the rise of parties was an evolutionary process, we can, to borrow a horticultural metaphor, uncover their roots in the historical garden, ascertain the point at which the minimal features of a party are present, and refer henceforth to parties without implying their existence in more mature forms."[46]

My own reading of contested representations of the King advances a notion of fervent partisanship and confirms the sense of increasing self-identification as 'Whig' and 'Tory' among pamphleteers. Whether or not this represented a 'party' conflict remains debatable. Yet a study of print propaganda does correspond with Harris' definition of 'parties' as possessing distinct political viewpoints (or ideologies) and some semblance of organisation. Arguing for the existence of parties is not a primary objective of this thesis, but, in general, my research tends to support Harris' position more than it does Scott's.

Jonathan Scott's most controversial claim - the mass conversion of Whigs into Tories – would have serious implications for the present research if it were established. However the historiographical majority-view is that he has failed to offer significant statistical analysis to substantiate it.[47] Harris agrees that Tory propaganda sought support through an appeal to the middle ground (using, as Mark Knights has shown, similar rhetoric[48]). Crucially though, this did not produce ideological consensus, the effect of increased Tory support was merely to polarise English society even further. The Whigs did not lose all backing after 1681, rather the Tories gained new strength - it simply became harder to stay neutral or disengaged. While some, of course, did change sides, the majority of Englishmen did not, and could not, because the issues which separated them were so fundamental. The key divide in 'party' allegiance being over the issue of the Church: with Whigs sympathetic to Dissent, largely

---

[45] Indeed, De Krey even argues for the existence of parties in London from the period 1667-73; 'Party Lines', p578
[46] Greaves, 'The Restoration in Turmoil', p614
[47] See Greaves, 'The Restoration in Turmoil', p617-618
[48] Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*, p193-257

supportive of toleration for Protestants, and placing an emphasis on parliamentary sovereignty (if not necessarily exclusion), and the Tories the faction of intolerant Anglicanism. For Harris then, political parties not only existed, but were poles apart.

Viewing the period through the prism of print literature helps to reveal the interplay of partisan (or party) rivalry and underscores how, through print, these ideological polarities sought to gain popular support. When and how polemists turned to the King is therefore crucial. Can we uncover two broad, and rival, sets of royal representations? If so, can we talk of the existence in print of a 'Tory Charles' and a 'Whig Charles'? Just how far did Whig/Tory propaganda diverge in their interpretations of the King's past actions and their professions of the ideal potential of Charles as monarch? What did each side consider Charles's main failings and successes?

(iii) The Growth of the Public Sphere

Perhaps the most noticeable development of recent years is the recognition of the growth and importance of 'public opinion' in Restoration historiography. David Zaret has suggested that the appearance of a phenomenon visibly akin to what we call public opinion represents a massively significant cultural shift of the seventeenth-century.[49] Such arguments stem, in part, from the debate about an early-modern 'public sphere'. It has been suggested that the emergence of a public sphere created a new kind of society; one where informed public opinion became a critical factor in politics.[50] This debate was kick-started by the German social theorist Jurgen Habermas and his assertion that by the beginning of the eighteenth-century, space existed in Great Britain specifically for public discussion and for the exercise

---

[49] David Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (2000), p3-17
[50] C. John Sommerville, *News Revolution in England: Cultural Dynamics of Daily Information* (1996), p161-170. The concept of public opinion/the public sphere is also explored in Steve Pincus, '"Coffee Politicians Does Create": Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture' in *The Journal of Modern History*, 67 (1995) and James Sutherland, *The Restoration Newspaper and its development* (1986), p1-44

of reason.[51] This view has proven extremely controversial[52] and has been challenged by, among others, Ronald Hutton, who maintains that free debate was eliminated after the re-imposition of the Licensing act, and by Jonathon Scott, who rejects any fundamental break in the socio-political continuity of the later seventeenth-century.[53] More recently Steven Pincus has set out the counter-argument; rearticulating the belief that a public sphere, in the Habermassian sense, did develop in the later Stuart period: with coffeehouses (the archetypal public space), print literature, and street politics providing the social and cultural locus for an early-modern English public sphere.[54]

Where does this historiographical debate leave the present research? If we follow Hutton in acknowledging that the end of Charles II's reign saw public discourse again suffering under government censorship, we are nonetheless still left with that singular period - the Exclusion Crisis – when this was not the case. This surely provides us with a fascinating 'window of opportunity' for the study of a public debate flourishing in something approximate to a 'public sphere'. The crisis years were a unique moment in English history: after the intellectual free-for-all of the Civil War years, yet prior to the watershed of the Glorious Revolution. We may find expressions of public opinion to be rather like the proverbial genie in a bottle – considerably harder to get back under control than to release. Just as the experience of the Interregnum changed public expectations during the Restoration, so, perhaps, the Restoration experience (not least of the crisis) changed outlooks in England post-1688.

The most systematic and comprehensive study of popular opinion (and propaganda) during the Exclusion Crisis can be found in the work of Mark Knights.[55] Knights deliberately divides his book into two sections – distinguishing, on the one hand, between 'high politics'

---

[51] Jurgen Habermas, *The structural transformation of the public sphere* (1989)
[52] Criticisms of the 'public sphere' are more thoroughly discussed by Pincus, 'Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', p809-811
[53] Hutton, *Charles II*, p404-445; Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677-83* (1991), p3-25
[54] Pincus, 'Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', p807-835
[55] Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis 1678-81*, p153-348

in Westminster and Whitehall, and, on the other, 'public opinion' outside Parliament and the court. He thereby grants parity of attention to public opinion in the country as a whole, and traces its expression through the media of press, petition and address.

A key issue is the relationship between public opinion and print culture.[56] Harold Weber has claimed that a correlation between the two was newly recognised by the judiciary in Exclusion-era trials: with a new criminal status emerging to define the act of authorship.[57] Weber has also underscored the enormous power that these seditious texts were considered to hold by those in authority. A picture is increasingly emerging of print literature as an agent of public opinion: affecting its formation, giving it voice, and reflecting the dangerousness of this novel phenomenon. Thanks to the work of Knights, Weber and others, we have a new conception of Restoration 'public opinion' as a vital presence and actor to be wooed through print.

The public sphere, it is maintained, was genuinely popular; with support sought from sectors of society not traditionally part of the political nation.[58] Certainly the reach of print propaganda was long, potentially affecting most levels of society and stretching into the provinces (not simply the streets of London). In particular the audience for ballads and poems was not exclusively the 'middling sort', but rather the masses. As David Underdown observes: "Shaftesbury's Whigs appealed to the people in pamphlets, in parliamentary speeches, and above all in London street politics, even more shamelessly than Pym's Roundheads had done."[59] It is perhaps not surprising that the term 'mob' first arose in the 1680s.[60]

---

[56] Joad Raymond, 'The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere' in *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (ed) Joad Raymond (1999), p109-141
[57] Harold Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II* (1996), p208
[58] Pincus, 'Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', p811
[59] David Underdown, *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-Century England* (1996), p113
[60] Tim Harris, 'Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain' in Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (eds) *A Nation Transformed* (2001), p125

Moreover, Underdown and Harris have shown that, while it remains fair to describe the Whigs as essentially populist, the Tories also conspicuously courted 'the mob'. The Tories orchestrated a counter-propaganda campaign which consciously sought to appeal to the populace and to build up support for the Duke of York.[61] According to Underdown it would be a grave error to suppose that polemists like Roger L'Estrange were not pitching their arguments to the less respectable segments of the population. Harris highlights the hand of government behind such Tory propaganda: in particular singling out the position of L'Estrange as semi-official and identifying Chief Justice North as fulfilling a coordination role in propaganda output.[62] In Harris's assessment, this, together with agitation at street-level by Tory crowds, represents a concerted effort to claim back the 'popular' mantle and confer 'representative status' upon Tory gatherings and Tory print (accrediting them as indicators of widespread popular support).

Harris has done much to draw attention to 'politics out-of-doors' in this era.[63] The question that I wish to consider is the effect which printed representations of Charles II had on public opinion 'out-of-doors': at stake was the meaning of (and the ability to wield) that most powerful of rhetorical symbols, the King himself. The Exclusion Crisis is often framed by historians in terms which marginalize Charles II: concerned, as it was, with the problem of James' succession, with contesting systems of political philosophy, and with the battle between Whig and Tory.[64] In the swirl of a thousand passions and issues that characterised the crisis, historians sometimes lose sight of Charles in this debate. Yet, unlike questions such as the Earl of Danby's impeachment or even exclusion itself, the issue of the King, as

---

[61] Tim Harris, 'The Parties and the People: the Press, the Crowd and Politics 'out-of-doors' in Restoration England' in Lionel K. J. Glassey (ed) *The Reigns of Charles II and James VII & II* (1997), p141

[62] Harris, 'The Parties and the People', p139-140

[63] Harris, 'The Parties and the People', p148-151

[64] Certainly this is evident in most general surveys of the period; Mark Kishlandshy, *A Monarchy Transformed Britain 1603-1714* (1997), p256-259; Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714* (1980), p325-333. These detail the actions of Charles II in the political arena extremely well and recap the main theoretic arguments found in Whig/Tory print – yet the two appear as separate spheres, with the King central to the former but marginal to the latter.

we shall see, could not be ducked: fundamentally, Charles was either part of your problem or part of your solution.

The trend of recent scholarship has been to avoid drawing too sharp a divide between elite and popular politics, or to view the former as the puppet-master of the latter: "although the Whigs clearly did seek to mobilize the masses, it is wrong to talk of manipulated mobs. People could not easily be persuaded to take action on behalf of a cause for which they did not have sympathy; moreover, there is plenty of evidence to suggest that those out-of-doors were capable of coordinating political activity for themselves...it is better to talk of convergence between the ideals of the Whig elite and the political concerns of their supporters amongst the masses."[65] It is now widely accepted that between 1678-83 an informed and politicised public opinion emerged.

The extent to which propaganda is responsible for this process is more contentious. Underdown maintains that printed polemic had a tangible effect on the formation of political ideas, citing the example that many people were convinced of the Duke of Monmouth's legitimacy entirely due to persuasive Whig propaganda.[66] Harris, however, has sounded a warning over interpreting print culture as the engine of politicisation.[67] He has criticised the methodology of some historians, including John Miller and Mark Knights, for taking a 'top-down, centre-out approach'. In other words, for structuring their arguments upon the starting-assumption that politicisation occurred when members of the elite reached out to the masses and sought to manipulate them through exploitation of the press: therefore a crisis for the elite at the centre is spread outwards to affect first London, and then other localities, drawing people into national politics primarily through exposure to print. For Harris such a methodological supposition represents dated sociological thinking - the erroneous notion that early-modern 'media' were largely responsible for creating public opinion.

---

[65] Harris, 'The Parties and the People', p126
[66] Underdown, *A Freeborn People*, p124-125
[67] Harris, 'Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain', p126

Rather, Harris urges, we should focus less upon the press and pay greater attention to socio-political and cultural processes in accounting for the politicisation of the masses.[68] It was the operation of traditions (political, cultural, religious), together with the first-hand experience of government at grass-roots level that shaped political awareness. Under Harris's scheme, the government itself was the greatest, if unwitting, tool of politicisation. Furthermore, while Harris acknowledges that early-modern media played an important part in heightening political awareness, he sees the most traditional incarnations as the most significant: sermons, oral communication, rumour, and visual displays. How far, he asks, did printed material produced in London or Edinburgh penetrate into isolated areas such as South-West Scotland? Yet these were often the most politically staunch localities, precisely because they experienced government policy at bitter first-hand.

It may be objected that Harris substantially overlooks the relationship between print and oral culture, treating the two as if unrelated. Yet sermons and accounts of politics out-of-doors were not only seen and heard but also read, reproduced in print and distributed across the Kingdom; thereby multiplying their potential impact and audience. The interconnection of the spoken and printed word has been well explored by Steve Pincus, and is perhaps best exemplified by the boom in coffeehouses where broadsides, newssheets and poems were frequently read aloud.[69] I would contend that it is unhelpful to make too pronounced a dichotomy between traditional and newer media forms, they acted in conjunction in the process of politicisation.

Harris' recent methodological warning has implications for this thesis as it is based on printed primary material. However whether one takes a view of public opinion as a top-down phenomenon (where propaganda may be said to be a centrally-controlled mechanism of politicisation), or adopts a bottom-up approach (where print appears as an authentic expression of public mood), it is hard to shake the sense that the press was absolutely

---

[68] Harris, 'Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain', p128
[69] Pincus, 'Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', p818-822

integral to the Exclusion Crisis. Harris is right to caution us against too crude an association between public opinion and print: Whigs/Tories could not simply manufacture public opinion by printing pamphlets. Nonetheless, many issues were shaped by press formulations and print could at least influence public opinion, shifting the centre-of-gravity in debates. If print was not a powerful medium why did the authorities take it so seriously? Why, indeed, did both Whigs and Tories expend such resources on their propaganda campaigns? The printing press was certainly not the only agent of politicisation, yet contemporaries felt the printed word to be a dangerous thing - we should trust their judgment.

While the notion of Restoration 'public opinion' and the workings of propaganda have received increased scholarly focus, the related area of royal projection has been substantially overlooked. Imagery in the reigns of Louis XIV, Charles I and the more regal aspects of Oliver Cromwell's rule have all merited in-depth studies, yet no comparable consideration of the Restoration has been undertaken.[70] It is true that the symbolic meanings and forms of Charles II's coronation have been considered,[71] but no work has attempted to cover the whole Restoration period, or more surprisingly still, to de-code royal imagery during the Exclusion-era. It is this serious omission that the current research aims to remedy.

The most relevant line-of-argument pertaining to the crown's relationship to public opinion is that recently advanced by Tim Harris. Harris suggests that the post-civil war era marked a new phase in royal projection. Elizabeth I had broadcast an image of splendour designed to impress and awe; subjects were invited to revel in the glory of the crown and in Protestant monarchy. Yet it could never be so straightforward for Charles II. It is worth considering Harris' argument in some detail:

---

[70] Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*; Thomas Corns (ed), *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (1999); Lunger Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell*. For a more general overview see Helen Hackett, 'Dreams or Designs, Cults or Constructions? The Study of Images of Monarchs' in *The Historical Journal*, 44 (2001)

[71] Lorraine Madway, 'The Most Conspicuous Solemnity: The Coronation of Charles II' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed) *The Stuart Courts* (2000), p141-158; Gerard Reedy, 'Mystical Politics: The Imagery of Charles II's Coronation' in Paul J. Korshin (ed) *Studies in Change and Revolution: Aspects of English Intellectual History 1640-1800* (1972), p19-43

"The troubles of the Seventeenth-Century had led to a demystification of majesty, and to the rise of a more articulate and assertive popular political culture which had proven that it could be a seriously destabilizing factor for the crown. Charles II therefore had to negotiate with his subjects, appeal to their sensibilities, convince and persuade - in short, he had to solicit their support by showing that his policies were designed to protect their interests and welfare, and in the process he ended up making certain promises to his subjects to rule in a particular way. When James II failed to rule in that way, all his attempts to exploit Elizabethan-type techniques for the manipulation of public opinion - royal progresses, the celebration of royal birthdays and so forth - were to no effect. The world had become a very different place."[72]

My own research supports the premise that royal projection endeavoured to appeal to popular sensibilities, to convince and to persuade, but I consider the primary mechanism of the diffusion of thought and opinion to be the printed word. If Harris is to be followed in suggesting that we downgrade the importance of print, how did loyalists, as he also argues they did, attempt to convince and persuade? The avalanche of broadsides, ballads, poems, and panegyrics centred upon the King acted, I would argue, to create plural images influencing perception of Charles. This research therefore offers a new understanding of royal imagery in the Restoration. In particular, it tenders a fresh perspective on the Exclusion Crisis by demonstrating how print culture fashioned rhetorical symbols and influenced public opinion. Recent scholarship, notably that of Mark Knights,[73] has significantly enhanced our knowledge of printed polemic and its operations. Yet the absence of a purposeful study into the semiotics of this propaganda-debate continues to allow a vital dynamic to be lost.

---

[72] Harris, 'Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain', p152-153
[73] Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*, p227-347

The primary focus of the present research is on the content of royal representations, not on the processes of publication - the claims that were made in these tracts rather than how they came into the public domain.[74] Such a remit enables us to follow more closely the perspective of a seventeenth-century readership. My aim is to restore to our analysis a sense of contemporary reception of the image, something too lightly disregarded by historians in our own time; to locate and explain which features of royal imagery triggered violent responses, which aspects were considered invidious and which most persuasive. The business of royal images, it will be argued, was transformed between 1678-83: for no longer could loyalist iconography be deployed with the field clear, it had to compete against an opposition press with its own set of representations.

For Harris the business of soliciting popular support appears to be predicated upon the monarch demonstrating that his policies were in the interests of the subject[75] (one might venture to suggest that this brand of Kingly persuasion sounds almost akin to a modern political manifesto). My own view, as will appear progressively in subsequent chapters, is largely complementary to Harris' but is of royal projection as a less future-centric and less policy-specific enterprise: it will be shown that representations of the King made reference not simply to royal policy, but also to royal majesty, character and providential destiny.

To summarise: this thesis will, it is hoped, offer a fresh understanding of the Exclusion Crisis as illuminated by analysis of new modes of royal projection. The convergence of three types of novelty makes this possible: (i) the recognition of a historical innovation: the emergence, as a significant dimension of national politics, of 'public opinion'; (ii) the

---

[74] An area which is considered in Chapter Two, but which has, in any case, already been extensively explored by Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*, p153-192, and Richard L Greaves, *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688-89* (1992), p15-52

[75] Harris has promised greater expansion of his point in his forthcoming '*British Revolutions*'.

highlighted importance in our own time of the pertinent issues raised by this phenomenon: image, construct and projection; (iii) the more subtle techniques and resources for analysis developed by representationalist historiography and, more generally, the semiotic study of socio-cultural and socio-political phenomena.[76]

Recognition of 'public opinion' as an emerging and increasingly important seventeenth-century reality is a crucial historiographical advance. Research by Harris and others has opened the door to more extensive studies of a similar type. The innovative methodological approach pioneered by this recent scholarship - and followed in my own research - promises to provide a novel interpretation of Charles II and the milieu of Exclusion debate. It uncovers an awareness of communication, of reactivity, and of the integrity (or, on the contrary, the plasticity) of symbols under the pressure of events and of persuasive designs. Thereby a vital new factor can be integrated into the political equation of the 1680s.[77]

Such a study is unapologetically of our own time: consistent with modern questions and insights. It need not be, and should not be, a source of unease that questions are asked of the past which are relevant to the present and use present-day concepts.[78] Such questions reveal both the contrast of past and present and the commonality between them. The world today accentuates a feature already observable in the seventeenth-century. It is a 'communications society' where political presentation seems to dominate political discourse and behaviour excessively; we can say, in this regard, that the cult of the King is alive and well.[79] What this research is concerned with is political presentation and with myth-making - rhetorical tactics with very ancient antecedence, but ones which retain their relevance to our time. Today's

---

[76] Considered in greater detail in Chapter Two.
[77] This approach has considerable resonance in historiographical approaches of continental historians such as Pierre Nora, and in the hermeneutics of historiography as pursued by key figures such as Paul Ricoeur.
[78] Historiography is always, by definition, indebted to its time; the real question being how well it knows this, and how appropriately it uses this knowledge.
[79] We are not, however, as explained in Chapter Two, dealing in questions of 'spin' – a concept too embedded in the digital age of the twenty-four hour rolling news-cycle to be applicable to a seventeenth-century context.

leaders continue to ape a messianic sense of personal and national destiny, and, still, the demonising of an individual ruler can be offered as the justification for foreign policy.

Each chapter will act as a case-study considering key aspects of the King's image. Chapter Three examines the King as symbol: the various uses that were made of Charles II in print propaganda; the ways in which the King constituted a major topos in a game of contending efforts of persuasion. The hope is to demonstrate and explain how references to Charles were woven into partisan arguments in order to empower, to legitimise and to condemn. Chapter Four focuses on the character of the King: how certain concepts about Charles began to coalesce, and, when taken collectively, tended to form a portrait of the King's character. In this chapter rival understandings of the King will be considered: assessing whether we may identify two separate Charles IIs, or, at least, two contrasting partisan constructs of the King.

Chapter Five explores the operation of a 'Restoration myth': which is to say it traces the relationship, as depicted in print literature, between the King's personal past and England's national history; examining how this 'national myth' affected the shaping and manipulation of collective memory through iconographic representations of the King. It also considers the unique impact that the period 1678-83 had in distorting perceptions of Charles's past.

Chapters Six and Seven scrutinise representations of the Duke of Monmouth and the Duke of York respectively (and in particular their relationships, as imagined by polemicists, to the King). Representations of the two Dukes add significantly to our understanding of how Charles II himself was portrayed in print: the two Dukes, as we shall see, were coupled in print with each defined both in relation to each other and, crucially, to Charles II.

In modern idiom, we would say that the Exclusion Crisis was a seventeenth-century 'feeding frenzy'. Only through a systematic study and de-coding of the semiotics of royal projection can we begin to understand the manifestations, the genetic mechanisms and the significance of this construct. At stake was the control of English cultural memory.

Memory is a powerful vector of collective identity: so many memories, so many identities. [80] Royal imagery endeavoured to direct and utilise these powerful cultural forces for ideological ends. It is a propitious moment to establish the claims of just such an enquiry.

---

[80] Pierre Nora, 'General Introduction: Between Memory and History' in Realms of memory: the construction of the French past (1997), p1-7

Chapter Two: Sources and Methodology

This chapter will set out and explain the methodological choices that have been made during the course of this research. How should the historian approach textual representations of the King? Helen Hackett has observed the difficulty of studies investigating images of monarchy: "How is the scholar to proceed in making sense of all these various forms and images? Clearly the methodologies of art history, literary criticism, and study of popular culture are likely to blend in this field. That said, it is striking how various are the chosen approaches of different scholars."[1] There is no single or 'perfect' way to deal with the type of complex historical evidence upon which this kind of study is based. The fundamental methodological question in this research, as indeed in most historical inquiry, should be what problems are presented by the available primary evidence and how may we best surmount them; to profit fully we must make explicit the historiographical and hermeneutical issues involved in the appeal made to evidence by the historian.[2]

At its core, this thesis considers representations of Charles II found in the print literature of the late 1670s and early 1680s – these representations are the common thread followed through an oceanic amount of diverse primary material. Four sections will deal with specific methodological issues raised by this research: (i) the dynamics of Exclusion-era print literature (the processes of production and the art of image-making), (ii) the nature of 'Whig/Tory' partisanship, (iii) print culture and the public sphere, and (iv) hermeneutical implications of 'representationalist history'.

---

[1] Hackett, 'Dreams or Designs, Cults or Constructions? The Study of Images of Monarchs', p811
[2] In a sense everything could be argued to fall within the purview of hermeneutics (the art or science of interpretation), including historiography, since everything involves interpretation.

It is important to consider the texts on which this research is founded; both the nature of the texts themselves and the uses to which they have been put. I have therefore sought to map the corpus of available material (detailing both the problems and the opportunities that it poses), to make clear the selections that have been made in approaching these texts, and finally, to give a brief outline of the process of print production itself (and how this affects our uses of the printed output). Three sub-sections will focus, in turn, on the selection of primary texts, the textual approach taken toward these sources, and the production of Exclusion-era print literature.

Selection of Texts

The number of printed texts produced between 1678 and 1683 was considerable. A fact which becomes abundantly clear in considering the corpus of Exclusion-era tracts. Wilmer G. Mason calculates that there are 4,700 Wing-listed items for the years 1679-1681 alone.[3] More recent estimates put that number closer to 6,000.[4] Given what we know about contemporary print runs, these figures suggest a total number of printed items in circulation in the millions; probably in excess of ten million.[5] Clearly the numbers involved were vast, and, indeed, a massive body of literature survives and is available to the historian for study (a resource that has not hitherto been fully explored by existing historiography).

The research in this thesis is based on approximately 300 examples of print culture. This constitutes the examination of as much material as was practicable within time constraints. Clearly, given the very large numbers of texts in play, it was not possible to consider every example of print surviving from the period – not least since my intention was to give detailed

---

[3] Wilmer G. Mason, 'The Annual Output of Wing-Listed Titles 1649-1684' in *The Library*, 29 (1974), p219-20

[4] Maureen Bell and John Barnard, 'Provisional Count of Wing Titles 1641-1700' in *Publishing History*, 44 (1998), p91

[5] Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (2005), p15-18

attention to each source examined. Yet such a sample is, if not comprehensive, of sufficient scope to represent a wide cross-section of surviving texts.

It is necessary however to state what kind of sources were less used and why this was the case. As much 'political print' – which is to say texts whose content touched obviously 'political' subject matter, Parliament, Popish Plot and so forth – was examined during the course of research as possible. Yet even within this genre certain types of 'political print' appear less prominently than others. Most obviously, the majority of government declarations[6], the chief works of political theory[7], petitions to the King, and the printed proceedings of Parliament are not central components of this research. Not least this approach was taken because these are the types of sources that have already been most extensively mined in published work.[8] It should also be noted that this study deals with textual representations only. Pictorial representation of the King constitutes a separate, if related, subject area for study and thus falls outside of the parameters of this research.[9]

It is also important to acknowledge the considerable diversity in the texts used. Although the term 'printed texts' is one I have frequently employed, it does, in truth, cover a wide constellation of material: pamphlets, poems, broadsides, ballads, etc.[10] How can these different genres of Exclusion-era print be said to differ from one another? The answer is considerably, for they encompass differing modes of expression: first person observation, third person narratives, 'character' dialogue, verse (both panegyric and satirical). We can

---

[6] This includes the words of Charles II himself – as published in official declarations and royal speeches. These have, in any case, already been expertly dealt with by Mark Knights who has traced the effects of the King's own words, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis*, p316-329. Although this kind of 'official' evidence is not a mainstay of the present research, it is pertinent to it, especially in so far as official pronouncement was picked up and perpetuated in 'popular' tracts (many of which directly built on, and responded to, official publications).

[7] This aspect will be discussed more thoroughly later in this chapter.

[8] Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis 1678-81*; Sutherland, *The Restoration Newspaper and its development*; Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics & Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (1986); Brian Weiser, 'Access and Petitioning during the reign of Charles II' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed) *The Stuart Courts* (2000)

[9] As discussed in the previous chapter, the work of Lorraine Madway has expertly explored visual representations of Charles II.

[10] When no page number is given in footnotes for primary source quotations it indicates that the source in question is a broadsheet or single-sided poem.

find the same idea articulated in many different forms. This diversity of media is something which should be taken into account in assessing primary material.[11]

Moreover, certain types of print were probably intended to reach particular audiences. Roger North noted that: "there was a Magazine provided of Ammunition, Libels, Lampoons, Satyrs, Pictures and Sing-Songs…Some adapted to deceive men of Fortune and Education, well penned, and perhaps in Heroic Verse; others for the Rabble, and drunken, sottish Clubs, in Ballad Doggerel, with witty Picture affixed."[12] Roger Chartier has advanced the important notion of distinct 'communities of readers'.[13] The lyrics to ballads, for example, were often more vulgar than other print types and, as a performance media, were best able to reach the illiterate. Both the vulgar and the verbal nature of ballads could, perhaps, be viewed as signifiers of a popular audience.[14] Price is another indicator of potential audience.[15] Though we know much, further research on the correlation between literary genres and social demographics in England would be timely.

However, having acknowledged the considerable differences of genre and target audience, it remains a defensible approach to examine print material collectively. For as Roger North noted, all sections of society were, one way or another, engaged and affected by the various forms of printed polemic. Therefore, without flattening out the very real differences of genre, it may be argued that ideas found in Exclusion-era print acted in some senses collectively.[16] Oral culture could facilitate a 'trickle down' or spreading of ideas – whereby an idea in print, whether read or read aloud, could be passed on by word-of-mouth (often being altered in the process). The psychological picture of the King carried by his

---

[11] In particular, verse and prose material could act in quite different ways.
[12] Roger North, *Examen: or, an Enquiry into the credit and veracity of a complete History* (1740), p101
[13] Chartier, 'Reading Matter and 'Popular' Reading: From the Renaissance to the Seventeenth Century' in Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier (eds) A History of Reading in the West (1997), p271-281
[14] Although we should be wary of assuming that vulgarity indicates popularity, or, conversely, that the presence of arcane concepts equates to influence over the powerful.
[15] A point made in great detail later in the chapter.
[16] An argument dealt with more fully later in the chapter.

subjects – it will be suggested – took shape from both direct and indirect experience. In the case of print, this is to say that ideas contained in print, even if only encountered in 'second-hand' form through word-of-mouth communication, had the potential to affect perception.[17]

Special attention has been paid to those areas of the printed debate which provoked particularly frequent and fierce propaganda sallies. In this way we may trust contemporaries to guide us toward that which was important to them. Rather than seek out elements of debate which – through secondary reading – we expect to be present and important, it is better to follow the primary material wherever it leads. In this way, we may best attempt to set our own preconceptions aside and avoid predetermining our conclusions. We may also hope to recognise the reactivity of the printed debate. The content of some texts frequently echoed others; replicating, altering and subverting existing notions by expressing them in new forms. On occasion tracts were explicitly written as direct ripostes to other printed texts (usually by way of repudiation).[18] The propaganda battle was, as will be shown, a struggle for the 'ownership' of powerful ideas and symbols – not least of the King himself.[19]

Approaches to the Texts and their 'Popular' Status

In approaching the body of texts which forms the basis of the present research, our first question must relate to language. History being a truth-seeking enterprise, as 'positive' or 'scientific' as may be, the historian normally prefers to deal with factual documents and fact-stating texts about the past. Here, on the contrary, the attesting material belongs to the most subjective of literary genres: satire, propaganda, tract. Language is being used consistently for persuasive effect, with as much tendentious art as possible invested in the effort of persuasion. To what extent therefore is a 'literary' methodology appropriate?

---

[17] Miller, After the Civil Wars, p55
[18] For example, *Some Remarques Upon a Late Popular piece of nonsense called Julian the Apostate* (1682) makes clear even in its title that its purpose is a rebuttal of the Whig tract *Julian the Apostate: Being a Short Account of His Life* (1682)
[19] As Knights has shown, there was much overlap in the rhetoric between Whigs and Tories – even language was a battleground to be contested: *Politics and Opinion in Crisis 1678-81*, p193-226

Of course, my enquiry parallels a properly literary concern over the first part of its trajectory (taking account of style and rhetoric means such as imagery, repetition, symbolism, etc). Yet we are dealing with historic documents, designed, in their own terms, to engage with the politics of their day. Accordingly my research seeks to contextualise these tracts against the background of the crisis; thereby opening up their meaning, purpose and impact to analysis. The methodological emphasis is not on the techniques of exclusively literary inquiry (examining cadence or pathetic fallacy, etc), but rather on the dynamics of political rhetoric – which is to say the act of persuasion through the skilful deployment of language. Sensitivity to the language that is found in these pamphlets is, therefore, crucial as a means to uncover an authentic sense of their operations (both to understand the text, as it is written, and the 'subtext' that lies behind it). Literature – including the type of print literature which is our subject – is a mode of communication; we must refer to the meaning it held for the reader, one can then identify the likely effects of signification and account for them.[20] This project is about how and why certain texts (and certain groups of texts) elicited powerful responses.

In explicating the content of these texts we also face the question of the author. Much of the printed material from the crisis years was published entirely anonymously, and, as much material again was credited only to self-justifying titles that largely preserved anonymity: *'a lover of his country'* or *'an honest gentlemen'*.[21] It is frequently not possible to augment an anonymous author's possible motivation for writing with reference to non-printed evidence – unlike the way that Shaftsbury's private papers help to shed light on the propaganda with which he was involved.[22]

---

[20] Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (1981), p48
[21] These titles, as James Sutherland has shown, were open to co-option by other writers and we can not even assume that any one of these 'names' was the exclusive preserve of a specific writer; *The Restoration Newspaper*, p185-232
[22] K.H.D Haley, *The First Earl of Shaftesbury* (1968), p391-393

Yet it is nonetheless possible to discuss the reading of authority in early-modern England; to make the vital distinction between the creation and the content of pamphlet literature.[23] In order to investigate the meaning produced in, and disseminated by texts, we must consider the habits of reading and the strategies of interpretation which shaped responses to texts.[24] Brian Stock has emphasised an approach that posits the separation of the author from the text that results from the act of writing.[25] Under this view the signification of a text almost takes on a life of its own. The bottom-line for the study of history is that we are left with the texts themselves - by locating them in the socio-political context in which they existed we may attempt to discover possible meanings/responses to these tracts. This is an achievable aim, and, while it may not produce 'certainty' regarding the reception of individual texts, it does improve our understanding of the collective political milieu and gain some insight into the psychology of contemporary debate. Such an approach also better allows for occasional mismatches in communication between what was sent out (authorial intention) and what was received (contemporary reception).[26] The content of these printed pamphlets remains available for study, and, if approached with care, these tracts can inform us about the debates of the 1670s.

Our aim should be to recreate the 'mind-frame' of public reception: these were, after all, texts directed toward the public. Most men and women in Restoration England would, it seems fair to posit, have been struck by the content of polemic rather by any overriding interest in how these pamphlets had found their way into coffeehouses or other points of contact with their daily lives. Indeed, the sheer volume of printed material remaining to us suggests that the experience of printed polemic (be it as reader, listener, buyer or seller), was a commonplace one during the crisis years. What preoccupied writers and their readership in the 1670s and the 1680s were the ideas contained within pamphlets. Therefore the way to

---

[23] Steven Zwicker, *Lines of authority: politics and English literary culture 1649-1689* (1993), p3
[24] Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England, The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (2000), p24
[25] Brian Stock, *Listening for the text: on the uses of the past* (1990), p17
[26] Michael Stanford, *A Companion to the Study of History* (1994), p80

recover a contemporary understanding of these texts lies, in part, in the texts themselves. Analysis of what was said (and how it was said), contextualised against a wider understanding of Exclusion-era politics, reveals what buttons propaganda was pushing and indicates the potential effects on perception that these tracts may have had.

The printed primary sources of this research are frequently referred to as being 'popular' in nature. What is understood by this? First and foremost what is meant is that this print material was 'publicly' available during the Exclusion years – it generally existed on the open market, without government control, and was thus available to anyone who could afford it, giving print the potential to affect perceptions of the King among a mass or plebeian audience.

It is true that some printed tracts were more 'popular' (or plebeian) than others. We may take some measure of this through pricing. We know, for example, that Narcissus Luttrell paid 9d. for a copy of Robert Fergusson's *A Letter to a Person of Honour concerning the Black Box*[27] and 1s. 6d. for Fergusson's *A Letter to a Person of Honour concerning the King's disavowing*[28] – the latter price especially (being almost a day's wages for a labourer in London), perhaps calls into question the extent to which this title may be called a 'popular' text. Broadsides, by contrast, were generally much cheaper – Luttrell paid 1d. for *A Dialogue between the D. of C and the D. of P* [29] – making that genre of print more easily accessible to the lower socio-economic segments of society. And there was certainly no shortage of available print during 1678-83 on this lower-end of the pricing scale. Stephen Parks has calculated of Luttrell's collection that: "[the] 617 items in the Popish Plot catalogues cost Luttrell £9 7s. 3¼d., or an average of less than twopence each."[30]

---

[27] Stephen Parks, *The Luttrell File: Narcissus Luttrell's Dates on Contemporary Pamphlets 1678-1730* (1999), p62
[28] Parks, *The Luttrell File: Narcissus Luttrell's Dates*, p62
[29] Parks, *The Luttrell File: Narcissus Luttrell's Dates*, p45
[30] Parks, *The Luttrell File: Narcissus Luttrell's Dates*, p8

Information about print-runs and the circulation of pamphlets also offers us a guide to the number and popularity of individual titles.[31]

It is important that these kinds of differences in mass availability are acknowledged and observed. However, the total numbers involved – probably in excess of ten million copies of printed titles[32] – suggest the streets were awash with print of one kind or another, and that propagandists were not merely writing for each other but had a wider audience in mind. Moreover, historians such as Steve Pincus and John Miller have argued that oral culture enabled the printed word to reach and affect even the illiterate.[33] Establishments such as coffeehouses widened access to all-kinds of print – in such places a man did not need to purchase a pamphlet himself in order to be exposed to its ideas and contents.[34] We may say that certain printed titles were more or less 'plebeian', but that the 'releasing' of print material (in all its diversity) onto the streets was an essentially 'public' act.

The Process of Production

In addition to scrutinising the content of printed literature, it is also important for the historian of the period to consider the production of tracts: when, how and why these pamphlets came into being and became publicly available. The provenance of printed tracts is integral to understanding the nature of the texts themselves. Much of what we know about the processes of production and circulation derives from the well documented government attempts at censorship. The Licensing Act of 1662 was the primary mechanism for government control of the press: providing, at least in theory, a statutory basis for pre-publication censorship. Crucially, having been extended in 1665 for the duration of the next Parliament, the Licensing Act finally lapsed during the political turmoil of May 1679. This

---

[31] Nicolas K. Kiessling, The Library of Anthony Wood (2002), p4-44
[32] Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain*, p15-18
[33] Pincus, 'Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', p814; Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, p55
[34] Pincus, 'Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', p817-822

blew off the lid of state control and opened up a freedom of the press unparalleled since the Civil Wars.

For research seeking, as this thesis does, to investigate the projection of 'images' through print, the points highlighted by the censorship system in choosing its targets tells us much about the chain of production that resulted in printed tracts (and ideas) hitting the streets. Punishments were laid down for unlicensed authors, publishers, printers, and booksellers. Although the emphasis was on preventing 'dangerous' tracts from ever publicly appearing, there was a de facto recognition by the government that post-publication measures were also required, with the law of seditious libel operating in this regard.

What were the driving forces – both financial and ideological - behind the production of printed tracts? This is a crucial question in understanding print literature generally, and literature with an oppositional bias in particular. It used to be thought that the Earl of Shaftsbury had an extensive 'propaganda machine': a centrally controlled Whig operation producing printed polemic to demand and in accordance with an overarching propaganda blueprint.[35] The view that one or more 'grand patrons' controlled all opposition activity (including propaganda) has increasingly been challenged; it no longer represents the prevailing view among historians of the period.[36] In its place has emerged a comprehension of a more diffuse, improvised and case-specific 'story' of print production. No propaganda mastermind stood in the shadows exercising control over the entire printed output of either side. Moreover, Harold Weber has argued that a new emphasis on, and recognition of, the author as an individual emerged during the Exclusion Crisis (which is particularly observable in the prosecution of 'the Protestant joiner' Stephen College).[37] The government, previously more concerned with printers and publishers, now awoke to a plethora of authors who appeared newly powerful and dangerous.

---

[35] Jones, *The First Whigs*, p16-18
[36] See Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts* (1993), p80-116
[37] Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II*, p172-208

The present research will follow, and indeed offer additional evidence in support of, this broad-based understanding of propaganda production. Weber's thesis that the individual author was important as never before finds corroboration in my own research: many texts bear the hallmarks of self-appointed champions of the Whig/Tory causes. Certainly there is little to suggest any overall propaganda master-plan. The writing of a political text was often, therefore, an individual enterprise undertaken in the name of a corporate cause: the purpose of a given text may have been to bolster one side or the other, but it did so on individual terms. There was no official vetting system or central command-structure dictating publication of texts; a point which must be remembered when allocating sources into any kind of groupings, and which helps to explain why certain Whig/Tory texts argue contradictory viewpoints to other texts supposedly on their side.

In describing the (often anonymous) authors behind the prodigious output of printed material from 1678-83 I have employed various terms: writers, propagandists, scribes, apologists, polemicists, etc. Generally these terms are largely consistent with one another, although each possesses a slightly different emphasis. Essentially we may locate texts and authors on a scale of politicisation: with the work of 'propagandists' and 'polemicists' being the most virulent in political partisanship. That said, we should not make too much of the differences between, say, a 'Whig writer' and a 'Whig propagandist', both, after all, describe broadly similar things.

The word 'propaganda' is used frequently throughout this thesis and, given its 'modern' associations – particularly its connotations of twentieth-century totalitarian regimes - requires some justification in application to an early-modern timeframe.[38] 'Propaganda' may be defined as being of biased or misleading opinion of a kind designed to promote a political

---

[38] Kevin Sharpe rejects this term: "our understanding and use of the word propaganda implies a cynical manipulation and misrepresentation that were quite at odds with the early-modern meaning (dissemination of a faith)." *Remapping Early Modern England*, p435

cause or point of view, or to spread an ideological persuasion.[39] This research will demonstrate that Exclusion-era polemic crafted its modes of expression, deliberately distorting its representations, precisely in order to solicit political allegiance from the reader. Therefore it does not seem misplaced to apply the term 'propaganda' to much of the ideologically motivated print literature of these years.

(ii) Whig/Tory Partisanship

The designations 'Whig' and 'Tory' appear repeatedly throughout this thesis. It is therefore important that their meaning and application be clearly understood. What did or did not make one a Tory/Whig (and exactly when these political groupings observably appeared), has been the subject of much historiographical debate.[40] For our purposes, a working definition of 'Whig' may be said to have three distinguishing features: (i) opposition - whether parliamentary activity, politics 'out-of-doors' or the output of printed polemic, Whiggism during this period was characterised by opposition to the government and the crown, (ii) religious dissent - nonconformists constituted a high preponderance of Whig support, and, while not all Whigs were religious dissenters, the correlation between the two is a significant identifying feature, and (iii) the unifying experience common to all Whigs was a deep sense of unease at the prospect of a Catholic successor (which pushed many into advocating the policy of exclusion).[41] 'Tories', conversely, can be characterised as overtly loyalist[42], overwhelmingly Anglican, and utterly committed to a Yorkist succession.

---

[39] 'Propaganda' is defined in the *Oxford English Reference Dictionary* 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press (2003) as: an organised programme of publicity, selected information, etc, used to propagate a doctrine, practice, etc.

[40] For discussion of factionalism in the Restoration court see Alan Marshall, *The Age of Faction: Court Politics 1660-1702* (1999), p91-124

[41] Coward, *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714*, p329

[42] In general I have employed the term 'loyalist' (rather than 'royalist') to describe the supporters of Charles II – the latter term being too redolent of civil war terminology and groupings. When 'royalist' is used it therefore denotes the memory during the Restoration period of the 1640s and 1650s. Whereas 'loyalist' refers to the supporters of the King (whom we also term Tories) in the late 1670s and early 1680s.

It is essential for our purposes to recognise the singularity of timeframe (1678-1683) in which we are operating. The historical moment, if not a period of sustained crisis, was, at least, a politically turbulent succession of years; it experienced the striking of trenchant political positions in response to 'big questions' (polarities formed naturally in reaction to issues such as the Popish Plot, Danby's impeachment, James's exclusion, the General elections of 1679, and the Rye House Plot). What it meant to be Whig/Tory during these momentous years is not interchangeable with what 'Whig' and 'Tory' came to mean after the Glorious Revolution, or, still less, what they represented during the eighteenth-century. These terms were used by contemporaries in reaction to the political issues confronting them; not least these were labels that arose in response to the Duke of York's religious faith and to describe the policies and character of Charles II. The issue of whether these widely accepted polarities of belief constituted 'political parties' is not directly relevant to this research.[43] My focus is the printed polemic produced in large quantities during this period, not on whether this literature is best described as the product of factions, political groupings, or political parties.

Yet, at times during this thesis designations other than Whig/Tory are utilized: 'loyalist opinion', 'opposition writers', 'Yorkist support' and so on. In general these descriptions are merely alternatives for Whig/Tory terminology, with meanings that are directly comparable to a specific part of the overarching categories of Whig/Tory, employed to prevent endless repetition for writer and reader alike. These substitute terms signify a narrower constituency from the broader labels of Whig/Tory. Whether 'royal propaganda' (suggestive of court involvement) is precisely interchangeable with the concept of 'Tory propaganda' (implying a more diffusive and decentralised process) may be open to question.

However, when these substitute terms are applied in a way that departs from Whig/Tory definitions, explicit reference is made to these new usages. For example, 'Yorkist support' is

---

[43] The dispute between Tim Harris and Jonathan Scott over political parties was discussed in the previous chapter.

generally consistent with 'Tory support' which is, in turn, generally concurrent with 'loyalism' (the use of all three in this thesis reflects this commonality of meaning); however, in Chapter Seven the championing of the Duke's cause by 'Yorkists' is considered in opposition to support for Charles II. The application of the terms 'loyalist' and 'Tory' are therefore used in this chapter in a slightly different way to previously (a point made clear in the chapter itself).

Of critical significance to my methodological approach is the identification of printed texts as Whig/Tory material. What criteria may accurately be employed in such an identification? Certainly in holding up a text as an example of Whig/Tory sentiment, a degree of judgement is required. After all, although some writers actively stated their political allegiances most did not describe themselves, or their work, as being Whig/Tory (these were, after all, terms of abuse). Moreover, there is a danger that textual subtleties are lost if everything is simply subsumed into two catch-all groupings. Rather, we should approach the canon of printed texts as shades of opinion existing on a political spectrum: there were many Whig voices, there were many Tory voices.

Nonetheless, a family resemblance is still identifiable in distinguishing these two tribes from one another. Some of these distinguishing features have been discussed - traceable in attitudes to the crown, to religion and to the political climate of the late 1670s. Often political bias expressed itself most clearly in attacks on opponents: the writer who fervently outlines all that he opposes thereby offers a de facto acknowledgement of the general political ground on which he stands. For example, the anonymous author of *The Rose of Delight* (1680) makes no acknowledgement of his being a Whig, but does decry, "that Tory-crew, who hath nothing to do but scandal [the] brave."[44] A text which, let us say, lambastes the Duke of York, advocates his exclusion, and defends the rights of Parliament may be described, with some confidence, as being 'Whig' in disposition (even if it is anonymously authored and without explicit declaration of its own 'Whiggishness').

---

[44] *The Rose of Delight, or An Excellent new song* (1680)

A survey of printed polemic also renders apparent clear trends in lists of publishers and printers, and indeed even in the titling of works themselves. These can act as guides to the identification of Whig/Tory texts. Titles billing themselves as 'Protestant', for example *No Protestant-Plot* (1681) are likely to be Whiggish in their views; those titles describing themselves as 'Loyal', such *An Apostrophe from the Loyal Party* (1681), are more likely to be Tory. Certain publishers and printers were notorious even in their own day for their Whiggish sympathies, these include Benjamin Harris, Richard Janeway and Francis Smith.[45] Equally, any work associated with the names of Roger L'Estrange or Nathaniel Thompson may assuredly be assumed as of a Tory bias. Harold Weber has suggested that the reading public, in London at least, knew a good deal about these indicators of allegiance, and that they helped them to seek out pamphlets of the political hue they were looking for.[46]

It is also important that we recognise Exclusion-era tracts as being the products of sophisticated political operators. Propagandists were entirely capable of executing disingenuous ploys; adopting the narrative voice of one's opponents was a favoured tactic of both sides.[47] It is not always possible to say definitively that a text purporting to be the work of one side was actually the work of a rival propagandist. But it is possible for the historian to raise doubts over the sincerity of certain tracts (those which damage the cause they claim to defend). And, more generally, it is possible for us to discuss Whig/Tory texts with a degree of confidence that such appropriations are not misapplied.

(iii) Print Culture and the Public Sphere

As discussed in the introductory chapter a recognition of an early-modern 'public sphere' has been one of the most important developments in recent historiography. The present research is predicated around an understanding of 'print culture' and the 'public sphere' – an

---

[45] Sutherland, *The Restoration Newspaper and its development*, p185-232

[46] Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II*, p187-188

[47] A rhetorical tactic that was particularly apparent in the Duke of Monmouth's 'black box' debacle; as, indeed, was observed by Robert Ferguson, *A letter to a person of honour, concerning the Black Box* (1680), p1

understanding which, in this section, will be made explicit and defended. There is a sense in which the world had changed forever after the Civil Wars: the nation had been politicised to an unprecedented extent (in part by the unfettered polemical print which abounded during the 1640s); consequently many people in Restoration England had raised expectations regarding the availability of news: "The widespread acceptance of the value of public opinion represents a new conception of political and social space, a conception constitutive of the public sphere."[48] The 'public sphere' is really a term for an overarching structure incorporating print culture and manifestations of public opinion and popular debate. The 'public sphere' provided the space within which printed tracts existed and exerted their influence.

The vast majority of sources examined in the course of this research originate from London printing presses. Can we talk only of a London-based 'public sphere' or did these texts have national reach and reception? A degree of London-centricity is difficult to avoid in this kind of study given that, in addition to being the nation's capital, London was also the centre of print culture in seventeenth-century England. Put simply, the city had more printing presses than anywhere else.

Yet it would be a mistake to assume that print culture in the 1670s did not have national reach. There were some local centres of print production – notably Oxford. Moreover distribution networks were in place to deliver news in its various forms (manuscript newsbooks, newspapers, pamphlets, ballads) from London to the rest of the country.[49] Coffeehouses, where the printed word was so readily available, could be found in Norwich, Bristol, Cambridge, York, Oxford, and even in many more provincial towns such as Plymouth, Yarmouth, and Dorchester (which had at least two).[50] The audience for printed

---

[48] Pincus, 'Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', p811
[49] Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, p53-72
[50] Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, p53-72; Pincus, 'Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', p813-814

texts was spread right across England and pamphlets – the vast majority originating from London – could by direct and indirect means reach almost every level of society.

The present research limits itself to English printed texts. Can we talk of a 'British public sphere' which superseded or encompassed the political culture of all three Kingdoms? Certainly one could undertake a similar (and valuable) study of print culture in Scotland or in Ireland during the Exclusion Crisis, or, indeed, a comparative study of print literature in all three Kingdoms.[51] Such research would be welcome and could form useful co-studies to the present thesis. These pan-British questions do, however, fall outside the parameters of this research. The northern and western Kingdoms, in as far as they appear in this thesis, do so through the distorting prism of English texts. This is defensible given that English public opinion was, in the most part, influenced by English texts, not by tracts from Edinburgh printing presses. How the Scots (and much less how the Irish) viewed themselves had little to do with how those nations were viewed within England; therefore non-English texts have generally been excluded from this assessment of English public opinion.[52]

It may also be questioned why such a strong emphasis has been placed on 'popular' printed sources at the expense of other types of evidence. The traditional historiographical reading of the Exclusion Crisis is heavily dependent on manuscript sources such as private letters and diaries of the main actors at court and in Parliament.[53] Printed evidence, by this scheme, features either in the form of official speeches and declarations or as 'key' texts that advanced sophisticated or prescient political ideas: if one reads the works of Algernon Sidney, John Locke, and a few other individuals then there is little else in the printed canon that need detain the historian. Yet these types of printed source (although they do feature),

---

[51] The best study of Scotland under Charles II is Clare Jackson's *Restoration Scotland 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (2003)

[52] In choosing to focus on an exclusively 'English' public sphere (as opposed to 'British' considerations), I have gone against the recent historiographical trend. Yet, it is better to respect the distinct Scottish and Irish historical experiences by recognizing them as distinct, rather than produce an essentially English reading of the past with token efforts at incorporating a Celtic dimension. That which purports to be 'British history' should have a genuinely 'British' scope, otherwise, it is preferable to acknowledge the actual area of interest being considered.

[53] A methodology evident, for example, in Haley, *The First Earl of Shaftesbury*, pXI-XII

are not the cornerstone of this research. Nor, indeed, are hand-written manuscripts such as letters the point of focus for my approach. The rationale behind these methodological choices is twofold: (i) an intention to focus upon 'open debate' – which is to say an examination of publicly available print material, rather than upon the actions of the court or parliament, and, (ii) an effort to break away from the traditional methodological approach which overlooks a majority of printed texts in a preoccupation with the 'big beasts' of debate, such as Locke.

It is true that manuscripts (in various genres) were produced in large quantities during the Restoration era and often had a wide circulation – and thus could be said to be part of 'open debate'. Manuscript material undoubtedly had the potential to influence 'public opinion'.[54] However, this kind of evidence has been fairly well explored already in existing historiography[55]; especially in comparison with the outpouring of Exclusion-era print. Therefore the aim of this thesis is to tackle the mass of printed material from these years. It is print which is the medium in question for our study.

It is worth considering in some detail David Zaret's argument on a related point:

"Far more is concealed than revealed by studies of the early public sphere that overlook direct evidence on political communication and, instead, rely on philosophical and theological texts…this has led many scholars to associate the early public sphere with elite eighteenth-century developments, most notably the rise of bourgeois society, leavened by the Enlightenment as the prototype for open, critical debate on public issues in civil society. But the "invention" of public opinion as a political force occurred well before the Enlightenment, in a more popular social milieu, a consequence not of theoretical principles but of practical developments that flowed from the impact of printing on traditional forms of political

---

[54] Harold Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (1993), p3-4

[55] Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts*; Harold Love, *English Clandestine Satire 1660-1702* (2004); Timothy Crist, 'Government Control of the Press after the Expiration of the Printing Act in 1679' in *Publishing History* 5 (1979)

communication...During the English Revolution (1640-60) these practical developments led to precisely those democratic tenets – for example, the importance of consent, open debate, and reason for the authority of opinion in politics – that current scholarship describes as intellectual discoveries of the Enlightenment."[56]

Public opinion - whatever the theoretical justifications made for it - was a factor in English politics in the later seventeenth-century. Those printed texts that held the greatest popular appeal were not necessarily those that are most 'interesting' to the historian seeking to chart the intellectual advancement of society.

Early-modern popular politics was often crude, banal or crass. Yet much of it succeeded in its aim of shaping political views. Such a state of affairs should not surprise us. One need only think in our own time of the front-page headline of *The Sun* newspaper on the day of the 1992 general election - "If Neil Kinnock wins today, would the last person to leave Britain please turn out the lights?"[57] – which has passed into British political folklore as a devastatingly effective attack.[58] Yet who remembers the editorials of the same day in any of the broadsheets? It is likely these broadsheet editorials offered more considered and intellectually rigorous opinions, but they were largely ignored in their own day and have been forgotten since. It is a dangerous assumption, in any era, to equate being cleverest with being the most influential.

In defending the study of 'popular' texts under the justification that, whatever their shortcomings, they had an 'impact' it becomes necessary to chart what this impact may have been. What effect did the deluge of polemical print actually have on the political landscape of England in the late 1670s? The growth of print culture reflects the fact that public opinion had become a real player in English politics; the printed word helped to drive on this process

---

[56] Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions and the Public Sphere*, p6
[57] Andrew Osborn, 'Kinnock: I'll be Global Crusader' in *The Observer* (01/06/2003)
[58] After Kinnock's narrow defeat, *The Sun* led the next day with the self-congratulatory: "It's The Sun what won it!"

of mass politicisation. As one pamphleteer in 1679 observed: "Every Coffee-house now seems, as it were, a cabal of State and the considering positive customer as great a Privy Counsellor."[59] Print literature, much of it highly partisan and subversive, over-ran the Kingdom during the crisis years like an infestation. It is clear that contemporaries believed print had an effect: otherwise the trials of authors, book-sellers and printers, the massive effort that went into the illegal production of tracts, and the sheer volume of publications becomes inexplicable. Whig and Tory alike held that the printed word was a dangerous, perhaps even revolutionary tool; there seems no reason for us not to follow them in their assessment of its potential effect.

The impact of print literature, as a media, was potentially so great because its demographic reach was so broad. The possibility existed for propagandists to exert widespread influence through print. Ideas contained in printed texts were unmanageable, once a text was released into the 'public sphere' it became public property; it was not possible to predict, or control, the knock-on effects an idea could have (including by word-of-mouth proliferation). Irrespective of gender, social status or political outlook, the possibility existed for politicisation through the spreading of political ideas in this way.[60] Authors were considered particularly subversive because their actions broke through social structures; they were politically empowered without, necessarily, being members of the traditional governing elite (a fact that became evident in trials of authors).[61]

We should not necessarily seek to track the 'reception' of printed texts only in the manifestation of partisan support. To suggest that propagandists could simply print a few pamphlets and watch as this action miraculously turned itself into tangible support is facile. The relationship between print literature and political activism is a complex one. The sheer perverseness of printed tracts means that it would be rash to dismiss the notion that any

---

[59] *A Letter to a friend, about the late proclamation* (1679), p2
[60] Steve Pincus has argued this point through study of the custom in coffeehouses, 'Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', p814
[61] Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II*, p172-208

relationship existed between print and action.[62]   It is reasonable to suppose that those authors/printers behind the propaganda output hoped to exert influence: both by effecting privately held views and by encouraging the public expression of those views.

Indeed, it could be argued that to view print as 'creating' political support is to put the cart before the horse; that, rather, we should view print literature as a reflection of the opinions of ordinary readers.   The debate in print was, after all, a market place.   Published texts responded to public demand: "Central to print culture is an alliance between commerce and controversy, forged by the interest of authors and stationers in producing texts for which popular demand exists."[63]   This raises the possibility that we may explain, and dismiss, the debate in print as mere sensation; an amusement with the ability to shock a contemporary audience, but one with little 'serious' consequence.   It is certainly true that a sense of transgression helped to add charge to opposition polemics.   Yet it must be remembered that the print literature of the Exclusion Crisis was intensely political and, at times, deeply subversive.   The government of the day took it extremely seriously and they were surely wise to do so.

The reach of print culture was significant not least because it had the power to transport the reader to events to which they were not party.   Tim Harris has made the useful distinction between the politics that historians have traditionally studied (essentially the actions of Parliament and the court) and politics 'out-of-doors' (by which he meant popular demonstrations and overt shows of political behaviour at street level).[64]   Yet, in a sense, print culture links the two worlds.   For much popular polemic was concerned with representing the actions of King, court and Parliament *for* street level.   If Charles II existed at court, then representations of Charles II existed in the court of public opinion.   The King, and his ministers, for the first time were obliged to take real account of this new kind of court.

---

[62]   Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis* (1988), p129
[63]   Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture : Printing, Petitions and the Public Sphere*, p13
[64]   Harris, 'Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain', p125-128

Indeed, it is the central assertion of this thesis that print literature affected, and sought to affect, how people conceived of their King.

Perhaps the greatest testament to the power of print culture is that Tories, who intensely disliked the existence of public debate, still felt compelled to engage in counter-propaganda. For the government this engagement with popular print was a vicious circle: "using the press to combat the press only compounded the government's problems, for such a strategy contributed to the already unwelcome public debate, implicitly legitimating the press's transgression into affairs of state…[Charles] wished not to conduct a propaganda war but to terminate one."[65] The hard truth was that both sides needed to utilize the potential of print lest the other side should have sole possession of this vital tool; public opinion simply had to be contested.

(iv) Representationalist History

One of the most significant shifts in twentieth-century historiography was the increased awareness shown by historians to what may be termed 'representationalist history'.[66] Which is to say an awareness that the writing of history is itself a representation of the past; not the truth of what is or was but somebody's representation of it; an account which takes notice of all the factors of the creation and projection of meaning (including the programming of meaning by ideology and propagandist intent). Accordingly, the methodological approaches that historians have followed have also shifted; there has been a move toward a study of languages in which the values and cultures of the past are revealed through all types of discourse – letters, drama, printed sermons, political tracts and so forth.[67] The text thus

---

[65] Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II*, p174
[66] For example, Kevin Sharpe and S. Zwicker (eds), *Politics of Discourse: the Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* (1987); Zwicker, *Lines of authority: politics and English literary culture 1649-1689* (1993); Sharpe, *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetics and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution* (1998)
[67] Not least this methodological shift has been influenced by, and is evident in, the works of John Pocock and Quentin Skinner. See, Pocock, *Politics, language and time: essays on political thought*

becomes a type of 'performance' or encoded display constructed of signs – the written equivalent of a public procession or a religious ritual - whose meanings can be unlocked through interpretive analysis.[68] Kevin Sharpe has called for even greater moves in this direction:

" 'the past', rather than a landscape simply elucidated by evidence, is a representation constructed by the historian from his own cultural vision as well as from the various representations that contemporaries created to discern meaning for themselves…[we must] pay attention to the representations that contemporaries presented of (and to) themselves: to urge a move from politics conceived (anachronistically) as the business of institutions, bureaucracies and officers to the broader politics of discourse and symbols, anxieties and aspirations, myths and memories."[69]

For Sharpe such an approach to the culture of politics marks a way to break "the sterile impasse of debates about revisionism."[70] One may agree with the desirability of this general methodological direction, without getting drawn into debates over revisionist/post-revisionist scholarship. The present research views symbols, myths and memory as being key concepts in deciphering the representations that contemporaries presented of (and to) themselves. Arthur Marwick once observed that history should be based on solid evidence such as diplomatic telegrams and official state papers, and not on propaganda or on newspapers.[71] By Marwick's definition, there is no 'history' to be found in this thesis.

---

and history (1971); *Virtue, Commerce and History*; J. Tully (ed), *Context and meaning*: Quentin Skinner and his critics (1988)
[68] Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England*, p39-46
[69] Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England*, p3
[70] Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England*, p19
[71] Arthur Marwick, *The Nature of History: Knowledge, Evidence, Language* (1970), p131-171. For Marwick "concrete facts" are the target of historical research and "a primary source is most valuable when the purpose for which it was complied is at the furthest remove from the purpose of the historian", p136. In other words, the most valuable sources are those which are freest of ideology and distorting intent; those documents whose creation was undertaken without thought for the interpretations of future generations.

It is to be welcomed, therefore, that the Restoration of Charles II can now be recognised, as Jonathan Sawday has done, not simply as an institutional crisis but also: "a crisis of representation...The restoration of a King was an unprecedented event in British history, requiring the manufacture of a form of legitimation from the materials which were to hand."[72] The business of justifying the crown, and of representing the King, were taken into uncharted territory. I would argue that this 'crisis of representation' found its apogee in the Exclusion Crisis; the most significant period of crisis since 1660.

My research concerns the creation of a royal 'image' or persona, which, in a sense, is the systemisation of symbol, myth and memory into an accumulative whole. It is possible, as Helen Hackett has argued, to see all artefacts from the past as part of a signifying system, with the historian as a kind of code-breaker interpreting and recovering the meaning contained in the visual arts and in ceremonial displays.[73] This approach is also applicable to texts. Patterns of representation can be traced through the print literature of this period.

In dealing with conceptually difficult notions – myth, symbol, memory – it is important to state from the outset what is understood by these terms. Approaching the field as an investigation in the semiotics (or the science of signs and of signifying systems), of printed representations best facilitates the consideration of these concepts.[74] This research is, in part, an investigation of the language of signification used by polemicists in representing the King. Print literature was the arena in which ideas were contested; myth, symbol and memory were the polemicist's weapons of choice.

The theme of 'national memory' is an important one in my research. It will be argued that the evocation and interpretation of the nation's past was integral to the mythologizing of the King. David Cressy has shown how 'national days' in England were manifestations of the politics of memory: "the English developed a relationship to time – current time within the

---

[72] Jonathan Sawday, 'Re-writing a Revolution: History, Symbol and Text in the Restoration' in *The Seventeenth Century*, 7 (1992), p171
[73] Hackett, 'Dreams or Designs, Cults or Constructions? The Study of Images of Monarchs', p813
[74] Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*, p19

cycle of the year, and historical time with reference to the past – that set them apart from the rest of Early Modern Europe...it gave expression to, a mythic and patriotic sense of national identity."[75] This institutionalisation of annul markers represents the orchestration of symbols – national, secular and dynastic – that gave schematic meaning to the year. The calendar itself therefore became a vocabulary of celebration and a form of communication. Even the passing of time, then, was vulnerable to ideological renderings.

Cressy's work therefore alerts us to another truth about symbolism and about memory: that such tools are open to co-option by rival projects. The original intention had been that England's calendar should provide common and unifying national symbols. The problem was that these national days, like all symbols, were susceptible to partisan appropriation and to the rendering of new meanings. During the Exclusion Crisis the November celebrations of Gun-Powder Treason day (5th of Nov) and Queen Elizabeth's day (17th of Nov) took on new riotous anti-Catholic and anti-Tory overtones. It is precisely this type of contestation that is of concern here; the fight for control of national memory, waged on the page, is a central theme of this thesis.

The third concept requiring special consideration (together with symbolism and memory) is that of 'myth'. In dealing with the output of propagandists we are dealing with the construct of 'myth'. Roland Barthes defined myth as a type of speech. In Barthes's scheme 'myth' is a second-order semiological system, which is to say that a myth is: "constructed from a semiological chain which existed before it...That which is a sign (namely the associative total of a concept and an image) in the first system, becomes a mere signifier in the second...the raw materials."[76] Myth writes a new meaning onto a pre-existing sign: the process that enabled the symbolism of Gun-powder day to be transformed and infused with anti-Tory resonance. For Barthes, therefore, 'myth' is "stolen language" or "language-

---

[75] David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (1989), pXI
[76] Roland Barthes, *Mythologies* (1993), p115

52

robbery"[77] – though one wonders if 'language hijack' may not be a more accurate term (and one with greater resonance for our post-9/11 age). "Myth hides nothing and flaunts nothing: it distorts; myth is neither a lie nor a confession: it is an inflexion."[78] The crucial point for our purposes is that the Exclusion Crisis saw two rival sets of myth-makers working in opposition. It is this distinction which marks the period out and opens the possibility for studying the clash between two opposing 'languages' of Kingly representation.

In research tracing the construct of the 'royal image', as this project does, one must anticipate a potential criticism: that what is rendered is fundamentally *my* construct, not that of Restoration contemporaries. After all, we have no official government, or indeed opposition manual from the late 1670s outlining the art of royal depictions. Perhaps there was no 'intent' or forethought to representations of the King; perhaps no agenda was being pursued through them. Yet, even if we were to accept this, the fact remains that these royal representations did (and do) exist in significant quantities; these representations thereby had the potential to elicit responses from readers during a highly-charged historical moment. It does not, therefore, seem far fetched to wonder if these countless royal representations affected how some of his people conceived of Charles II.

Moreover, a subject would not have needed to be exposed to the whole propaganda canon from these years to form a new opinion of the King (or have an old opinion altered). A good many political views, then as now, may have been based on mere fragments of information and understanding (or indeed, on misinformation and misunderstanding). One may subscribe to a 'trickle down' theory: where fragments of ideas and aspects of Kingly representation found in tracts, gradually permeated their way into collective consciousness. Whether by means of print or by verbal relaying (or both), word had a habit of getting around: "News gathered by word of mouth in London, transmitted in handwritten letters or in print into the provinces, where it became the object of 'chat'…[similarly] reading

---

[77] Barthes, *Mythologies*, p131
[78] Barthes, *Mythologies*, p129

newsletters or newspapers aloud made written news available to the semi-literate or the illiterate, as did ballads, prints, playing cards and other visual representations."[79] Print culture had the potential to have an enormous impact on public opinion. And, as the Duke of York discovered to his cost, once a series of ideas had coalesced into a fixed set of perceptions, public opinion could prove very difficult to shift.

In conclusion, the many notions regarding the King contained in innumerable tracts do, cumulatively, form a persona or royal image. A sense of what characterised and defined Charles II begins, through these representations, to appear to us, as it did to his contemporaries. The politics of persona involved an expression of political culture unlike those we observe in Parliament or glimpse behind the scenes at court. Images of monarchy triggered responses by directly appealing to passions and emotions, by engaging prejudices and desires.

Monarchical personas resulted from deliberate construction by central authority (and the opposition press) intersecting with the projections of public desires and anxieties onto a prominent figure.[80] Both ingredients were necessary to produce a truly transcendent figure. The business of 'image' construction was not a simple one way, top-down, process: "Representations and images of rule in Early Modern England were not the illusory tricks performed by hegemonic authority to keep citizens subject. They were part of the theatre of politics in which the expectations and desires of the audience helped shape the show, the symbols and metaphors through which (as in all ages) men and women worked out the complex relationship between themselves and the artifice of government."[81]

---

[79] Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, p55
[80] Hackett, 'Dreams or Designs, Cults or Constructions? The Study of Images of Monarchs', p814
[81] Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England*, p459

One may ask if all this is merely a matter of 'spin'? In deliberately posing the question in these terms – in the vocabulary of the modern 'public relations' industry - I raise the possibility that this research is anachronistically misapplied; that it is simply too much of 'our time' to reveal anything authentic about the seventeenth-century. Yet, all history is of its own time, the question rather is how well it knows this to be the case and how appropriately it applies its concepts to the study of the past. This research is not about 'spin', it is not about the digitised multi-media age. The medium in question is entirely an early-modern one, with all the limitations and dynamics that this implies.

Yet this research is not without relevance to the modern world. In observing Exclusion polemicists attempt to shape national memory, or to appropriate powerful symbolisms, or to weave the past into a self-justifying mythology, we may learn better how to recognise these phenomena in our own day. Nor does one have to look far to find latter-day examples: the British National Party's recent attempts to represent Alfred the Great as a paragon of Anglo-Saxon purity, or the ceremony held annually by the National Front in France to lay flowers at the statue of Joan of Arc.[82] These are actions that reinterpret the past; that seek to overwrite new meanings on the representation of historical figures (Alfred the Great and Joan of Arc). The iconicity of an individual, the rendering of that figure as representative of a cause or ideology, remains a powerful paradigm - one which we may benefit from better understanding.

---

[82]   Julian Barnes, 'French Farce' in *The Guardian* (03/05/2002)

Chapter Three: The Symbol of the King: Charles in Print Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the various uses that were made of the King as a symbol in the discourse of both Whig and Tory texts. In the context of print propaganda, the King constituted a major topos in a game of contending efforts of persuasion. He was a rhetorical football, and, as in football, it was important for each side to be in possession. How Whig and Tory[1] authors exploited the symbolic potential of the King is therefore crucial to understanding Exclusion-era debate. References to Charles, as we shall see, were woven into diverse partisan arguments. The point is that the King was a powerful symbol, one worth contesting and moulding into an advantageous form.

Much of the historiography dealing with Exclusion debate has, perhaps curiously, been written in such a way as to marginalize the King.[2] After all, this debate, in a sense, did not directly concern Charles: it was often expressed either in terms of abstract theory or in relation specifically to James. That Charles could and should continue to reign for the rest of his lifetime was in little doubt. Historians have, quite rightly, paid great attention to the seminal debates in Parliament and in print over the basis of monarchy, the origins of common law in England, the King's prerogative powers, and the limits of parliamentary authority.[3] Yet it is in keeping with the recent trend among historians of adopting a wider focus - a greater awareness of the importance of popular politics and print culture[4] - to

---

[1] 'Whig' and 'Tory' as set out in Chapter Two are the best, or perhaps least bad, short-forms available to us. The terms did not gain much solidity of meaning until at least 1681. Here, however, they are applied to the period as a whole (even pre-1681). This is defensible, in part, for simple ease of communication.

[2] For instance, Jones, *The First Whigs*, p1-19

[3] Richard Ashcraft, 'The Radical Dimensions of Locke's Political Thought: a dialogic essay on some problems of interpretation' in *History of Political Thought*, XIV (1992), p702-772; Mark Knights, 'Petitioning and the political theorists: John Locke, Algernon Sidney and London's "Monster" Petition of 1680' in *Past & Present* (1993), p94-111

[4] Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis 1678-81*, p193-226; Harris, Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain, p125-153

reappraise Charles II as trope in the debates of 1678-83.[5] It should not be overlooked that the entire crisis happened on Charles II's watch - it was very much a product of his reign and was certainly imprinted with the hallmark of his Kingship. In this crisis the King mattered. A fact recognised by (and reflected in the output of) Exclusion-era pamphleteers: the King occupied centre-stage in much of the print that flooded the streets during those momentous years.

The following four sub-sections will examine different aspects of the role of Charles in printed rhetoric: (i) representations of the King's importance, (ii) justifications given for speaking out in this debate, (iii) the projected nature of the threat posed to Charles (from both popery and Presbyterianism) and, (iv) Charles II and Parliament.

(i) The Importance of Charles II

"Dread Sovereign, You are the Object on which all our eyes are fixed; You are the center in which the hopes and desires of all Loyal hearts are lodged."[6]

Central to both Whig and Tory texts was the assertion that Charles II was of crucial importance. This often meant little more than an unfocused conviction that the destiny of England rested on the King's shoulders. These fate-of-the-nation addresses showed a self-conscious awareness of the historical moment. It was universally accepted that the country was facing a crisis and that the nation found itself at a fateful juncture. The survival of the King determined the survival of the nation. Propagandists on both sides maintained this to be the case: "th' unseen hand of Providence...from these designs sav'd Charles's Life and our Throats."[7] Charles II was held up as the only barrier between England and civil war (or

---

[5] In the way that Peter Burke has done successfully for Louis XIV and Laura Lunger Knoppers has achieved with the figure of Oliver Cromwell.
[6] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681), p2
[7] *Philo-Carolus consisting of three points viz A canto upon the Plot* (1680), p15

worse, invasion). Yet Whig and Tory writers differed in their understanding of what this danger actually was, of who was responsible for it, and even what precisely was under threat. A comparison of rival polemics reveals, as will become apparent, that statements regarding the King's importance were divergent in both their meaning and their purpose.

The writings of the Whig Charles Blout seized upon the supposed danger to the King. For Blout every Englishmen bore a duty to revise his stance urgently and respond to new realities. Blout and other Whig polemists urged that a new recognition of the precariousness of the King's safety should act as a national epiphany, or a wake-up call galvanising a sleepy nation: "If the approaching ruine of the Father could open the dumb Son's mouth, then all...good English-men...have now the same reason to speak and complain...[when] apparent ruine is at hand, the Sword already hangs over our heads, and seems to be supported by no stronger force than that of one single hair, his Majesties Life."[8] Here the evocation of the King's vital significance is designed to act as a rousing call for preventative and immediate action. Blout was attempting to steer the reader into an interpretative understanding of recent events - to shape, or manipulate, the formation of collective memory predicated along ideologically received precepts. Such narratives attempted to hammer home an acceptance of the terrible danger posed to the King, and then to transfer that recognition into acceptance of the solutions they offered (in this particular case, the radical brand of Whiggism espoused by Blout).

Tory propagandists were equally adamant about the fundamental import of the King: "There lies our Fort, our Rock of firm Defence 'gainst Foreign and Domestick Violence."[9] Yet the threatened domestic violence alluded to was imagined to be the product of Whig sedition. Praise for Charles doubled as condemnation by the Tories of their political opponents: the King was a rock in the face of Whig tumult. The sense of possession of the

---

[8] Charles Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City, for the Preservation of His Majesties person* (1679), p3
[9] Robert Whitehall, *1679, gratulamini mecum, or, A Congratulatory essay upon His Majesties most happy recovery* (1679)

58

King found in many Tory sources is noteworthy. Charles II is frequently represented as *our* King: while such references at times meant nothing more than the nation's King, they could also signal an underlying sense that Tories were appropriating Charles as emblematic of their own fortunes (vis-à-vis the Whigs). "All our dearest interests, are bound up in his life, and...their stabiliment and continuance to it; and it seems our Enemies think so too, and therefore go to wound us through his sides, and to enslave us, by his destruction."[10] This extract comes from the aftermath of the Rye House Plot and demonstrates a highly partisan concern: its perspective was of Charles as the Anglican-Tory champion, targeted by dissenting Whig plotters.

Interestingly Whig and Tory pamphleteers often turned to near identical linguistic formulations in expressing their respective visions. Blout for example, articulated Charles II's worth to the nation thus: "the wolf hath nothing to do, but to destroy the Shepherd and then fall upon the naked Sheep."[11] While in the poem *A Congratulatory Essay* (a text with obvious Tory-bias) we find an almost exact replication: "[if] the Shepherd lost, the Sheep shall be...Prey."[12] The metaphor of the nation as a helpless flock when without their shepherd King was perhaps an obvious image to employ; it derived in part from the common treasury of Biblical imagery and language. The salient point however was that Whigs and Tories could harness the same symbolic modes for very different purposes. In the propaganda war of 1678-83 there was much overlap in the rhetoric of the two sides as they both sought to utilise and appropriate the image of the King. Slight variations in linguistic emphasis therefore become telling, revealing the disagreements that lay behind apparent agreement. For example in Tory pamphlets Charles is regularly styled "Defender of our Faith."[13] Whereas more typical of Whig material are references to: "protector of our

---

[10] Henry Hesketh, *A Private Peace-offering, for the discovery and disappointment of the late horrid Conspiracy against the King* (1684), p22
[11] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p4
[12] Whitehall, *1679, gratulamini mecum, or, A Congratulatory essay* (1679)
[13] Whitehall, *1679, gratulamini mecum, or, A Congratulatory essay* (1679)

Religion, Lives and Liberties."[14] This kind of difference represents much more than mere word-games. The application of the term *liberties* opened up a can of worms because the concepts which underpinned it concerned the law, Parliament and the crown's prerogatives; they went, in other words, to the very heart of the Exclusion debate and of Restoration society. This is not to say that examples cannot be found in both Whig and Tory texts of terms more typical of their opponents. Rather the point is that politically charged patterns of language and symbolism are important in deciphering meaning and in reconstructing the debate.

A problem facing Whig polemicists was the inherently oppositional nature of the cause they espoused. They were fishing for public opinion and using the King as bait, yet it was common knowledge that Charles II resisted all efforts against his brother in Parliament and in print. One rhetorical tactic adopted to sidestep the King's own objections was to posit his death - the cause, invariably, murder by papists. Having established the overwhelming importance of the King's life, to then explore the nightmarish chaos resulting from his death could be a devastatingly effective tactic. Many Whig writers urged their compatriots to prepare for such a dreadful eventuality:

"As your Interests are united, so let your Resolutions be the same; and the first hour wherein you hear of the Kings untimely end, let no other noise be heard among you but that of Arm, Arm, to revenge your Soveraign's Death, both upon his Murtherers, and their whole Party, for that there is no such thing as an English Papist who is not in the Plot, at least in his good wishes."[15]

Such rabble-rousing rhetoric circumvented Charles's current objections by evoking the possibility of his future (perhaps imminent) murder. By maintaining the fiction that Whigs

---

[14] *A Tory Plot, or, The discovery of a design* (1682), p4
[15] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p4

acted in the King's name with the King's interest solely in mind, opposition could be turned into loyalism. What greater demonstration of loyalty could there be than diligence in the face of danger to Charles? The King's safety was the nation's safety and both had to be protected (irrespective of Charles's apparent misgivings).[16] Therefore the denial of being in opposition to the King (or at least of acting in rebellious disobedience of him) was consistently maintained by Whig pamphleteers.

Imagining the King's death opened the door to a multiplicity of hypothetical scenarios, most of them dire. Propagandists could follow in their writings those projected futures which best lent credence to their particular bias. For example the subtext of the extract cited above by Charles Blout, (an acolyte of the Earl of Shaftesbury) was to bolster the claim that the Duke of Monmouth could make in the event of the King's sudden death. Nevertheless, while specific agendas could be, and were, advanced through the utilization of this rhetorical device (envisaging the royal death), this was not the norm. Broadly speaking these texts were designed to support a general Whig worldview, not buttress specific policies. Their primary function was to galvanise the nation into non-specified action: "you may much easier prevent the Distemper at first, than remedy it when it has once got a head...think how to prevent it."[17] The 'what if' questions raised by Whigs were a way of concentrating minds: when push came to shove, they asked, which side was the reader on. They thereby acted as a recruiting sergeant for Whigs and their spectrum of preoccupations. Most importantly, these 'death narratives' also represent an attempt to de-activate Charles II as an obstacle to the gaining of popular support by Whigs.

However, such postulations were not the exclusive preserve of Whigs. Tory scribes can also be found positing Charles's death in order to lead the reader though the ensuing chaos. However, Tory polemicists tended to paint a somewhat different picture from their Whig counterparts. Whereas Whig material frequently assumed the murder of the King, Tory

---

[16] Evoking a sense of the King's 'Two Bodies'.
[17] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p5

pamphlets generally worked from a scenario of death by natural causes. If Charles II died and the Duke of York had been excluded from the succession, what happened then? Tory polemicists were adamant that it could not be taken for granted that Mary would be crowned next: "the Princess of Orange, perhaps in complement to her Father, and to prevent a War, may refuse; and her Husband cannot come to the Throne...what then? the next after cannot come in; must the Duke then? No, that's against Law. Here will then be no King; consequently, Anarchy and Confusion."[18] A major weakness of parliamentary efforts at exclusion was the lack of an obvious alternative to James. By declaring that Mary and William were unlikely to accept the crown in these circumstances, Tories were seeking to take away the notion that exclusion could ever be an easy option without disastrous consequences: simply skipping one down the royal line was an impossibility. Tory scribes forcefully reaffirmed that tampering with the natural succession would fundamentally rupture the fabric of royalty. If James were debarred from the succession then the end of Charles's reign would mark the start of civil war.

The idea of Charles's death acted differently therefore in Tory and in Whig texts. The Tories used it to lead into a discussion of the knock-on effects of exclusion. Whigs exploited the notion of Charles's death in order to ratchet up the pressure for preventative action (not least exclusion itself). Though Whigs and Tories offered differing visions on how the future might work out if their own concerns were not addressed, both sides agreed Charles II was crucial. They shared the fear that should the crisis be unresolved at the time of Charles's death, the results for England would be catastrophic (though each side understood different things by 'resolving' it). The King was thus presented as the lynchpin holding the nation back from disaster. In a sense print literature contrasted two types of danger. Tory writers warned against the dangerous action of interference with the natural order of things - the consequences of which would precipitate the whirlwind of political chaos. This had to be weighed against the dangers of inaction which Whig pamphlets railed against - the inertia

---

[18] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p14

62

which was allowing the pernicious unfolding of a Popish Plot and was prepared to permit a Catholic to assume the throne of England. The imagined death of Charles II brought both these dangers into sharper relief.

(ii) Speaking for the King: the Loyalist and the Wronged Loyalist

What we may term 'the wronged loyalist' was a rhetorical strategy much employed by Whig polemists. This narrative voice played with notions of opposition and sought to attack the Tories under the guise of self-defence. Whigs, it was claimed, were unjustly accused of disloyalty to Charles II by base Tories: "you Tories you think you now have the better end of the Staff, you have the Law, you have the great ones, you have Power, on your side; & therefore...abuse whom you please, the Whiggs must not open their months, and let them speak never so reverently of the King, all is blasphemy and canting in your Ears."[19] The Tories, by 1682 certainly, were acknowledged to hold the upper hand - unsurprisingly perhaps, given that the 'Tory reaction'[20] was by then in full flight. Yet crucially, while the vague "great ones" of the Tory cause were alluded to, the King was not attributed to the Tory side. Rather the text laments Tory attempts to stifle Whig expressions of admiration for Charles. Implicitly it is suggested that if only Whigs could gain a fair hearing they could reclaim the King and redeem their cause. Was this a realistic prospect by 1682? Almost certainly not - but in a sense that is the wrong question to ask. The mere articulation of the hope and possibility, as expressed in print literature, enabled the continued Whig campaign to be waged (nominally) under the King's standard.

It was imperative for those writing in support of Whigs to explode the myth of the Tories as the self-styled 'loyal party': to break the axiomatic association between the interests of the Tories and those of the King. The Whig line of attack entailed questioning the good faith of Tory actions. The archetypal figure of the Tory, as sketched by Whig pamphleteers, was:

---

[19] *The Medal Revers'd. A Satyre against Persecution* (1682), p7
[20] Which is to say the period of backlash against Whigs and dissenters; see Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts*, p119-123

63

"pretending only the publick Good, and a Veneration for the King...[these are] gross fallacies, and that 'tis most necessary for men in your circumstances, to pretend both: For without them you could not deceive the King...when all the while you are sapping the...peace of the nation."[21] Tory loyalism was mere appearance, a fiction used to shield the real, and malign, intentions of that faction. The King himself frequently appears in this kind of Whig text as an inherently good but misled monarch (deceived by the 'evil counsellors'[22] that surrounded him). Therefore the 'wronged loyalist' stance allowed Whig writers to cede "the better end of the Staff" to their rivals (to accept their own oppositional nature), while simultaneously pursuing a threefold strategy: (i) neutralising Charles as a rhetorical symbol deployed against them by denying royal inclinations toward Toryism, (ii) indicating a potential appropriation, now or in the future, of the King for the Whig cause, and (iii) attacking the Tories as the real threat to the King and the nation.

An assertion found in Whig material was that the inner hidden nature of the Tory faction could be glimpsed through Tory propaganda. The purpose of these Tory scribblers was to manipulate the uninformed, to turn the people first against the Whigs and then against their own King: "you see your Arts fail you, and that the Loyalty of the People, & Love they bear to their sovereign (notwithstanding your false charge) make them stedfast, and not to be moved with your Libels...[which slander] even the King himself."[23] It was a tenet of much Whig material that Tories were seeking to shift the loyalty of the people away from Charles because their own devious interest required it. Importantly the people were consistently shown as steadfast in their loyalty to the King; as indeed the Whigs also depicted themselves. The tactic of Whig scribes was to couple the notion of loyalty to Charles with support for the Whig agenda (or at least to link it to opposing an imagined Tory agenda). Tory literature was attempting to "Slander the Subject and abuse the Crown."[24] Whigs and

---

[21] *The Medal Revers'd* (1682), p3
[22] An aspect considered in more depth in Chapter Four
[23] *The Medal Revers'd* (1682), p5-6
[24] *The Tory-poets a Satyr* (1682), p1

Charles II were in the same boat: both were victims of Tory attacks and together they needed the support of the nation. Charles II, the Whigs, and the people therefore formed the three points in a triangular relationship. This loyalist triangle existed in opposition to the Tory-papist negative other, and upon it the fate of England depended.

Within Tory literature these roles were, predictably perhaps, reversed: with Tories representing themselves as defenders of the King and the Whigs as aggressors, posing a danger to him. The discovery and aftermath of the Popish Plot provided Whig (opposition) propagandists with the 'evidence' to substantiate wild claims of conspiracy. By contrast Tory writers in their response to the plot tended to stress the personal involvement of Charles II in the prosecution into the design: "how did his Majesty behave himself in the matter, he summons his Parliament, and till that can come, proceeds by all imaginable means to search into the Plot...[acting against suspects] to seize their Persons and Papers."[25] Superficially such statements seem like a vindication of the King. But a vindication against what? It was rare for Charles to come under attack directly or personally over the plot, rather high-placed Tories, particularly at court, were accused of failing to extirpate the plot because of their own popish inclinations. By emphasising Charles II's lead role in the rooting out of conspiracy, Tories were in fact protecting themselves by hiding behind the King. The use of the King in this way could provide cover, indeed almost goading Whigs into attacks on their sovereign. The Tory hope was to discourage complaints of under-investigation at the heart of government, by rendering them all a reflection upon, or even assault on, Charles himself. Indeed, some Tory writers went further by claiming that critics of the plot response were directly impugning the King's honesty and integrity:

"the King in some Mans judgements believes not the Plot, an opinion...severe and impertinent, for without all doubt a Prince in all Respects so merciful, would never have

---

[25] *The English-man's Happiness under a Protestant-prince and the present condition of the Kingdom considered* (1681), p2

given way to the Execution of so many Men, if he had not believed them guilty...they no doubt guess better who conclude he believes not his Brother in the Plot."[26]

In this instance doubting Charles's sincerity is offered as tantamount to accusing him of judicially-sponsored murder. Such formulations were designed to make it harder for Whigs to make inflammatory accusations. In effect, Tory propaganda was using the King as a 'human shield'.

In order to differentiate between the King and his Tory supporters Whig writers constantly reiterated the truism that the 'papist-Tory' faction was guilty of plotting against Charles: "They all ow'd duty to their Prince...But their duty was all won out long since, by their Plots we have too plainly seen."[27] One mechanism by which Tories could be labelled thus as disloyal Catholic plotters was through their support for the Duke of York. By definition Tories favoured James's succession. Therefore as supporters of the Duke, their loyalty to the King could be questioned. When the interests of the two royal brothers conflicted, on which side did Tories fall? For Whigs the answer was obvious: "The D. They Love, but not the King, can any tell a reason why...They'd Crown him if they might have leave, and our good King they would have slain."[28] By setting up Charles and James in opposition to each other, polemicists created the opportunity to box the Tories in, to portray them fundamentally as the Duke's men. This stance also enabled Whigs to depict themselves as unequivocal supporters of the King - their loyalism untainted and unconflicted by allegiance to Catholic York.

Tory propagandists did not let the suggestion of their own side's disloyalty to the King go unanswered. It was exactly that kind of Whig broadside which prompted Roger L'Estrange to scoff: "for us to drink the King or Duke of Yorks Health, is debauchery, and the man who

---

[26] *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p3
[27] *The Coat of arms of N.T J.F & R.L an answer to Thomson's ballad call'd The Loyal feast* (1682)
[28] *The Coat of arms* (1682)

speaks of them with affection, must be thought to have four Devils in him."[29] Yet this exclamation and others like it disingenuously misapprehended the Whig position. Whig writers precisely did not couple the two royal brothers, they did not condemn both alike or those who followed them. Rather Whig material used contorted arguments in order to praise Charles while taking pot-shots at James - making the distinction between the two was central to Whig presentation of the key questions.[30] Tory material on the other hand refused to acknowledge any distinction between supporting the King and favouring his heir - making no distinction between the two was central to the Tory case.

In a sense the representations of both sides were mirror images of each other. It was incumbent on Whig writers to underscore alleged Tory admiration of James and antipathy towards Charles: "In scornful lines can'st thou revile a King? With inky clouds of lyes, can'st thou obscure an Hero's Glory infinitely pure?"[31] Tory scribes, by contrast, endeavoured to demonstrate that the cause of both royal brothers was unified - to support one was to support the other. This line of argument required a delicate balancing act: the hope was that James could be rendered more palatable to the nation through association with Charles; yet the close identification of the two could also alienate the masses from their King, thus depriving Tories of a trump card. Therefore Tory writers had to guard against the King appearing oblivious to the concerns of his people: "so many Pamphlets...reproach the King with want of Affection for his People; onely because he has some for his Brother."[32] Each side then, heroically undertook the defence of their King from the supposed attacks of the other side.

Another notable feature of many Tory texts was a eulogised vision of the wondrous glories of the Restoration era. There was a sense that loyal (Tory) observers could not allow the Whig's libels against King and country to go unchallenged. Many Tory writers engaged in

---

[29] Roger L'Estrange, *Theosebia, or, The Churches advocate endeavouring the promotion of loyalty to our King* (1683), p6
[30] A point made in greater detail in Chapter Seven.
[31] *The Tory-poets a Satyr* (1682), p3
[32] *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p1

tribute to the privileges that were bestowed upon their fellow English subjects: "your good King, the Church, the Law combine to make ye happy! English men alone can boast this priviledg: their Neighbours live servile to their Kings-will...Heal our Divisions then, teach us to...sing Long Live Great Charles, our good and glorious King."[33] Doom-and-gloom laden Whig texts contrasted sharply to this strain of Tory celebratory panegyric which informed the nation of its manifest favour. Disgusted Tory pamphleteers declared that those who caused political instability against this backdrop of admirable harmony were rocking a boat upon placid water. Whigs were delivering an unforgivable self-inflicted wound.

Integral to this supposed golden age was Charles II himself. The shower of blessings experienced by England were, it was said, due almost entirely to Charles. In part this notion connected with the 'Restoration myth' which accredited causality of national gain to a providential circle of history: England was blessed because God protected and favoured Charles.[34] Significantly however, the blessings of peace and plenty were also attributed to the character of Charles II. The mythologized Charles and the projected personality of Charles merged: "did a Nation injoy more by a King than ours hath done by this, and perhaps had one of any other temper Govern'd in our times, our case had had a worse crisis, never were people more happy."[35] Charles is thus exonerated from precipitating the crisis which the nation found itself in. To both God and to the King "our utmost gratitude is due."[36] Also inherent in these kinds of statements was a rebuke to the nation who were not showing, and had not shown since the Restoration, due deference and thankfulness.

Within this context, Tory writers bemoaned Parliament's defiance of the King's express wishes, denounced Whig rabblerousing pamphlets, and, most of all, seized upon the Rye House Plot as the ultimate demonstration of a breathtaking lack of appreciation for the King. Nowhere was this outrage more clearly manifest than in those individuals implicated directly

---

[33] *The Glory of the English Nation, or an Essay on the Birth-day of King Charles the Second* (1681)
[34] This is the subject of Chapter Five.
[35] Hesketh, *A Private Peace-offering* (1684), p18
[36] Hesketh, *A Private Peace-offering* (1684), p22

in the Rye House revelations: "Monstrous Ingratitude of these wicked wretches...[toward] His Sacred Majesty. For several of the chief conspirators...had been raised to their Height, by His Majesties special Favour and Bounty."[37] Presumably this referred to the Earl of Shaftesbury and to the Duke of Monmouth, but it could equally have been extended to the Duke of Buckingham and to other leading Whig figures. A favoured Tory critique was of the covetousness and insatiable ambition of Whigs. The concept of ingratitude to the King was partly built upon this foundation of unfulfilled (and unfulfillable) Whig ambition.[38]

Yet Tory texts invariably proclaimed that Charles would overcome this present crisis. His appointed role in history was already clear and being written by contemporaries. Charles II would be remembered as the Prince whose greatest achievement was the Restoration itself and whose legacy was the continued success (and succession) of the monarchy: "Posterity shall Praise His Memory, and Generations to come shall call Him the Father of his Country, and the Mighty Defender of the Faith."[39] Charles, and his loyal Tory allies, were destined to emerge victorious from the Exclusion Crisis.

(iii) The Threat to the King: Popery and Presbyterianism

Running through print literature were two rival versions of the threat to the King as seen by competing readings of the political times, the demonising of two sets of religious troublemakers, papists and Presbyterians. Both these nests of sedition are defined with reference to the King. How was the danger faced by Charles II from popery, on the one hand, and from Presbyterianism, on the other, presented? What arguments were used to persuade contemporaries that one danger was greater than the other?

The central feature of a great many Tory tracts was a vituperative attack on Presbyterianism. We may say that this rhetorical tactic was favoured by Tory writers above

---

[37] Richard Pearson, *Providence bringing good out of evil* (1684), p21
[38] A subtext of such passages - considered in detail later - was a Tory criticism of Charles II's character based on his meekness and propensity to forgive his enemies.
[39] Miles Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p23

all others. The application of the term 'Presbyterianism' generally meant all types of Protestant dissent, not merely the more narrow meaning of a specifically Presbyter church structure. Indeed, the term was used in the 1680s in much the way that 'Puritanism' had been used forty years previously - abusive but ill-defined. Therefore we find all Tory guns targeted on Protestant nonconformity: the main thrust being that these hot-headed fanatics were natural rebels and formed a serious threat to Charles II. Miles Barne, for example, observed: "the Presbyterian has always been a Turbulent Imperious Bloudy Religion...with Rebellion, Civil war and Misery, from its first Rise at Geneva...to its unfortunate Arrival into this Island."[40] Although Protestant dissent was condemned by Tory texts in a myriad of ways, the most prominent was the threat that it posed to the King.

Conversely in Whig tracts the popish menace was a constant theme and touchstone. The Tories, as supposed defenders of popery, were branded "the infantry of old Rebellious Rome."[41] Indeed it was common for Whig texts, even those written by known nonconformist writers, to focus on attacking the Tories for this alleged Catholic sympathy rather than directly defending dissent - it is, after all, easier for propagandists in any era to play to the galleries of generally held prejudice rather than to challenge them head on. One area where this generalisation did not hold true was over the assertion that dissent meant disloyalty to the King. This charge of disloyalty to Charles was vociferously denied. It was claimed that Protestant nonconformists were being 'framed' as plotters against their beloved King: "and all this is done to vindicate underhand the Catholic Party, by throwing a suspicion on the Fanaticks."[42] Papists, charged Whigs, were manipulating the 'Church party' with misplaced fear of Presbyterianism and controlling the 'court party' with a groundless fear of republicanism - "although nothing is less design'd, or more improbable."[43] Tories thus appear as the duped puppets of unseen but malicious popish masters.

---

[40] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p8
[41] *The Tory-poets a Satyr* (1682), p1
[42] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p5
[43] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p7

The Tory riposte to such charges was to posit that their worldview constituted the loyal (Anglican) middle-ground of English society, while religious nonconformists, be they of Presbyterian or Catholic hew, were identified as an extremist fringe. Tories therefore denounced both religions as potential enemies to the King: "thee [Charles], From Presbyterian Tummult keep us free, and Papist undermining Treachery."[44] However, it was apparent that Tory writers did not attack both equally. Measured in terms of the space devoted in the canon of Tory print and in the ferocity of tone used, dissenters were on the receiving end far more than papists. Indeed, much appeared in Tory literature which played straight into the hands of Whig polemicists. "How", asked one Tory pamphlet, "is Popery more dangerous than Presbytery, either in Principles or Practice?"[45] Cited as evidence in support of this view were the bloody deaths of Mary Queen of Scots, Charles I, and the recently murdered Archbishop of St Andrews.[46] However this was a risky line of argument to follow: for it further primed the suspicion (already boisterously advanced by Whigs) that Tories were mere popish apologists. The most important way in which Tories sought to break this bind was to claim the King as their own. Charles II, Tories maintained, shared entirely their apprehension of Nonconformists as a potential Fifth Column. Had the King not acted swiftly to crush the recent Presbyterian insurrection at Bothwell Bridge? Charles was instrumental in efforts to stem the Presbyterian tide: "Fanatick Band of Rebel-Scots, thou [Charles] dost unshaken stand, as Rocks are fix'd, though in the midst of Sand."[47] Maintaining that the King stood firm against the Protestant 'Fanatic' threat enabled Tory writers to represent the King as a moderate occupying the centre-ground (where the Tories imagined themselves to be); with the Whigs tarnished as religious and political extremists.

Whig writers attempted to dynamite the conceptual bridge that linked the Tories with the King. Loyalism, it was repeatedly claimed, meant nothing more to the Tories than a mask to

---

[44] *Philo-Carolus consisting of three points* (1680), p19
[45] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p16
[46] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p16
[47] *Philo-Carolus consisting of three points* (1680), p16

hide their popery. The Tory may appear to stand foursquare behind the King but, "He follows his Prince, as Judas did Christ."[48] Therefore Tories were not true and loyal subjects to Charles II, they secretly desired: "A Bishops Head, set on a Princes Neck...then the Monarch must Romes Lawes obey."[49] The obvious Whig hope was to create an imagined dichotomy between the King and the Tories. The means to achieve this was for pamphlets to siphon off all that was negative away from the King and label it 'Tory'. Whigs, by contrast, presented themselves as the genuine loyalists. They contrasted their fierce "hatred we do bear the Roman whore" with a deep affection they felt for "our good King...Great Charles."[50] In the Whig scheme these two statements were opposite sides of the same coin: Rome was out to get Charles II, and they, the Whigs, were dedicated to preventing it.

A vital component of the anti-Catholic rhetoric employed by Whigs was a projected French hazard. References to the gallic peril were a hallmark of Exclusion-era Whig pamphlets. In these texts the French bogeyman acted as the spectre of what could happen to Charles II's England: the unholy trinity of invasion, absolutism and Catholicism being the lurid scenario of 'nuclear meltdown' used by Whigs to drum up support. Despite the King's foreign policies[51], it was the Tory faction, more than Charles, that was taxed with popish sympathies and with a specifically French-gravitation. The Tories being: "so tender of a breach with France, or opposing its Exorbitant power, from whence...[they] would pattern...[the] Model of British Soveraignty."[52] The Tories are thus depicted as supporters not of their own English King, but as proselytes to Louis XIV and his absolutist modes of government. For disdainful Whig writers these Tories were as good as foreigners: "You'l swear the Frenchmen speak good English now."[53] This notion of French influence became a

---

[48] *The Character of a through-pac'd Tory* (1682), p8
[49] *The Medal Revers'd* (1682), p9
[50] *The Coat of arms* (1682)
[51] Which sought to foster an alliance with Louis XIV's France.
[52] *The Character of a through-pac'd Tory* (1682), p9
[53] *The Tory-poets a Satyr* (1682), p6

stick with which to beat the Tories. The Whigs painted themselves in a patriotic light; it was they who were the followers of the English monarch.

Tory texts often mocked what they dismissed as Whig paranoia regarding France: "some would...have us for certain to believe...the most Christian King [Louis XIV], Monsieur Colbert, and the rest of the French Cabinet are here."[54] Nonetheless Tory polemicists considered the charge serious enough to merit rebuttal. This rebuttal often took the form of boosting the Protestant and anti-French credentials of the King. For example the declaration of thanks by the 'French and Dutch Churches' in London was published for public attention. In it, Charles received praise: "to testify the profound Acknowledgements...all the Favours that you have show to the Protestant Strangers who are came to seek for a Sanctuary."[55] In almost prescient anticipation of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, French Huguenots are shown as turning to the English King as their champion and protector against Louis XIV. Similarly Tory texts asserted that when war against the French had been judged necessary by Parliament, trade had ungrudgingly been forbidden with France thereby depriving the King of a very considerable part of his revenue (the subtext being the resentment felt by Tories that Parliament withheld sufficient funds regardless of government policy). Yet the overarching point was that Charles would happily undergo any hardships in the name of the national interest - even resisting France. There is a sense in Tory texts that in vindicating Charles from the suspicion of French inclinations, they could also somehow clear all those who professed to support the King or act in his name.

Yet Charles II is often conspicuous by his absence in Whig texts centring on the French danger. Even when decrying the French sway over the English court the King was frequently (conveniently) overlooked by Whigs. However exempting the King was not always possible; not least because Charles was well known to lean toward the French in his tastes for fashion, music and other cultural forms. It was almost impossible, for example, to

---

[54] *A Letter to a friend, about the late proclamation* (1679), p2
[55] David Primerose, *Remerciement fait...The Thanks given to the King on behalf of the French and Dutch Churches in the City of London* (1681), p1

attack the pernicious influence of the Duchess of Portsmouth and not implicitly criticise Charles. Certainly Portsmouth became a repeated target for Whig satirists who mocked her as a French spy in the King's bed: a "leech of the English state...England will...a plenteous Harvest Yield...[for her in France] to buy Lands and Palaces to Build."[56] While the inference of such statements was damaging to Charles it was nevertheless rare for the King to be directly or severely harangued for his French favouritism; it was even rarer for the King to be given up altogether as irredeemably of a French persuasion. It is ironic that Portsmouth became a hate-figure of the Whig press because of her unseen influence over the King, given that, in retrospect, we know that her private advocacy to Charles was actually in support of exclusion.[57] Nonetheless the appearance of a conspiracy can be as damaging as the real thing.

Crucial to the Whig comprehension of their own corporate identity was the notion of reactivity or self-defence. It was the popish-Tory faction who threatened the Kingdom and the Whigs who were reacting: "The Papists are the Assailants, who...will neither let a Protestant King enjoy his Crown, nor Protestant Subjects their Estates or Lives. Such King and Subjects may therefore lawfully unite and combine for their mutual defence."[58] At a popular level, the idea of the papist aggressor may even be said to have formed the basis of the case for exclusion. More generally this was the way that Whigs sought to appropriate Charles, to make him a common victim in the struggle against England's enemies. And this is why the Rye House Plot was such a disaster for Whig polemists.

Tory pamphleteers tried to undermine this sense of Whig self-defence. Many tracts - particularly those produced after 1681 - engaged in Popish Plot revisionism. They rarely went as far as to claim that the plot had been entirely fictitious, but they certainly asserted that the Whigs had massively overplayed and exploited it: "they [the Whigs] have taken such

---

[56] *A Dialogue between the D. of C and the D. of P* at their meeting in Paris(1682), p2
[57] Sonya Wynne, 'The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed) *The Stuart Courts* (2000), p183
[58] *The Charge of a Tory plot maintain'd in a dialogue* (1682), p12

great Advantage of the late Popish Plot, that the guilty Papist had almost made them innocent."[59] This kind of literature self-consciously attempted to downgrade the significance and scope of the Popish Plot. Moreover replacing the Popish Plot in the public imagination with the Rye House Plot enabled Tory apologists to more credibly take the offensive. A dissenter conspiracy, acted in conjunction with Parliament, no longer seemed as far fetched as it once had.

The anonymous Tory author of *England's Concern* warned that 30,000 French-trained Irish soldiers were ready to strike at any moment, and claimed that the Scots could raise as many men as well. "Scotland and Ireland will rejoyce at another Civil War in England, in hopes to free themselves from the Inconveniences of being Provinces...free themselves from any Dependence, or at least change their present from that of England to France."[60] Superficially this appears a very similar prediction of impeding disaster to Whig variants on the theme - in both the French bogeyman awaits only his opportunity to strike. Yet on closer inspection what is revealed is an emphatically Tory and Anglican nightmare: England is subjugated because the Exclusion Crisis provides the opening for Scots Presbyterians and Irish Catholics to enact their treachery, which, in turn, ushers in a French invasion. The tampering with the succession is key: for it creates ripe conditions for religious Nonconformists to reek havoc.

The Tory appropriation of Charles was taken to a new pitch after the Rye House Plot. His deliverance foretold of a new royal calling: "He is still reserv'd for some extraordinary work in the World."[61] The hour was at hand for Charles to fulfil his historic destiny:

"Now shall it be in His Power to subdue that Pestilence of Puritanism, which for above these hundred Years has raged in this Nation...To Him it is reserv'd to bring the Church of England up to those Glorious Heights, that she shall appear the Envy of Rome, and the

---

[59] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p9
[60] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p10&14
[61] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p22

Terrour of Geneva. To settle the Monarchy upon so firm a Basis, that it shall be no more shaken by Republican Rage."[62]

This, of course, was an Anglican-centric articulation of Charles's purpose made during the Tory reaction (serving, in part, to justify the large-scale suppression of dissenters then underway). Nonetheless, this extract also underscores perfectly how the Tories adopted Charles as the emblem of their cause: the more contentious or important the aspect, the greater the impulse to grant centrality of association to the King. Charles, after all, was the Tory's most effective rhetorical battering ram.

The impact of the 'Tory reaction' upon printed political tracts was also discernable in a general hardening of the rhetoric and tone employed. The symbolic moment of change for Tory fortunes was presented as being the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament. There was a consciousness in Tory texts of Oxford as a turning point: "Westminster was an Autumn to our Lays, But th' Oxford wipping Spring had kill'd our Bays, had not your Mercy and Dissolving Skill stopt both their doing, and our suffering Ill."[63] The view was expressed, as early as 1682, that parliamentary exclusionists had reached the end of the road. The discovery of the Rye House Plot only added further momentum to this trend of intolerant Tory rhetoric: "The Kings Command, be it just or unjust, must be suffer'd."[64]

Importantly, this stronger tone indicative of the Tory reaction effected depictions of the King. Charles II had been preserved from the plots, as we have seen, for a historic purpose: "God will go on to perfect that great work by which he hath begun to magnifie him: but what hath been already done may serve to raise the confidence of all his Subjects in their Loyalty towards him, and to strike a terrour into the hearts of all that hate him."[65] After the Oxford

---

[62] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p23
[63] *The Poets address to His Most Sacred Majesty* (1682), p1
[64] Tho Pomfret, *Passive Obedience, Stated and asserted* (1683), p22
[65] Tho Long, *The History of Joshua applied to the case of King Charles II* (1684), p22

Parliament, and particularly after Rye House, the King's providential destiny was increasingly expressed in terms of an Anglican and a Tory triumph.

The concept of threat to Charles ran along parallel lines. On one side was an imagined Presbyterian danger both to the King's life and to his throne - the spectre of republicanism hovered menacingly around such fears. On the other side was the projected Catholic threat - in this scenario, the King might be murdered and replaced with his brother while the Church and State were brought under the Roman yoke. Both sets of claims viewed the other as the definitive danger to King and to nation.

(iv) Charles II and Parliament

The changing relationship of the English crown to the institution of Parliament has received much critical scrutiny by historians of the seventeenth-century - becoming a key issue in scholarly debates.[66] Accordingly, the Exclusion Crisis constitutes a seminal moment in historiography addressing the England of the post-civil war era. The manner in which Parliament appeared in texts during the crisis is therefore of importance. In particular, the relations depicted between Charles II and his Parliament represent a vital dynamic in Exclusion-era print propaganda.

In the view of Whig polemicists the recent treatment of Parliament by the crown constituted a highly disturbing trend. During a time of crisis, and in the space of less than four years, two general elections were held (the first since 1661) yet Parliament had been prorogued on several occasions and actually dissolved three times: "there sprang a jealousie in the hearts of many, that some about His Majesty, who influenc'd his Counsels, were either themselves concerned in the Plot, or had too great a kindness for those that were, seeing they thus obstructed the further discovery of it, and prevented the prosecution of the

---

[66] Not least those concerned with the causes of the civil war; Ann Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (1991)

conspirators."[67] Parliament is presented in many Whig texts as the nation's safeguard against the Popish Plot. Those, therefore, who opposed Parliament's work could be said to favour the plot. The two were coupled: the fate of Parliament was directly linked to the outcome of the plot. If the nation was endangered by the plot, so too was the very survival of Parliament itself.

The first task of Tory polemists was to assert Charles II's honest dealings with Parliament. The King, according to loyalist tracts, profoundly valued and respected the institution: "And then, what ground or Reason can any one have to think that he is fallen out with his Parliaments? Has any King been so much beholding to them, as he has been?...And hath he not often of late repeated...his affection to, and esteem for them?"[68] Moreover, Tory pamphleteers demanded that the nation view afresh royal interactions with Parliament since the Restoration: "that no one useful Bill has been tendered to his Majesty, which he has Refus'd, till within this Year [1681], and that but once."[69] The implication was that it was the actions of Parliament - not least its recent proceedings toward a bill of exclusion - which had provoked the present crisis. Loyalists were emphatic on this point: in explaining the worsened relations they blamed Parliament, not Charles, for the poisoning of the wells.

As with other contentious areas of debate, each side deliberately misrepresented the position of the other. Generally Whig tracts did not blame the King for Parliament's treatment, as it was claimed by Tories that they did, but rather they blamed the Tories themselves. Whig writers frequently made conspicuous efforts to avoid directly lambasting the King. The figure of the courtly Tory was important is this respect:

"For the peoples concerns, he [the Tory] looks upon it but as a Drug of State, or such a Coursness of the Common Law as sullies the splendors of the Scepter...As for Parliaments, he abhors them in his own defence, being conscious of the cause they must have to detest

---

[67] *A Tory Plot* (1682), p5
[68] *A Letter to a Friend, about the late proclamation* (1679), p5
[69] *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p1

him; who is deeply concern'd that he can find no pick-Lock expedient that can bring him to finger publick money without their compliance."[70]

For his own self-preservation the machiavellian Tory had to, as a matter of necessity, turn the King against his Parliament. Such a strategy became even more menacing given, as we have seen, that the notion of courtly corruption was fused by Whig pamphleteers to the Popish Plot. If Parliament was lost to the nation, then the nation itself was lost. Indeed, the prorogations and dissolutions were actually represented by some Whig writers as a evidence of the plot's unfolding: "This is the only saving card that the men of this Interest have to play, to make the King jealous and fearful of this Parliament, and consequently to breed a diffidence in them of Him, that the foundations of the Government being rendered thus unsteady, they may upon a favourable juncture overturn it."[71]

Tory writers used the symbol of King to deflect the charges made against their faction. In locating the blame for the precarious state of the Kingdom firmly at the gates of Parliament, Tory scribes were pursuing a rhetorical strategy designed to protect Charles II, and themselves, from the damaging effects of suspicion. It was imperative for Tory pamphleteers to argue that in his dealings with Parliament the King acted with no hidden agenda. The intention was to demonstrate that the King posed no threat to the institution's long-term survival: that the motivation behind all royal actions was merely the interest of the nation. The purpose of such an endeavour was to try and counter-act opposition 'conspiracy theories' which explained the crisis in terms of the government deliberately antagonising Parliament in order to create a pretext for its abolition (and eventual replacement by royal absolutism). Therefore the reasons for the breakdown of royal influence in Parliament were expounded upon in such a way as to leave the reader in no doubt of the King's good faith.

---

[70] *The Character of a through-pac'd Tory* (1682), p9
[71] *A Tory Plot* (1682), p29

Because Tory apologists claimed that the actions of Charles II had been, and continued to be, entirely proper and commendable, it became incumbent upon these writers to offer alternative explanations of how the crisis came about. Obviously Parliament was at fault. But how? What had motivated parliamentary actions? The Tory press was unanimous in decrying that there was something strange in the development of this crisis. Undeclared private causes were, they claimed, being pursued through Parliament - and in particular through the policy of exclusion: "This is the Trojan Horse, that ruines our City; for in its Belly is hid a mysterious Consequence."[72] Inside exclusion lurked an army of republicans awaiting their chance to reek havoc upon England. Central to loyalist representations of Charles II, and of his relations with Parliament, was the notion of a hidden agenda driving the crisis dangerously onward. Tory writers set out to prove that this hidden agenda belonged to the Commons, not to Charles.

The memory of the Civil Wars could be evoked in the pamphlets of 1678-83 in such a way as to form an attack on both Whigs and Parliament. It was a favoured Tory ploy to trace an unbroken continuity between the Parliament of Pym and that of the Exclusion Crisis. Whig writers worked to counter this argument. Such comparisons were utterly rejected:

"And to deal plainly, I know nothing that can so plausibly justife the Parliaments cause in that war, as the telling the world that there was little or no difference betixt their Principles and the Principles of those that sat in the Two last Parliaments, whose actings the Addresses do with so much Indecency brand and asperse. And the language that is daily bestowed upon the Members of these late Parliaments, as being men of the same complexion that they of the Parliament Forty One were, will, instead of leaving any reproach upon them on whom it is intended to be fastned, beget a better opinion of those to whom they are compared."[73]

---

[72] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p4&2
[73] *An Impartial account of the nature and tendency of the late addresses* (1681), p8

In this instance, the Whig pamphleteer claims that the image rebounds upon those Tories who deployed it. The comparison with 1641 not only fails to hold up, but, because the current Parliament was so upstanding, that of 1641 even gains revision. The salient point is that Parliament was often shown in an heroic light in Whig texts: battling against the Popish Plot and the insidious forces of Rome.

Suspicion of the court was a powerful presence in Exclusion-era debates. In the climate of heightened fear generated after the Popish Plot, the prorogation of Parliament appeared to many a doubly sinister development - eroding trust in the King and in his government. A fact which loyalist writers themselves were very conscious of. As one Tory remarked after the prorogation of December 1679: "will nothing assure you that he [Charles II] is Real, because he hath made so many Prorogations, and especially now so long a one?"[74] Explaining the King's stance and attitude toward Parliament remained a crucial task for royal apologists throughout the period between 1678 and 1681.

A favoured tactic of Tory writers was, perhaps surprisingly, to emphasise Charles II's lack of control over the political situation. "These audacious Proceedings having forc't His Majesty to an Interval of Parliaments."[75] The sense of compulsion is important. Charles is presented as making a choice that he would not, under normal circumstances, either arrive at or wish to make. Yet, in order to regain control he is forced by the extraordinary and outrageous actions of Parliament to call a halt to proceedings. Crucially, propagandists claimed that recent events had not dented Charles's admiration for the institution of Parliament. We could almost call the conceptual distinction made by Tory pamphleteers as being 'Parliament's two bodies'. The King felt displeasure merely with the misdeeds of *this* Parliament, not with Parliament the institution: "He hath told you, he hath been forced (no doubt to his own inward regret) to dissolve two Parliaments within less than a years time,

---

[74] *A Letter to a friend, about the late proclamation* (1679), p5
[75] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p15

because of the great...animosities among them."[76] Such extracts betray the necessity of defusing fears over absolutist tendencies in Charles II's court. The overarching point being made was, in this regard, essential to the loyalist defence: recent difficulties with Parliament were presented as being ephemeral, not structural.

A newly composed Parliament or even simply a change in the prevailing political climate could, it was claimed, dissipate the crisis (thereby removing the threat posed to the King, his Parliament, and the nation). Under this logic, a prorogation or a dissolution of Parliament could actually be defended as steps taken in *support* of parliamentary institutions. For by ensuring the functionality of the Commons and Lords at a time of national peril, Charles II was ensuring Parliament's continued role and importance in the life of the nation. The King was not destroying Parliament, he was saving it from itself.

One Whig contention, made in response to such arguments, was that those who disregarded the legitimacy of Parliament were equally capable of disrespecting the legitimacy of the monarch: "Nor can His Majesty be supposed to believe, that ever they will prove true to the Monarchy, who are not true to the Rights and Priviledges of Parliament."[77] Another charge levelled at Tories was that their words were poisonous: "If at any time the Representative of the people be obsequious enough as to the point of giving [funds to the court], he will then perhaps stroak them for their pains, or allow then the Epithete of Loyal."[78] To be hailed as 'loyal' by Tories actually meant being lulled into complicity with the plot. It was better to be labelled a troublesome opponent if the accusers were Jesuitical politicians.

A favoured argument advanced by Tory scribes in support of Charles was that he was personally investigating the Popish Plot, and that he must be given time to do so free from the hysterical and reactionary furore to which Parliament was prone. Tory writers could also be quite shameless in their appeal to the self-interest of the nation: "He [Charles II] hath

---

[76] *A Letter to a Friend about the late proclamation* (1679), p5
[77] *An Impartial account* (1681), p11
[78] *The Character of a through-pac'd Tory* (1682)

82

heard how great the murmurs of his People have been at the heavy taxes that the Parliaments have so often laid upon them, and perhaps that may be one Reason [for the prorogation]."[79] To suggest that a primary concern in the King's thoughts between 1678-81 was the high burden of taxation upon his subjects, was as outrageous a Tory claim as it was mischievous.

When it came to Charles's ongoing commitment to the institution of Parliament, loyalist texts insisted that the King merited unreserved trust. "He has himself told you...nor does he think the Crown can be happy without frequent parliaments."[80] Trust was very much personalised around the person of the King - loyalty to Charles II meant trust in his custodianship of the constitution. Some Tories even mocked what they presented as histrionic over-reaction, ironically observing: "But, O Cry the people very fiercely, here's a year's Prorogation longer, and we shall never see our dearly beloved Parliament again."[81] Loyalist texts were adamant: Charles II was no threat to Parliament, even if the same could not be said in reverse.

There is a sense in which loyalist writers self-consciously saw themselves as addressing the nation in the face of clamorous entreaties by the opposition (very often associated, by Tories, with being the parliamentary opposition). Which is to say, Tory texts frequently adopted a narrative technique that seemed to deliberately accentuate the difficulty that they themselves - as defenders of the crown - faced. Their arguments were presented as a vital response to an opposition whose insidious pamphlets were already flooding the streets: "Every Coffee-house now seems...a Cabal of State."[82]

The appeal made by loyalists for the nation to reject dangerous sedition was proclaimed to cut through the arguments of opposition tracts and to by-pass parliamentary opponents: it held itself to be a voice of counsel that needed to be heard. It had become difficult, claimed Tories, for sense to prevail: "If any Loyal Member...stood up in the Defence of his King or

---

[79] *A Letter to a friend about the late proclamation* (1679), p5
[80] *A Letter to a friend about the late proclamation* (1679), p5
[81] *A Letter to a friend about the late proclamation* (1679), p6
[82] *A Letter to a friend about the late proclamation* (1679), p2

Countrey, He was either rudely hiss't at, or run down with a Train of Clamourous Speeches."[83] The subtext, perhaps, of such complaints was to ask if the absence of such a rotten Parliament would truly be a loss. More immediately though, it allowed Tory texts to add magnitude to their words as they self-consciously set out, in their own terms, to fight the good fight against powerful opposition. Certain Tory texts almost presented a corporate identity where they, the Tories, were a minority struggling to be heard, or even where they were an 'opposition' to the Whig multitudes.

A important feature of Tory texts was the conceptual differentiation that was made between 'Parliament' and 'the people'. The one, claimed Tory scribes, must not be automatically considered as representative of the other. "The present Electors, not making a sixth part of the Nation, cannot in reason bind the rest."[84] In the Tory worldview only the King was able to navigate between all the competing interests that made up the nation. Only Charles II was able to govern on behalf of all. There was a popular dimension to such arguments: though the Commons were accused of rabblerousing by Tories, equally Charles II was said to embody the whole nation, both elite *and* unenfranchised, in a way that Parliament never could. In a sense, Tory pamphleteers were deliberately setting up Charles II in opposition to Parliament, presenting Parliament as a usurping force illegitimately claiming an omnipotence of rule possible only to the crown.

Yet, in many Whig texts the voice of people is portrayed as being stifled by the policy followed toward Parliament. This kind of argument was usually framed in the context of the Popish Plot:

"We in the Country have done our parts, in choosing for the generality good Members to serve in Parliament; but if (as our last Parliaments were) they must be dissolv'd or prorogu'd, when ever they come to redress the Grievances of the Subject, we may be pitied,

---

[83] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p14
[84] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p10

but not blam'd. If the Plot takes effect, (as in all probability it will) our Parliaments are not then to be condemn'd, for that their not being suffer'd to sit ocasion'd it."[85]

Again, Parliament is depicted as best able to deal with the Catholic threat. Although the popular dimension is left implicit in the above extract, it is nonetheless present. A dangerous coterie of ministers around the King is characterised as preventing the representatives of the nation from securing England's safety. Such an invidious argument was not simply politicised, it was politicising - encouraging outrage and engagement in equal measures.

While a myriad of Exclusion texts engaged in complex theorising regarding philosophical systems of power, many others, particularly Tory texts, eschewed abstract theory in favour of more mundane but 'practical' arguments. Both types of arguments are important to the historian attempting to reconstruct contemporary Exclusion debate. For some Tory writers the issues surrounding the bill of exclusion had become overblown and over-complicated. The real issues, they claimed, were not arcane legalistic questions of what could or could not be done within the constitution, but were much simpler: what should be done? As one Tory tract put it:

"I cannot but conclude both Sides mistaken in the Main, and to have, wilfully or ignorantly, past over...the chief part of the Question; which was, not what the Parliament, meaning King, Lords and Commons, could do, by vertue of their might or power; but what in Justice, or Prudence, they ought to do in the case of His R.H?"[86]

Some loyalist writing seemed to want to shut-down the theoretical debate, to simplify and personalise the questions at stake in terms of obedience owed to Charles II. "May subtile

---

[85] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p3
[86] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p1

Two-fac'd Lawyers chat no more, whether succession be of Right."[87] Most propaganda was intended for as wide an audience as possible. Its message was thus condensed and simplified to enable wide access. Complex and contentious questions were often answered with crude and simplistic answers. Aphorisms could pass as uncontested fact: "our Kings derive not their Titles from the People, but from God; that to him only they are accountable."[88] Often in Tory material the 'truth' was something stated, not debated.

Tory pamphleteers protested that the existence of so vocal an opposition must be seen as a judgement against, and rejection of, Charles II. Whigs often countered this line of argument with the trusty 'evil counsellors' defence: "but how far his Minister...may render his authority a Cloak to their malice."[89] No criticism of the King, Whigs maintained, was intended in criticism of his ministers. Yet Tory literature remained unmoved. Tory propaganda tended to bring the argument back to, and personalise it around, an attack on Charles and on his brother: "no more Disgrace the Stuart's name, nor fly in Charles's Face...May stubborn Peers, Pimps to a Common-weal...feel the keen-edg'd Ax."[90]

The Definition of parliament given by the source cited earlier - that of King, Lords and Commons[91] - is a significant one. Loyalist texts were fond of reminding the reader that 'parliament' included the King. Their point was that efforts at exclusion were futile. Charles would never assent to such a bill and so exclusion could never be enacted. Whig writers sought to turn this argument on its head. The House of Commons, they observed, was merely offering advice to its sovereign. Yet were Charles II to truly embrace his Parliament, he could become massively powerful: "For though perhaps when they [the Tories] talk of a publick conscience, they mean none but the Kings; yet if ever the King be infallible, I would the readiliest expect him to be so, when he has the concurrent advice and

---

[87] *The Humble Wishes of a Loyal Subject* (1681)
[88] Humphrey Gower, *The Speech of Doctor Gower, vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge* (1681)
[89] Robert Ferguson, *No Protestant-Plot; or The Present pretended Conspiracy of Protestants against the King* (1681), p4
[90] *The Humble Wishes of a Loyal Subject* (1681)
[91] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p1

consent of the whole Nation."[92] This was both a reproach and a promise to the King - he could chose to make Parliament his ally rather than his opponent.

Asserting that exclusion could never happen did not prevent Tory scribes from discussing it and disclaiming the effects of such a bill. Exclusion would upset the perfect constitution. Moreover, it would be utterly unnecessary and illogical for Englishmen to attack the monarchy in this way, for under English law: "you possess your Right, equally with your Prince."[93] Charles II was offered up as the focus for renewed national unity: "Summon your Reason...Heal our divisions...Long Live Great Charles."[94] Yet while Tory writers could engage in exhortations of this kind, based around the concept of reconciliation, the rhetoric of Tory polemic could also use the King's name in a far more authoritarian way: "it is convenient for all subjects to obey, and not to seeme to contend with him, whose admired Virtues, may serve for Paterns to the whole World."[95]

Given the pressure exerted by the current political disarray it is unsurprising that there arose calls - mostly from opposition sources - for the King to find a compromise position; for Charles to come up with an escape route out of the crisis. Whatever the private manoeuvring at court, such a stance was firmly and publicly rejected in Tory literature. Once a compromise was granted, particularly one involving any form of exclusion, a step by step erosion of Charles' power would follow, until, inexorably, he too would be forced to relinquish the throne: "for what has been once done, may be again, Tummults and Factions...may make a Prince quit his Crown to save his Life...every Flower or Jewel he parts with, is a step or advance to his Grave."[96] The examples of Edward II and Richard II were cited to prove the point.[97] The initial compromise of these Princes had not resulted in peace but in their dethroning by Parliament – or, at least, so it seemed to Tory writers.

---

[92] *A Tory Plot* (1682), p1
[93] *The Glory of the English Nation, or an Essay on the Birth-day of King Charles the Second* (1681)
[94] *The Glory of the English Nation* (1681)
[95] *Here is a true and perfect account of the proceding at Windsor* (1683), p2
[96] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p4
[97] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p4

It is significant that *Englands Concern*, a loyalist text, was prepared to acknowledge such a precedent (even if only as a negative example of what could happen). Many Tory readings of history denied any such breaches in the royal line had ever occurred, maintaining that the disastrous novelty of 1649 was parliamentary involvement. Whereas in *Englands Concern* Kings were deposed with unnerving frequency and Parliament is given very great prominence - appearing throughout history as a de-stabilising factor. Both these readings of the past were ideologically driven and Tory in perspective, yet were significantly divergent and incompatible with each other. In part these differences reflect simply different interpretations. However, it is also true that polemicists were not always certain which arguments would prove most effective for their cause. There was a degree of trial-and-error in the Exclusion-era propaganda of both sides.

For Tories, the futility of the Crown's granting concessions appeared to be confirmed by the Rye House Plot. This episode was represented as exposing the true colours of exclusionists and therefore of the danger of attempting to appease them: "And because his Majesty would not consent unto that Bill, you too plainly see, that they consented...unto a worse. And from distaste, fell into conspiracy; which, would have ripened in...slaughter."[98] The Rye House Plot acts to vindicate Charles II's firmness in the face of opposition: " 'twas always suspicious, but is now manifest...[exclusion] was carried on with that Violence, to facilitate the Dethroning of the King."[99]

Tory polemicists declared that none, after Rye House, could still refuse to acknowledge the truth of a fanatic plot - acted in conjunction with elements in Parliament - and directed against Charles II: "I know it is a hard thing to perswade some men that there hath been a Plot...to take away the life of the King: and it is the interest of some infidels not to believe it till they see it executed, as in the case of the Royal Martyr."[100] Rye House showed the true

---

[98] L'Estrange, *Theosebia, or, The Churches advocate endeavouring the promotion of loyalty to our King* (1683), p19
[99] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p12
[100] Long, *The History of Joshua applied to the Case of King Charles II* (1684), p21

depravity of the Presbyterian plotter: "thereby made themselves far worse than the very worst Papists, by designing to Murther the King themselves, and then to cast it, and pretend to revenge it."[101] This kind of rhetoric sought to empower Charles II through denouncement of Parliament and of Whigs: only the King could offer security to England.

In conclusion it is clear that the symbol of the King acted in a multiplicity of subtle ways in print literature. The propaganda battle for hearts and minds was waged by means of contested ideas, symbols and rhetoric - with each side searching for an effective conceptual armoury that would be advantageous to its political agenda. Tory polemicists sought to invalidate accusations that they were in league with Rome by making Charles II emblematic of their worldview. To condemn them was therefore to condemn the King. Whigs could simply not afford this or any other Tory appropriation of the King's symbolic power to stand unchallenged. Within Whig printed texts the King represents the last barrier to national disaster; he appears not as an auxiliary of the true Tory cause (i.e. popery) but as a bulwark against it.

The King (which is to say the symbolic importance of the King) was the pivot in a game of power and influence. Charles represented the fulcrum around which a thousand passions swirled. This crucial historical moment was unstable in its context and fraught with perils. Both sides used references to Charles II to condemn opponents, to empower themselves, and to legitimise their arguments. The key point is that the King was not a 'side-show' of Exclusion debate; Charles as symbol was the unavoidable presence at its centre. Even arguments that were not directly related to Charles II had to be reconciled to the King through a system of lateral references. Both sides understood that in order to prosper they had to appear to engage with the King.

---

[101] Pearson, *Providence bringing good out of evil* (1684), p24

Chapter Four: The Character of the King in Debate

"He [God] honoured him with many special endowments that qualified him for Government, above all his neighbouring Princes."[1]

This chapter explores how the character of Charles II emerged from the Exclusion-era propaganda debate. What sort of King was represented by the pamphleteers of both sides? For what was Charles praised? For what was he criticised? If Whig and Tory writers agreed upon on common attributes of the royal character, did they place different interpretations upon them? It will be argued that print propaganda threw up two sets of understandings of Charles II: two ideologically charged constructs which supported rival political polarities; the symbol of the King being modified to fulfil divergent purposes in this debate.

Both sides, as we shall see, were conscious of the importance that print could play in forging popular perceptions regarding the King's character. Equally, both sides were aware of how these perceptions of character could function as political leverage in the debate. Character assassination, it was claimed, should not be looked on with any leniency for it was tantamount to the real thing: "And so dangerous is their ordinary conversation, that, as the Italians chose to Murther a man rather then slander him, these chose to slander him on purpose that he may be Murthered."[2] In this particular case the charge formed part of a Tory tirade against Whig writers, but the fundamental point underpinning it was more generally applicable: print could be deadly. Printed propaganda became crucial in contesting ideas of who the King was and what the King represented.

The chapter is divided between two main themes: the first considers how the crisis debate affected perceptions of the King's character; the second examines how perceptions of the

---

[1] Long, *The History of Joshua applied to the Case of King Charles II* (1684), p22
[2] L'Estrange, *Theosebia, or, The Churches advocate endeavouring the promotion of loyalty to our King* (1683), p16

King impacted on and altered the nature of crisis debate. Three sub-sections in each half will isolate and analyse different aspects of these processes.

The Impact of Exclusion Debate on the King

Charles II could not exist as he had done before. The unfolding crisis required new representations of the King to meet the challenges of a transformed political landscape. In particular three aspects of the crisis held important consequences for perceptions of the King's character: (i) Charles's supposed attitude to the crisis that was engulfing the country, (ii) the notion of 'evil counsellors' and the implication their presence held for the King, and (iii) Charles II's personal religious beliefs.

(i) Charles II and the Crisis: Popish Plot and Exclusion

What was Charles II's attitude toward the Popish Plot? Why did he refuse to support the exclusion bills put before Parliament? And what did these royal stances reveal about Charles II? These were questions that occupied considerable attention in print between 1678 and 1683. The first of these questions was not an identical inquiry to the (related) questions of what was being done in response to the plot, or to debating whether such actions were sufficient - both of which also received a public airing through print. Rather the question turned upon the King personally: the significance being that the Popish Plot was taken to reveal the 'real' Charles. The plot, it seemed to scribes, was the acid test of the royal character, confirming or confounding suspicions and expectations of him. Therefore assertions over what the King believed took on a politically loaded meaning.

The King's defenders were keen to emphasise that Charles accepted that the plot was genuine: "hath not his Majesty several times told us, he verily believes there is a...Conspiracy by the Papists against his most sacred Person."[3] These kind of statements sought to defuse accusations that the (allegedly) lacklustre reaction by the government

---

[3] *A Letter to a friend, about the late proclamation* (1679), p5

stemmed from the King's failure to take the plot seriously. Such refutations were also crucial in counteracting the suspicion that not enough was being done because Charles was sympathetic to the Catholic religion. Thus in Popish Plot narratives we find frequent restatements of his firm Protestantism: "he is not a Man for their turn, but a firm adherer to the most excellent Church of England."[4] Loyalist propagandists acknowledged public apprehension and even public dissatisfaction with the state of the nation's security. These propagandists also sought to prevent the King from acting as a lighting conductor for this public disenchantment. "He hath promised...to make a strict search as he can into the plot himself, and to do all things for his people to their own wish if they will but have patience, and give him time."[5] Evident in this extract is the stress placed upon Charles personally; it was the King who was taking responsibility for investigating the plot, not Danby or the administration (this aspect worked also to protect Tories who could shelter behind the figure of the King[6]). On the one hand then, Charles was presented as personally in charge of the investigation: thereby, the symbol of the King was used to offset both the charge of evil counsellors and that of royal inertia. Yet, on the other hand, efforts were made to dissociate Charles from the unpopularity resultant from such a strategy; be patient, loyal apologists pleaded, for the wheels of national security turn slowly. These two features of loyalist propaganda pulled in opposite directions - the King took responsibility for everything but nothing was his fault.

The modes of expression, utilized in calls for decisive counter-plot measures, are analogous to the later calls for the passage of an exclusion bill. Both types of texts drew their electricity from a perception of danger (which they themselves had helped to create) and channelled this energy into demands for action. Whig scribes, in assessing what they saw as inadequate protection of the country against the reality of plotting, tended not to

---

[4] *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p3
[5] *A Letter to a friend about the late proclamation* (1679), p6
[6] A point considered in greater detail in Chapter Three.

castigate the King directly but to lay the blame elsewhere.[7] However, one area in which Charles was unavoidably entangled was the involvement of the Duke of York. James is the most direct bridge between texts dealing with the Popish Plot and those concerning the exclusion bills. It was widely suspected that the extent of James's complicity in the Popish Plot had not been fully scrutinized because of his position in the royal family. Yet, even in this instance, Charles II largely escaped severe criticism. The contention was that Charles was blinded by brotherly love to the viper at his breast; an idea offered up as an extenuating circumstance that should not deter popular affection for the sovereign: "I say he has all these to Apologize for his not giving countenance to the Bill, and to keep Him in the good opinion of his Loyal Subject...But for others that have none of these colour'd Glasses to look through, they may indeed affirm...that white is black, but they lie against the truth...they are well pleas'd at the King's danger."[8] Therefore Charles's main reason for not investigating the plot fully and also his motivation for refusing the exclusion bills are shown to be one in the same: a commendable, if misplaced, sense of loyalty to his brother. The vitriolic contempt of Whig polemicists was reserved for those who "lie against truth" - not the King. Charles therefore got off relatively lightly.

Obstinately the Whig strategy was to convince the King that his duty to the nation superseded his loyalty to his brother - and that this in turn necessitated action (such as exclusion). Again however outward deference to the King masked disobedient opposition. This barrage of print literature was not aimed at the King, as it purported to be, but at the nation. These broadsides were intended to exert indirect pressure on Charles by winning over his subjects. Declaring their undying loyalty to Charles II was in fact a means for Whig pamphleteers to circumnavigate Charles II or to address the people over the head of the King.

---

[7] Not least on the King's 'evil counsellors' – an aspect dealt with later in this chapter.
[8] *A Tory Plot* (1682), p21

The loyalist circle was squared by Whig writers who asserted that subjects should continue to love their King despite the fact Charles (currently) stood against exclusion. What is interesting is that exactly the same was true of many Tory sources. There is a tacit acceptance in much Tory literature that popular sentiment broadly supported the measure of exclusion. Charles II, it was said, would do anything for his people. Anything that is, except assent to an exclusion bill: "truly 'tis to be believed, that he who in so many Years has denied nothing to his People (that one thing excepted...the Dukes Exclusion) were he really as well satisfied that he might as rightfully [do it]...without all doubt he would do it."[9] Charles is represented as a monarch so attentive and sensitive to his people's wishes that he would exclude his only brother from the succession if only he 'rightfully' could. This formulation of the argument was a rhetorical tactic designed to reinforce the impossibility of exclusion. In stating that Charles would consider exclusion if only it were not wrong, the effect was actually to underscore Tory legal and moral objections to the bill while simultaneously delivering a sympathetic rendering of the King. This was a Tory device enabling them to have the best of both worlds.

Indeed Tory propaganda took this line of logic a step further. By refusing an action that the majority of his people desired, Charles II had actually demonstrated why he was such a good Prince: "a consciencious Prince should refuse to do what he really believes would be a wrongful Act...how profitable and expedient soever it might be...[it is] the very worst condition of a people to have a Prince, who in acting takes not his measure by what is Right and Honest, but Profitable and Convenient."[10] Therefore the King's ability to sail against the popular wind is offered up as a cause for admiration, not censure.

A key concept in this debate over what Charles inwardly believed (or did not) is that of 'interest'. This was an item of conceptual currency traded by both sides: 'interest' in the crisis was used to mean a favourable outcome securing that which was considered valuable

---

[9] *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p3
[10] *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p3

94

(be it in a religious, financial, legal or moral sense). The idea of 'interest' was often personalised to the King: "Besides, His Majesty cannot but find it his own Interest to stick to the D. when he reflects."[11] For propagandists to establish what the King's interest actually was, and then to demonstrate the consistency of their favoured policies with it, was to take possession of defensible high-ground in the debate. The assumption was that Charles would act in accordance with his own 'interest' - provided, of course, he understood what that was.

A mainstay of Tory interest-arguments was the idea of the hidden agenda. Exactly what innovative design lay behind recent developments none could tell for certain, but the omens were ominous: "who can lay aside fatal Apprehensions...when Two House of Commons have successively prepared a Bill disposing the Crown contrary to the King's express commands."[12] The perfect form of government was threatened with being capsized: becoming at best a distasteful elective monarchy and at worst a republic. Tory sources tended to give great weight to the opinion that the bill did not merely damage York, but Charles also. The Tories expressed their views not only with reference to abstract theories of monarchy[13]; they often put the accent on Charles himself: the bill was a gross offence to his honour, his justice and his conscience. In the end, the King was just as much a target as his brother: "[events are] carried on...to facilitate the Dethroning of the King."[14] The bottom line was that it was not in Charles's interest to assent to an exclusion bill because, ultimately, it would unseat him too. In choosing to frame their argument as an appeal to the interests of King, Tory pamphleteers were seeking to establish that the nation's interest was identical to that of the King's. Yet also detectable in certain Tory texts is a slight apprehension; an underlying fear that Charles II might, just might, acquiesce to exclusionist demands.

The Whigs too could play the interest card. In their terms the only alternative to exclusion was to go down the road toward popery. This course led inexorably to absolutism. Needless

---

[11] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p8
[12] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p4
[13] Such as the reprinting during the crisis of Sir Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha* and *Freeholders' Grand Inquest* (1680)
[14] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p12

to say, such eventualities were not in the nation's interest. However absolutism was also presented as being against the King's interest: "no Religion or Government can be so much for his Majesties advantage, as that which is establish'd amongst us: since in Popery, although his Majesty would be made absolute over his Subject, yet his slavery to the Pope would be so great, that as well his Liberty as his Revenues would be much less than now."[15] Under this scheme there were only two possible choices: the government as currently established or absolutism. Both Whigs and Tories claimed that their preferred course of action maintained the status quo – as beneficial to Charles personally as it was to the nation - and that their opponents advanced dangerous innovation.

Perhaps more remarkably Whig pamphlets were prepared to appeal directly to the royal coffers. Charles, James and any other English monarch in the future would be richer were they not absolute rulers. Under absolutism, it was claimed, massive amounts of money were extracted from the subject yet these went to the church and to maintaining a standing army. Kings themselves, like the nation at large, were actually poorer. It was not in the interest of Charles to allow a popish successor: "who ever reads our Chronicles will find, that no school-boys have been greater slaves to their Masters, than many of our English King were to the Pope...[a Prince] can have no Interest to introduce Popery, unless he desires either to be whipp'd by a Monk, or stabb'd or poyson'd by a Jesuit...'tis the Jesuits that govern, and not the King."[16] The notion of 'interest' facilitated this discussion of absolutism - the real purpose of such horror stories being to scare the nation about the prospect of a papist King.

Moreover this general popish menace was given a pronounced specificity in the case of Charles II. Catholic forces were, of course, presumed to have desired the death of every English Protestant King but, it was argued, they wanted to murder Charles more than most. Had Charles not already consented to severe measures against Catholics? Such acts the Jesuits could never forgive. Furthermore, the Catholic faction knew there always existed the

---

[15] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p25
[16] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p16

possibility that Parliament would finally grant Charles sufficient funds, thereby, it was said, forging a new bond between the two and spelling disaster for the Catholic interest. For papists the question was why should they gamble on Charles II continuing to oppose Parliament, rather than bring about the succession of their champion the Duke of York: "their Interest does unavoidably excite them to murder his Sacred Majesty."[17]

When dealing with the concept of the 'King's interest' we have to ask why each example was expressed in the terms that it was. The answer is that the King's interest could act as an umbrella for promoting a version of the nation's interest. Such narratives were rarely about persuading the King - as they purported to be - rather they were conduits to examine the post-exclusion world, to contrast the Whig nightmare of absolutism with the Tory fear of anarchy.

(ii) The King and his Evil Counsellors

The old idea of 'evil counsellors' - a frequent jibe against Charles I - resurfaced during the Exclusion Crisis. The Whigs were fond of proclaiming themselves to be 'wronged loyalists'. Therefore the idea that they were being misrepresented to the King by his Tory ministers served to support their protestations of loyalism. The effect of Tory duplicity was "to create a misunderstanding between His Majesty and His good Subjects though disguised with pretence of service to his Majesty."[18] The Whigs made no distinction between themselves and 'the people' - rather the dividing line in Whig texts appears between the majority of stout hearted Englishmen (the 'good Subjects') and the seditious Tory-papist faction. The notion that the King received distorted and manipulated reports of events proved extremely useful for Whigs. Such a scheme could be used to explain Charles's lukewarm, or even hostile, response to any number of events from the winter petitioning campaign of 1679-80 to the various parliamentary attempts at exclusion. The concept of the 'evil counsellor' was

---

[17] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p23
[18] *A Tory Plot* (1682), p6

97

one connected with earlier anti-court rhetoric (that had been particularly prevalent during the 1670s) but was now projected onto the Tories. The Exclusion-era Tory, as seen from Whig texts, was one-part papist plotter and one-part corrupt and self-interested courtier.

The identification of a glut of treacherous politicians encircling the King was, in effect, a recognition by Whigs of their own logic and character as an opposition grouping. For most of the period 1678-83 the King's advisers were men whom historians have generally characterised as 'Tory' rather than 'Whig'. The 'evil counsellor' figure was a form of political alchemy: turning base opposition into golden loyalism and legitimising action taken in resistance of this nefarious influence (including printed publications). Misleading the King was key to the papist's devious divide-and-rule strategy: "to make the King…fearful…[in order to] erect their own new Model [of government]."[19] Moreover the argument often advanced by Tory writers - that the questioning of decisions made by the King's ministers showed an outrageous and unwarranted presumption - only served to reinforce these suspicions. Tory writers repeatedly reproached the nation that they should be satisfied in the knowledge, "to be sure the King will be very well advised indeed."[20] But such statements did little to offset the perception that 'evil counsellors' around the King avoided scrutiny precisely because they had something to hide.

What did all this say about the King? Generally Whig writers were at pains to stress that Charles could not be blamed for his evil counsellors (either their existence or his actions taken under their guidance). It was a vicious circle: it was the very presence of evil counsellors at the heart of government that ensured their perpetuated power because, for as long as they held their positions, they would continue to cast their black spell over the King. "'Tis impossible the King should attend all the affairs of State himself, He must necessarily see many things with other folks eyes, and hear them with others ears; and therefore…things

---

[19] *A Tory Plot* (1682), p29
[20] *A Letter to a friend, about the late proclamation* (1679), p8

be misrepresented to him."[21] Crucially, it was almost unheard of for Whig pamphleteers to totally write off Charles II as irretrievably tainted by his counsellors. Rather in Whig pamphlets the King's innate goodness was usually presented as leaving open the possibility for a redemptive transformation of his government. Indeed, even in those dark days Whig writers were willing to concede that the King still afforded the nation a degree of protection: "we should with all Thankfulness acknowledg, that we are in some Security during His Majesties Life."[22] The carefully constructed caveat in this statement is also worthy of note: what happened to the nation after Charles II was no longer on the throne was left conspicuously unresolved.

Whigs of the Exclusion-era inherited a well-established conceptual framework relating to the evil counsellor - in other words the idea was not one which had to be planted in the public consciousness from nothing. Not least this was the legacy of Charles I's reign (particularly the much scrutinised influence of Archbishop Laud and the Earl of Strafford). Examples of the evil counsellor argument in the period 1678-83 broadly derived from this existing conceptual matrix, and followed established patterns of thought. This said, with the possible exception of the Earl of Danby, Exclusion-era accusations tended not to home in on individuals, but to damn all the King's advisers alike. This shift perhaps reflects the 'party' political nature of the crisis - to Whig pamphleteers, one Tory minister was as bad as the next. Another regard in which the Exclusion-era may be said to be different is the perceived nature of the King. The Exclusion idea of the evil counsellor fed into the pre-existing popular understanding of Charles II as being of a mild disposition. Charles II was represented as a King especially inclined to trust unquestionably those closest to him. Yet there is little sense that his ministry represented the deeply held convictions of the King. In certain tracts there is a clearly stated hope that Charles II might become pliable to the Whig

---

[21] *The Charge of a Tory plot maintain'd in a dialogue* (1682), p30
[22] *An Impartial account* (1681), p7

cause were a new set of political advisors to replace the current batch – a sense which endured even as the ministers themselves shifted.[23]

By contrast, it was common in loyalist pamphlets for the King to appear as steadfast; maintaining the assertion that once the King was set upon a particular policy path he could not be blown off his plotted course: "has he not given them the assurance of it upon his Royal word (and what can be required more?)."[24] Yet this did not deter Whig writers. Indeed such Tory arguments were prone to be undermined by the passage of time: the more often they were articulated the less true they appeared, as the King was observed to change the approach and personnel of his ministry.

Not only was Charles exonerated by Whigs of responsibility for the snake-pit of the advisers at his court, but Whig texts also firmly restated their belief in the King's basic good nature: "The King is of too much goodness, and a Prince of greater wisdom and more unstained Justice, that any of his subjects should apprehend or fear any thing illegal from him while he acts free and unconstrained."[25] The logical continuation of such a position was that on any occasion when the King did seem to act illegally, the assumption could be made that his actions were not "unconstrained" - something dangerously close to a form of 'resistance theory'. The King is consistently credited by Whig texts with 'positive' developments (for example the calling of Parliament) yet his evil Tory counsellors blamed for the 'negative' ones (the proroguing or dissolving of Parliament and so forth). Charles II was not held to be guilty for misrepresentations made to him, while any excellent decisions were latched onto as proof that his innate goodness could still transcend the adverse circumstances of court.

In a sense, the Whigs depicted themselves not only as true loyalists but as supporters of the true King. In other words they espoused the policies that Charles would, they claimed,

---

[23] Including the remodelled Privy Council of April 1679 which briefly included Shaftesbury, Lord Halifax, the earl of Essex and Lord Cavendish.
[24] *A letter to a friend, about the late proclamation* (1679), p4
[25] Ferguson, *No Protestant-plot* (1681), p4

favour if his judgement was clear of the befuddling influence of evil counsellors. The true King was the Charles II that would emerge once the Tories had been swept away. By contrast, it was maintained that the Tories blamed the King for all that went wrong, even that which they had advised: "[Whigs] do not well like your fastning the faults of the King's ministers upon the King."[26] To which complaint Whig scribes imagined the Tories as replying: "we care not what scandals and suspicions we draw upon the King, so we can but preserve the Duke's esteem."[27] In the Whig imagination only their support for Charles was sincere and enduring.

(iii) Charles II and Religious Belief

Francis Bacon famously declared of Elizabeth I that she would not make windows into men's hearts.[28] The point was that the Queen demanded of her subjects only outward conformity, their private hinterland did not concern her. The pamphleteers of the Exclusion Crisis extended no such privilege to Charles II. In the wake of the Popish Plot furore the religious convictions of the King became the focus for intense scrutiny. This was not only a question of examining the religious policy pursued by Charles's government. The debate was personalised. It concerned what the King himself felt and what he himself believed. Crucially, the issues of royal policy and royal faith were, as they appeared in pamphlets at any rate, inextricably connected. If the match up between policy and faith was not genuine, there was a sense that any religious policy would inevitably come apart and fail. Sincerity could be the only sound basis for religious policy. Indeed, the dangers of having a Catholic Prince upon the English throne - however well disposed he may be toward Protestantism - was the very core of the case made by Whigs against James.

We may say that the task facing Tory polemicists in relation to Charles was twofold: to propound a defence of the King and to set out an 'attack' strategy against his opponents. In

---

[26] *The Charge of a Tory plot maintain'd in a dialogue* (1682), p11
[27] *The Charge of a Tory plot maintain'd in a dialogue* (1682), p11
[28] Christopher Haigh, *Elizabeth I* (1988), p37

order to defend and protect the King Tory pamphleteers had to 'prove' that the royal character was not constituted around a popish orientation. Secondly, to get the Whigs on the back foot Tory writers attempted to shape Charles into a symbol of Anglicanism. For in making the King represent the Church of England they could then marginalize Whigs as religious and political extremists.

In the climate of suspicion that prevailed for much of 1678-83 it became absolutely vital that the Tory press vigorously contest all suggestion of popish partiality in the heart of the King: "certainly none can have such a ridiculous [notion that Charles]...can be any ways inclinable to Popery."[29] In this effort loyalist scribes demanded that the nation re-evaluate the King's 'track-record' since the Restoration. Was the story not, they asked, one of unwearied diligence for his people's safety, of protection for their religion, their property, and their liberty? "We neither need nor desire any other Declaration...for our Assurance and Security for the future."[30] The nation must hold firm and continue to place their trust in Charles II.

Loyalists pointed to the Test act of 1673, arguing that when the nation had apprehended for its own safety from a popish menace, Charles had secured his Kingdom:

"Was not this one thing alone sufficient to belye those Villians, who let fall words as tho' the King himself leaned a little that way...for it is not to be imagined by a Man of Sense, that a Prince who had power to refuse a Law, would ever pass one to the utter defeating all designs and measures of a party whose Interests he secretly favoured and meant to Advance."[31]

After all, York's Roman Catholicism would not have been publicly exposed had it not been for the Kings' attentiveness to England's security. This argument, however, tended to be

---

[29] *A Letter to a friend, about the late proclamation* (1679), p4
[30] Gower, *The Speech of Doctor Gower* (1681)
[31] *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p2

ignored in the clamour of the crisis. The fact that York was Catholic seemed simply more important than how he came to be known as such, or what that might reveal about Charles II.[32]

This was, of course, in any case a dangerous line of argument to follow - for Whig writers responded with an alternative analysis of recent history and a rival reading of the King's past actions. One interpretation common to Whig tracts was that since the Restoration dissenters had been consistently and unfairly maligned. And that this constituted a distraction for the government coming at the expense of effective action against Catholics. By this view the Popish Plot became crucial; radically changing perceptions of where the 'real' menace lay: "this present year 1678, may be called a Year of Amazing and Stupendous Discovery."[33] The stupendous discovery was that the Popish Plot formed a dividing line in Whig texts, marking a new start for a nation now alert to its own peril. Ostensibly the King too was part of this new beginning. Whig pamphleteers reasoned that *because* Charles was a good Protestant Prince his instinct naturally leaned, like those of good Protestant subjects, toward decisive actions against England's papist enemies. Whig writers could therefore agree with their Tory counterparts that Charles II was not of a popish character. Yet in Whig hands this assertion acted to apply pressure on the crown and on his Tory supporters by appropriating the 'Protestant' course of action as being that advocated by Whigs.

As has already been shown, Tory writers depicted Charles II as leading the search for truth in the Popish Plot, of rooting out every last papist conspirator in the land, and as being willing "to seize their Persons and Papers, then lay the whole before the Parliament."[34] This kind of rhetoric sought to defuse Whig polemicist's emotive exploitation of the plot. Such expressions were also part of the effort to dispel suspicion over royal resistance to, or even

---

[32] An aspect dealt with further in Chapter Seven
[33] *An Account of the Several plots, conspiracies, and hellish attempts of the bloody minded Papists* (1678), p45
[34] *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p2

103

obstruction of, the investigation. These kinds of expressions were, therefore, all outgrowths of the effort to defend the King.

If much of loyalist literature was defensive, it was nevertheless also capable of taking the offensive. As the crisis progressed, particularly after 1681, there is a notable increase in the emphasis given to the King's Anglicanism and his support for "the most excellent Church of England."[35] Charles increasingly appeared in print as an Anglican figurehead and champion. "Great Charles, our Faith's Defender."[36] The term *our faith* underscores the new personal nature of this association: Charles was appropriated for the Anglican majority and his adherence to the national Church stated with renewed vigour.

The projection of an 'Anglican Charles' was closely connected with the attack on Presbyterianism. Thus the dissenting 'they' were blamed for everything from the Civil Wars to the present crisis. Anti-Presbyterianism was a mechanism designed to achieve a momentum shift - to take pressure off the King (and the Tories) and to unify all 'moderate' opinion in a centrifugal crusade against religious extremists on both fringes. Charles was shown to be in the vanguard of that struggle. Therefore the King was praised for following the true and moderate middle-way. The Anglican worldview during Exclusion was of England harassed by Catholicism on one flank and by dissent on the other. This was a moment, Tories said, to self-consciously hoist the standard of the Church of England: "still is the Envy and Terror of her Adversaries, as well as the Beauty and Strength of the Reformation."[37] In a sense, perhaps, the King provided an outlet for frustrations that had built up whilst undertaking the difficult and uncomfortable task of defending Papist James. Once the King's commitment to the church had been reaffirmed (by Tory writers), then steam could be let off in jubilant celebration of Anglican Charles.

Even during the height of the Tory reaction, opposition pamphleteers were still at pains to stress their loyalty to the King: "the loss of Goods, Religion, and Life itself, will not move

---

[35] *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p3
[36] *An Heroick Poem to the King, upon the arrival of the Morocco and Bantam embassadors* (1682)
[37] Gower, *The Speech of Doctor Gower* (1681)

those you call Whiggs to actual Rebellion against a Prince they love."[38] The representation of the King's character in Whig material remained substantially as it had before: that of a fundamentally good Prince mislead by evil counsellors. There was no significant reaction against Charles II personally during the period of the Tory reaction. In part this may be explainable because the symbol of King remained a valuable rhetoric weapon, and not something to be ceded lightly to ones opponents. Therefore Whig writers instead lamented the state of the nation, for which they blamed the Tories. Again the attempt was to divorce the King from his Tory supporters: "We do not believe that the King intends to make use of Arbitrary Government...but we also certainly know there are others, who endeavour...to make their own Fortunes, by unjust ways."[39] It was a harder task for Whig polemicists to successfully attack the Anglican-Tory establishment than it was to label all Tories as crypto-Catholics.

Unperturbed by these Whig arguments, Tory texts presented the relationship between the King and the Anglican Church as very much a two-way commitment; the King's support to his Church was repaid in turn with loyalty shown to the King: "no other Church in the World...Taught and Practised Loyalty so conscientiously."[40] Reaffirmation of Charles's personal Protestant faith thus acted to elicit support for him from the Anglican majority. It also undercut attempts to polarise the debate between Protestant and Catholic opposites - whereby all Tories could be labelled as papists: "those bad men...brand all those who stand up for your Rights...with that scandalous name Papist...rank bare-fac'd Papists...If those men can make us Papists at this rate, we shall have Popery among us before we know where we are."[41]

` For loyalist writers the Presbyterian treachery acted against Charles II was made all the worse because the King had always adopted a benevolent attitude toward them: "Since all

---

[38] *The Medal Revers'd* (1682), p6
[39] *The Medal Revers'd* (1682), p6
[40] Gower, *The Speech of Doctor Gower* (1681)
[41] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681), p3

this time they have owed their Lives, too plentifull Fortunes, and dangerous Liberty to a Gracious Act of Oblivion at first, and repeated Acts of Indulgence since, and they have not yet Repented?...these sons of Perdition."[42] Outrage at the perceived ingratitude of dissenters, stretching back over two decades, was, in the early 1680s, channelled into the effort to crush 'opposition' (be it manifest in exclusion, in Whiggism or in religious dissent). The representation of an Anglican Charles II sounded the starting gun for this attack.

The King's Character in Exclusion debate

The 'character' of the King affected the ways in which Exclusion-era debate took place: perceptions of who the King (in his two bodies) was, understandings of his personal characteristics and interpretations of his Kingship all affected the positions taken and the arguments used by polemicists. What picture of the King emerges from this print debate? Three sub-sections will consider major themes associated with Charles II: (i) the idea of a good or indulgent Prince, (ii) the recognition of royal aging, and (iii) the King's dealings with women. Through these a sense of the King begins to take shape into a whole; a royal portrait (or portraits) sketched by pamphleteers comes together to form an understanding of a complex monarch that held great significance for the Exclusion Crisis.

(i) The Most Gracious and Indulgent Prince

"It is impossible for us sufficiently to admire your goodness...we beheld in the world no Person above you, you are most worthy of our most Humble Respects...altho so great and so Elevated, you are nevertheless so Clement and Benign."[43]

---

[42] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p10
[43] Primerose, *Remerciement fait au Roi de la part de L'eglise Francoise* (1681), p2

One facet of Charles II's character that was frequently remarked upon by pamphleteers was the King's supposed good nature: "the most Gracious and indulgent Prince, that Heaven ever bestowed upon a People."[44] This verdict was delivered by the Tory Humphrey Gower and was intended as a favourable appraisal. Significantly similar sentiments are just as recurrent in Whig texts. The notion of Charles as being "so good a Prince by Nature"[45], forms an area of ostensible overlap between Whig and Tory polemists. However, while the language of praise was superficially similar, it actually disguised conflicting meanings which led Whig and Tory readerships to very different destinations. The assertions that the King was innately predisposed toward clemency or kindness were sufficiently general and ambiguous to allow pamphleteers to interpret them in a multiplicity of ways. Crucially, even if Whig and Tory assessments of the royal character are examined separately, both sets of considerations carried approbation but also admonishment. With reference, as we shall see, to the same personality traits Charles II was praised and criticised for different things.

Whig polemists maintained that one manifestation of Charles II's great capacity for kindness could be observed, over the course of his reign, through his dealings with English Roman Catholics. Yet for this kindness the King had been repaid with the Popish Plot. Such duplicity toward Charles therefore revealed a wider truth about the nature of that corrupted religion and acted as a warning bell: "those who had so much ingratitude and baseness to attempt the Life of a Prince so indulgent to them, will hardly be less cruel to any of his Protestant Subjects."[46] There is implicit criticism of Charles in this assertion: he appears as an overly lenient and gullible King who has failed to understand the unappeasable papist heart of darkness. Yet this criticism is left unspoken, thinly concealed by the shroud of admiration for his gentle spirit. In and of itself Charles' 'natural goodness' is presented as most becoming of a Prince. The primary function was not to lambaste the King for his

---

[44] Gower, *The Speech of Doctor Gower* (1681)
[45] Whitehall, *1679, gratulamini mecum, or, A Congratulatory essay* (1679)
[46] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p3

failings, but rather to exploit them in order to underscore the danger posed to King and nation - thereby validating Whig concerns and once again recasting opposition as loyalism.

Whig writers found the portrait of a good, but politically malleable Prince an extremely helpful one. It seemed to empower them in their adopted role as self-appointed guardians of the King. If Charles would not protect himself because his innate goodness prevented him from fully comprehending such nefarious plotting, then Whigs would provide protection for him (by whatever means they saw fit). Moreover Charles' loving nature, asserted Whig scribes, rendered him blind to those closest to him. The closer an individual was, the greater the King's blindness. None were closer than James: "His Majesty indeed has, the natural affection towards a Brother...[because of Charles's] incomparab'e lenity of disposition...he cannot easily believe there can be so monstrous ingratitude."[47] Charles could never believe, argued Whigs, that his own brother could be implicated in a conspiracy against him. This left the King vulnerable:

"where any great Conspiracy has been made, it...begun by such as were most familiar with the Prince...so that what ever Prince trusts too much to the friendship of his dearest Favourites, nay to his own Brother, may sometimes find himself deceiv'd...when a Successor observes, that the Life of one single Person, not only keeps him from three Kingdoms, but also makes him, his Family; and whole Party, be banished and persecuted, you must needs acknowledge, that he lyes under a great temptation to violate the sixth Commandment...I cannot but think that a Prince's good Nature, renders him secure only in his own conceit, and not in reality."[48]

The outwardly commended personality of Charles is thus made the mechanism utilized by Whigs to point the finger at James: to accuse the heir to the throne of conspiring the most

---

[47] *A Tory Plot* (1682), p21
[48] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p17-18

serious crimes imaginable. Praise for the King could also operate as a self-validating weapon of attack against his brother.

By contrast, Tory print material is often much more blunt in its criticism of the King. With the state in crisis a predisposition for mildness was a weakness, not a virtue: "Since...thy Royal Heart is so inclin'd that thou canst mercy for a Traytor find, Pity the sufferings of each loyal mind. May Heav'ns (Great Sir) thy Veins with fury fill...who spares one Traytor, does five Subjects kill."[49] A Tory critique of Charles begins to emerge, based, significantly, on the view of a King lacking in "fury". Charles II appears deficient and devoid of the unwavering courage necessary to face down his foes: a King prone to the destabilising tendency of placating those whom he should crush.

Loyalism, in this context, seems to exist independently of the King. The 'loyal subjects' (the Tories) are in a sense let down only by their King and his unsteady prevaricating. It was time for Charles to model himself in the image of his Tory supporters. The meaning of the 'loyalist' cause seems to be fixed - with the Tories standing on the right political-ground but Charles dangerously wandering across the political landscape.[50] From the Tory perspective of the early 1680s, it appeared that the pattern for Charles's reign had been set by the mercy and leniency shown by the King immediately after his Restoration (a notion bequeathed to these later 'royalists' from the old Cavalier resentment of that era). Tories saw a direct thread leading from the Act of Oblivion, through the Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, to the current mess. At the centre of these debacles was Charles - whose character appears in much Tory literature to infuse the entire era with a lax moral and political ambivalence, which in turn created these crises. It was true that Tory scribes attacked the ingratitude and duplicity of a 'malevolent party' in exploiting the King's goodness, yet in doing so they were also acknowledging Charles's complicity: "Since all along His Majesty's Mercifull,

---

[49] *Philo-Carolus Consisting of three points* (1680), p19
[50] Ironically perhaps, one could make a case for saying that this thread of Tory thought berates Charles for lacking 'absolutist' impulses.

Peacefull and God-like Reign, these ungratefull Vipers have been warm'd with the Sunshine of His Favours."[51]

Charles II himself was particularly reproached for his failing to learn the definitive lesson of recent history:

"Dispel those mists that cloud thy piercing Eyes; Read o're thy Martyr'd Father's Tragick Story, learn by his Murder different ways to glory...How fatal 'tis, by him is understood, to yield to Subjects when they thirst for Blood...As thou art God-like by thy Pity, show that thou art God-like by thy Justice too: lest we should count thy greatest Vertue, Vice, and call thy Mercy, servile Cowardise."[52]

Insistent Tory pamphleteers declared that the moment had arrived for Charles II to be less merciful and more wrathful, for him to direct a mighty and righteous anger against royal enemies (these also being the enemies of loyal Tories). These comparisons between Charles I and his son also served to firmly link the opposition of the Exclusion Crisis with that of the Civil Wars: "You cannot...perwade yourself that the Murderers of the Father can ever love the Son."[53] Tory exacerbation with Charles II was palpable - and perhaps was expressed with more vehemence than might have been expected from 'loyal' voices. Whereas Charles I had fought against those seeking the monarchy's destruction, Charles II was shamefully bowing to them:

"their former ill-doings were well done, which makes them bold to act them over again. Sir, such are their proceedings, that you appear no longer now as a King to govern the People, but as a Pupil to be governed by them...this makes us fear you have delivered your Royal Scepter into their hands; And if so, you have made your Self and Friends one Sacrifice

---

[51] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p10
[52] *The Country-Mans Complaint, and Advice to the King* (1681)
[53] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681), p3

to the Fury...of your Enemies...What a monstrous thing it is to see the Tail pretend to more wisdom than the Head...for Heavens sake Sir, let us have no more on't."[54]

The King was allowing the tail to wag the dog, and the sense of frustration with Charles from his own 'supporters' was tangible. For Tories the solution was self-evident - Charles had to take a hard-line with his rebellious subjects: "Sir, you have been silent too long...take off the head of that man who shall dare to...contradict [you]...be assured that this way of Governing shall gain you more Friends in one day, than all your complyance to the unreasonable demands of your Parliament shall gain you in an age."[55]

The Whigs too called for a more ruthless King to emerge and to vanquish the nation's foes: "If his Majesty would be pleas'd for one Month to think himself Henry VIII and...do by the Papists, as they would do by us...even Rome itself would tremble at us."[56] The rhetorical device employed here - the historical parallel with Henry VIII - could be made to serve two masters. The Tory pamphlet *An Apostrophe from the Loyal Party* for example contained the exhortation to Charles: "let us hear you roar like the King of Lions, when next you meet your Parliament...till (like your Predecessor H. VIII) you make them tremble."[57] A similar reading of the King's character called for an analogous course of action, yet the target for this action diverged wildly. Whig and Tory propagandists used the same tools but with them they produced very different constructs. In a sense both sides agreed it was time for St George to slay the dragon, they simply disagreed on who the dragon was.

(ii) The Aging of the King

In the print literature of the Exclusion-era there was a heightened awareness of Charles II's aging. He was, indisputably, no longer the youthful Prince who had returned to England in

---

[54] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681), p2-3
[55] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681), p3
[56] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p23
[57] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681), p3

1660. "Still Glorious, like the Sun, may Charles appear, Till Heaven removes Him to a Nobler Sphere."[58] There was a definite anxiety in certain tracts during the years 1678-83 that the King may be entering the later stages of his life. This increasing sense of Charles II's human fallibility was, of course, coupled to the growing concern over his political fallibility. Were the King to die unexpectedly, with the crisis still on-going, the political consequences could be catastrophic. Rarely has a single figure been so integral to a major historical happening as had been the case at the Restoration: the era began with, and centred upon, the person of Charles II. What the nation's future held beyond the King was, in the early 1680s, still very much unresolved.

Apprehension of the potential fallout from Charles's death was brought to the fore, in part, by his sudden illness of 1679. This serious bout of sickness in August of that year massively increased alarm, sending out a shock-wave that the King might be about to die. The Duke of York, exiled overseas, even rushed back to London from Brussels in order to ensure that his claim to the throne was upheld - in a power vacuum actual presence on the political stage could be critical. The health scare became the topic for loyalist poets to express their thankfulness publicly. One observed that: "I dare promise it, 'Twas not the Jesuits Powder chekt the Fit."[59] Superficially this was an allusion to the medicine administered to the King on his sickbed ('Jesuit's Powder' being the recent arrival in Britain of an early form of quinine derived from imported bark)[60] - of which the King's doctors had been highly sceptical. However, the medicine's name inevitably forged a symbolic link - open to various interpretations - with the Popish Plot then gripping England.

We find the Oak imagery (derived from the battle of Worcester)[61] that was so associated with Charles evoked in this context – partially, perhaps, because of the bark-based cure:

---

[58] *Loyalty rewarded, or, A Poem upon the Brace of Bucks bestowed upon the loyal apprentices by His Majesty* (1681)
[59] Whitehall, *1679, gratulamini mecum, or, A Congratulatory essay* (1679)
[60] Antonia Fraser, *King Charles II* (1998), p382
[61] The subject of detailed consideration in Chapter Five.

"Oaken Bark...That yield a Monarch Shelter in Distress."[62] Charles's recovery is metaphorically expressed in terms already redolent of royal deliverance: the protective Oak tree. Similarly, for Tory writers the royal scare merely provided yet further evidence that providence watched over Charles II: "Providence...found a Soveraign Cure; that Providence that slumbers not, nor sleeps, But his Anointed still in safety keeps."[63]

In the summer of 1679 a peculiar paradox held sway - on the one hand there was widespread shock at the apparently imminent and unexpected death of Charles II from illness, while, on the other hand, large sections of the nation fully expected, at any moment, for the King to fall at hands of a popish assailant. They are surely strange days when death through natural causes is more unforeseen than by assassination, yet such was the state of England in 1679.

However the general preoccupation with the King's age may itself be said to have been odd in certain respects. Even within loyalist pamphlets thoughts seemed to be turning toward elegy: "Posterity shall Praise His Memory."[64] It was only one step away from this kind of tribute to referring to the King in the past tense. However, while it was true that the King had already achieved longevity of reign - over two decades - Charles II was hardly decrepit or a particularly sickly monarch, rather he was considered physically very strong and healthy. Even taking into consideration the shorter average lifespan in the seventeenth century Charles II was hardly ancient. James VI&I had been nearly 60 by the time of his death, while Elizabeth I had lived to the ripe old age of 70. In 1679 Charles II was 49 years old, the same age his father had been in 1649 - and Charles I's life may surely be said to have been cut prematurely short.

Rather, perhaps, the reason for this greater awareness of Charles II's relatively advanced years was the crisis itself. The political times appeared to emphatically demonstrate the importance of the King in keeping a lid on simmering discontent. Moreover, it suited both

---

[62] Whitehall, *1679, gratulamini mecum, or, A Congratulatory essay* (1679)
[63] Whitehall, *1679, gratulamini mecum, or, A Congratulatory essay* (1679)
[64] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p23

sides to exploit the centrality of the King. Both Whig and Tory writers employed the possibility of Charles's death to advance their arguments. They did so to concentrate minds on the crisis, to raise the political stakes, and, in differing ways, to adopt 'scare tactics' about what might happen to England once Charles was no longer her King.

(iii) Charles II and his Relations with Women

It is stating the obvious to observe that the Exclusion Crisis was created, at least indirectly, because of Charles II's lack of legitimate offspring. Yet it is important that Charles had, in a sense, failed in his kingly duty by not producing a son and heir who could have secured the nation's future. Potentially his failure could lead the nation to civil war. One scheme mooted in certain quarters during the crisis was for a royal divorce and remarriage; the hope being that a new union might produce legitimate Protestant children. Such an idea was not new, having been first suggested as early as the mid-1660s, but it now received renewed consideration.

Catherine of Braganza is not generally a prominent figure in Exclusion-era literature. Indeed, the Portuguese Queen is often conspicuous by her absence in tracts dealing with her husband's character. In as far as it received comment, the marriage's failure to produce any children was blamed squarely upon her - rather than the King. After all Catherine could be lambasted with relative impunity, not least because Charles II's many romantic exploits were common knowledge, as, indeed, were the existence of his multiple bastard progeny. As a woman, and a Catholic one at that, Catherine was always more likely to be blamed for the marriage's failure.

The manner in which the divorce project was debated reveals much about perceptions of the King. It is fair to say that the idea did not set the world of pamphleteering alight. The idea was discussed in some printed tracts of course, but without the widespread prevalence or seriousness that was applied, for example, to the possibility of an exclusion bill. The proposal did have its champions, not least the Earl of Shaftesbury. But there is a general

acknowledgement in printed tracts that Charles himself was implacably opposed to divorcing Catherine. In this regard, if not in others, Charles II appeared as a husband of steadfast loyalty.

Moreover, Tory writers warned that even if such a measure were to take place it would not achieve its intended ends:

"A project of Divorce whisper'd between the King and Queen, will not be sufficient Security...it's possible the King may have no Issue by a new Consort...or, if he have, that the most will look on them but as Illegitimate: and so, as a questionable Divorce once brought us from the Church of Rome, in Henry the Eight's day, another may return us thither, during, or soon after the Reign of Charles the Second."[65]

In Tory polemic, the terrible consequences that could accrue from a royal divorce were portrayed much as those of an exclusion bill were: the nightmarish possibility of rival claimants contesting the throne after Charles II's death, with civil strife on the horizon, and even a prospect of England returning to Rome.

Nonetheless, we do find a degree of wish-fulfilment in some texts from 1678-83. One astrological based tract for example even proclaimed that: "the famous Nostradamus is able to warrant, his present Majesty Charles the II...will have an Heir of his own Body lawfully begotton."[66] Unsurprisingly, the assertion that Nostradamus had made such a prediction failed to defuse the Exclusion Crisis. The salient point is that this kind of expression reads like an escapist fantasy that panders to and embodies a national desire, offering the paying public a 'perfect world' solution to the current crisis: "But let Charles the Third, who is to be

---

[65] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p14
[66] J.B. Philalelos, *Good and joyful news for England: or, The Prophecy of the renowned Michael Nostradamus* (1681), p4

115

the lawful son of Charles the Second, inherit the Empire of Europe, which his Father shall leave him."[67]

Significantly, more prominent than the Queen in texts of this period were representations of Charles II's many mistresses. They regularly featured in popular satirical print, with especial fame and infamy reserved for Louise De Keroualle, Nell Gwynn and Barbara Palmer. The royal mistresses offered a way to attack and to mock Charles indirectly. A critique could be outlined of the King's character through his romantic liaisons. Representations of his mistresses often went to heart of the charges made against the King - typifying many of the King's alleged failings. The classic example of this is the suspicion produced by the intimacy of the King with the French Catholic Duchess of Portsmouth: "what aspersions were scattered up and down, to insinuate into the people a belief, that his Majesty was too much a Friend to the French, too much a Friend to some other Religion."[68]

In this respect *A Dialogue between the D. of C and the D. of P* is a revealing text. It takes the form of an imagined conversation between Portsmouth and Cleveland, and could equally have been read aloud or performed as dialogue. At its most basic level it offers its audience simple bawdy humour depicting a catfight that was intended to amuse. Yet its subtext was highly political, launching a coded attack on the King through the characters of his mistresses. The picture that emerges of Charles is one of moral laxity, hedonistic indulgence, and a negligent indolence toward the business of government. The character of Cleveland for example, accuses Portsmouth of being a parasite upon English wealth comparable to Papal taxes of old: "Thou French She-Horle-Leech of the English state, Rome us'd to draw its richest Treasures thence the English Gold was chang'd to Peters pence."[69] Both women appear in the text as drains upon the national exchequer, reclining in states of

---

[67] Philalelos, *Good and joyful news for England* (1681), p7
[68] L'Estrange, *Theosebia, or, The Churches advocate endeavouring the promotion of loyalty to our King* (1683), p18
[69] *A Dialogue between the D. of C and the D. of P* (1682), p2

Queen-like splendour. Again the implications are damaging for the King (who was the real target in all this), reinforcing his reputation for wasteful extravagance.

Perhaps a more serious charge still was the suggestion that Charles's mistresses, and Portsmouth in particular, wheeled political influence. Portsmouth is imagined stating: "that four Kingdoms did imploy my thought: statesmen did...from me took measures how to Rule."[70] This point was especially harmful to Charles for it fed into two separate, though interrelated, suspicions of him: firstly that he was inclinable toward popery (in his tastes for art, women, government, and religion), and secondly that his style of governance made him reliant upon a malign group of evil counsellors at his court. No figure united these two strands better than Portsmouth herself. She proved, therefore, a useful figure indeed for opposition propagandists to decry.

Overall, we may say that from these myriad Exclusion-era texts certain concepts about Charles began to coalesce; and, taken collectively, they tended to form some portrait or other of the King's character; a portrait drawn, for the most part, by anonymous writers who were pursuing political agendas. Between 1678 and 1683 two broad (and rival) understandings of the King emerged. An examination of this debate literature reveals that a superficial commonality of language and symbolic modes actually veiled extremely different purposes. Whig and Tory writers may have used some similar rhetorical tactics but they did so to support diametrically opposing views.

Whig pamphleteers sought to circumvent their status as a force of opposition primarily by engaging the symbol of King. Whigs *had* to be seen to be supporting Charles II. This was less true of the Tories. Tory writers, more secure in their 'loyal' status, consequently felt freer to represent the King in a 'negative' light. The onus was not on the Tories to prove

---

[70]   *A Dialogue between the D. of C and the D. of P* (1682), p3

117

their 'loyalist' credentials. This is the causation behind a considerable paradox: the theoretically 'oppositional' Whig scribes fawn upon Charles, while the more obviously 'loyalist' Tory writers often attack him.

A wide range of techniques were employed either to camouflage the fact that Whigs existed in opposition to the King, or even to turn this opposition into a form of loyalism. This was an absolutely crucial enterprise because it countered the accusations that Whigs were really religious fanatics and closet republicans. Whigs were vulnerable to such attacks, not least because of their association with the policy of exclusion - the jibe of Republicanism being a repeated one. Therefore by choosing to stress their loyalty to and admiration for Charles II, Whig writers were attempting to invalidate the entire set of charges made against them. It was difficult for Whig propagandists to argue convincingly that nothing detrimental to the institution of monarchy was intended by any of their faction; it was a much easier task to invoke pro-Charles sentiments as a way to defuse these suspicions.

Each side needed to represent the King. Differing notions about what Charles represented were actually contested interpretations of the meaning and applicability of the symbol of the King. We are dealing with two separate Charles IIs, or at least with two contrasting constructs: a Whig Charles and a Tory Charles. Each of these was a creation born largely of print literature and each was designed to support its respective cause by influencing the public imagination. Did perceptions of Charles II's character shape the debate or did the debate shape perceptions of Charles II's character? Undoubtedly the answer is both – indeed, each fed off the other.

Chapter Five: Restoration Mythology

This chapter is concerned with historical memory. It examines the relationship between accounts of the King's personal past and England's national history; of how one was deliberately woven with the other until they became indivisible. The intention is to offer an exegesis of how and why texts between 1678 and 1683 located Charles II within collective memory. In this way we may hope to break down the royal iconography of Charles II into its component parts, and to analyse its meaning with reference to the transformed political landscape of the period.

Interpreting the King's past was, of course, not the exclusive preserve of Tories. The opportunity certainly existed, as we will see, for alternative explanations that did not conform to 'officially' sanctioned versions. Yet, in general, it must be admitted that within the corpus of relevant texts dating from the Exclusion Crisis, the numerical balance is weighted toward those with a Tory bias. This is not to say that Whig writers did not contest the meaning of these symbols. Rather, for reasons which will become apparent, the task facing Whig polemicists was a more difficult one than that of their Tory counterparts.

My two main sections will examine different aspects of Restoration mythology: the first will deal with representations of the Civil Wars and with the way that they were mobilized in Exclusion-era debate, and the second will tackle the Restoration itself and how contemporaries accessed its place in history.

Charles II and Civil War Memory

How the Civil Wars, and Charles II's part in them, featured in printed texts from 1678-83 fall into four subsections: they will focus on the Noon-day Star, the civil war years themselves, the battle of Worcester, and, finally, the regicide.

(i) The Noon-day Star

Strictly speaking, the symbol of the star had no direct correlation to the Civil Wars. It referred rather to the story that a star had apparently appeared in the sky in 1630 on the day of Charles II's birth. This was not a notion created in the early 1680s and retrospectively applied to the past; the 'Noon-day Star' had been a common feature of loyalist projections since the birth of Charles II (though it became especially prominent during the 1660s).[1] However, the meaning which the star was thought to hold, and the reasons why it was given renewed attention between 1678-83 are significant. And, indeed, they relate to Restoration concepts surrounding the Civil Wars.

The primary sense of the star was that it established a favourable portent for the baby Prince. This idea fed directly into the extensive providential myth which, as we will see, surrounded depictions of Charles's life as a whole. Indeed, the star even ennobled Charles' birth with almost Christ-like overtones: "The Noon-day Star that appeared at this Glorious Birth, did doubtless presage our now Dread Soveraign, the peculiar care of Heaven, to be attended with Miracles."[2] The 'Restoration myth' - which will emerge progressively through the present chapter - viewed the Civil Wars and the Restoration as a cycle of history at the centre of which was Charles II's personal destiny. It is, however, significant that heavenly care was 'backdated' to the very moment of the King's birth. When viewed through the prism of Charles II's story the history of civil war almost begins with his birth: setting in motion that historical cycle whose eventual apogee would be the Restoration. In a sense, the star foretold that the nation would be redeemed by Charles.

It is noticeable that towards the end of Charles's reign the circumstances of his birth increasingly re-surfaced in panegyric texts.[3] Accordingly the King was presented as marked by destiny from the first: "How God hath begun to magnifie him we have seen, by many signes and wonders: He honoured him with a signe in the Heavens, a Star appearing at noon

---

[1] Fraser, *King Charles II*, p3-4
[2] John Harrison, *A thanksgiving sermon for discovery of the late phanatick plot* (1683), p13
[3] Most commonly expressed through notions concerning the Star.

when he was baptized."[4] The concept contained in this expression is an important one: Charles had, throughout his life, been *magnified* and *honoured* by God. It was incumbent upon Charles II's subjects to comprehend these many signs and to adopt a proper sense of wonder and respect toward their King. This was precisely the task royal propagandists had set themselves. It was they who were magnifying and honouring Charles through print, and they who were guiding the reader through an interpretative journey of understanding God's signs.

However, as with every aspect of the King's iconography, the image of the star could be applied to the present in ways which opened up new - sometimes alternative - meanings. It could, for example, even become an instrument of criticism. For as one poem exhorted in a tone of somewhat weary disillusion: "What thy Star promis'd, let thy Reign fulfil."[5] The use of symbolic representation was rarely a one-way affair. The past being always available for different readings; a symbol which one writer found useful in excoriating the King, another writer could harness, with suitable modification, for elegiac tribute.

(ii) The 1640s and 1650s: Civil Strife and the Republic

Time and again the unique nature of Charles II within the chronicles of English history was stressed by pamphleteers: "never was a Prince exposed to more dangers, and troubles than he hath been."[6] Absolutely central in this story of the King were the Civil Wars. As has already been noted, there was a marked increase in the projection of 'the Restoration myth' between 1678 and 1683. The nature of the political situation during those years inevitably stirred memories of the civil war era. Therefore, perhaps, it is no surprise to find an upsurge in the number of tracts dealing with the Civil Wars and with Charles's experience of it. The re-telling of civil war history was loaded with contemporary political overtones: contesting

---

[4] Long, *The History of Joshua applied to the case of King Charles II* (1684), p22
[5] Giovanni Battista Draghi, *An Ode to the King on his return from New-market* (1684)
[6] Hesketh, *A Private Peace-offering* (1684), p19

the ownership of the King's biography became key in shaping the collective memory of the wars themselves.

Frequently Charles appears as the youthful Princely hero of such texts. The basic outline of these narratives was, generally speaking, comprised of component parts which were already well established in public consciousness: the young Charles witnessing the battle of Edgehill, his taking nominal command of royal forces in the West, his continental exile, the regicide, and the battle of Worcester.[7] It seems highly plausible that the corpus of civil war narratives acted collectively as a metaphor for Charles's ability to surmount difficulty. Having come through such turbulent times in the past, the King had surely demonstrated the requisite survival instinct needed in the present: Charles was conditioned to ride-out the current political crisis successfully *because* of his experience of the 1650s.

The nature of the crisis then gripping the nation was such that any reference to the highly sensitive subject of the recent wars was likely to provoke strong political reactions. Certainly civil war storytelling contributed to a generalised elevation of Charles's personal history to the status of national mythology. This in turn impacted on the perceptions of the King held by his people - and consequently on perceptions of his role in contemporary politics. These civil war narratives, written in 1678-83, acted to encourage loyalty to Charles through an emotive mythologizing of his past.

Yet it is also crucial to recognise that, very often, this fostering of loyalty was done without direct reference to current politics but merely through a powerful evocation of the past (though such texts frequently contained extremely strong, if still implicit, parallels which could easily surface when read in a 1680s context).[8] Equally however, the opposite was also true. It was common for pamphleteers to draw explicit and quite deliberate links between the two eras: highlighting what they considered to be the points of re-occurrence and of

---

[7] The importance given to the latter two of these events merits separate consideration.
[8] For example: *A Pastoral Copy presented to His Majesty at Cambridge* (1681)

dissimilarity.[9] Yet texts which adopted either implicitly or overtly comparative approaches were engaged alike in the same business: reviving the politically charged memory of the 1640/50s. Our aim should be to reconstruct something of a contemporary viewpoint and to understand how this historical memory exerted a potent influence over later politics.

Of course, some aspects of these civil war narratives were more directly applicable to the Exclusion-era than others. For example, some scribes revelled in the fact (or rather the perception) that no Catholic help had been acceptable to Charles II in his quest to regain his throne: "he refus'd...that his Subjects should by Forreign Force be Horas'd. Foreigners have no remorse."[10] The expression of this sentiment seems a premeditated inclusion. Its barely concealed subtext was of a patriotic English Protestantism finding its proper embodiment in Charles. As such, historical example acted as a rebuttal to those royal opponents who, in the early 1680s, were lambasting the King for his alleged Catholic inclinations and for his Francophile leanings. The passage did not make reference to the Exclusion Crisis, yet, in a sense, it did not need to do so: historical memory could vindicate Charles II. Ideas relating to the 1650s were emotive and powerful. They could, and did, affect perceptions in the 1680s of the 1680s.

If historical memory could be exploited to take pressure off the King, so, conversely, it could be used to apply further pressure. A seeming innocuous extract from a Tory tract relates the hardships of the 1650s for royalists: "they [Cromwellians] wanted nothing but to kill the Heir...(but) they had no opportunity for it...they torment him in the Punishment of his Friends, Maliciously contriving against Thousands of Innocent people for his sake."[11] One gets a sense of the old Cavalier resentment of the 1660s; a sense that the King owed 'royalists' an unpaid debt of gratitude for their past services. Such expressions were loaded and coded, articulating as much about the 1680s as about the 1650s. The Exclusion Crisis

---

[9] A trend observable in *The Glory of the English Nation* (1681)
[10] *The Glory of the English Nation* (1681)
[11] L'Estrange, *Theosebia, or, The Churches advocate endeavouring the promotion of Loyalty to our King* (1683), p17

was no time to desert those who had consistently suffered for the loyalist cause; implicitly such sentiment reveals a dissatisfaction directed at Charles. Significantly, civil war terminology could be used to express this frustration felt by 'royalists' in the 1680s: "'tis come to that, that you shall not hear an honest Cavalier...but presently he is [labelled] a Papist."[12] This pamphlet made clear an important distinction between loyalists (or 'Tories') on the one hand and the King on the other: acknowledging that Charles II was not all Tories might hope. It is remarkable that this insight into contemporary political groupings comes not from a text considering them directly, but from one purportedly dealing with the 1650s.

A favoured tactic of Tory propagandists - one which helped, precisely, to counter any distinction made between themselves and the King - was to underscore direct and blunt associations between the opponents who faced Charles II in the Exclusion Crisis and those who had opposed Charles I during the Civil Wars.[13] The Earl of Shaftesbury in particular was singled out as a troublemaker in the 1650s mould: "Nor are his Followers behind in Zeal, T'advance the Good Old Cause, and Common-weal...with Villers, Capel, Cooper, and the rest...zeal for the Good Old Cause enflames their Breast."[14] Shaftesbury, the Duke of Buckingham and Sir Henry Capel are placed in a direct line traceable from John Pym, Henry Ireton and Oliver Cromwell. The rebels of then are depicted as having metamorphosed into the opposition of now (an idea even more powerful when framed in terms of the regicide[15]). The salient point however is that the two eras were coupled - that distinct echoes of the past were detectable in the present.

Yet crucially, the major difference was that the outcome of the Exclusion Crisis was not yet certain. An awareness of the nation's story, it was claimed, could prevent history repeating itself and stop England finding herself, once again, torn asunder by war.[16] In a sense, Tories adopted a circular understanding of history, while Whigs argued in linear

---

[12] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681), p3
[13] For example, *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p1
[14] *Loyalty Truimphant: or A Poem on the Numerous Loyal Addresses To His Majesty* (1681)
[15] An aspect dealt with later in this chapter.
[16] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681), p4

124

terms. For Whig writers the Exclusion Crisis had little to do with the civil strife of twenty years before. While in Tory texts the notion was advanced that, to all intents and purposes, history really could repeat itself.

The rising tide of reference to the Civil War did not, therefore, go unanswered by Whig scribes. Opposition pamphlets frequently articulated complaint over what they regarded as abuse of history: "calling these Times by no other Names but that of 40 or 41...they again threaten us with another 48."[17] The reason that Whig texts rejected the circular 1650s analogue so firmly was because (as it was constituted in Tory texts at least) it placed the Whigs at a serious disadvantage by casting their faction and their interest in the official post-Restoration role of villainy.

The extent to which certain elements within Whiggism may or may not have held private sympathies with aspects of the old republican regime is irrelevant. For to be labelled thus publicly was to be marginalized as an extremist and a subversive element undermining Charles II. Therefore clear efforts were made to blame Tories for this dangerous and partisan slur: "R. L'estrange struck up his Fiddle, and play'd us the Old Tune of Forty One."[18] The Tory press, it was said, were shamelessly exploiting the memory of the Civil War and artificially raising levels of anxiety by: "reviving the memory of the late unhappy Troubles, which it is the Interest both of His Majesty and the whole Kingdom to have buried in perpetual oblivion."[19]

It was claimed that adopting such a malicious tactic that was opposed to the nation's interest would rebound against the Tories: "[turning] the minds of men toward that unhappy war...will not prove very useful to the Party that appears most forward in it."[20] Yet, as we shall see, the reality was that Whig writers were just as forward in it as their Tory counterparts. For all their outward protestations, Whig polemists were equally guilty of

---

[17] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p5
[18] *A Tory Plot* (1682), p7
[19] *An Impartial account* (1681), p8
[20] *An Impartial account* (1681), p8

evoking the Civil War in their arguments. Indeed, the memory of the Civil Wars was far too powerful a stimulus to leave unchallenged in the possession of their opponents.

Accordingly a Whig understanding of the conflict was articulated: "When the Businesses of the late bad Times are once ripe for an History...it will be found, that the late Rebellion was raised and fostered by the Arts of the Court of Rome. That Jesuits professed themselves Independent...that they might pull down the English Monarchy."[21] With no apparent sense of irony, this extract stated firstly that the time was not yet come to understand the late troubles, before itself explaining with utter conviction the cause of the war. This line of argument - centred on papist plotting - was the classic 'all-purpose' Protestant explanation for most historical cataclysms. This argument also sought to defuse the accusations made against Whigs that they threatened Charles II, as Charles I had been threatened by his opponents. Its significance lies less in the fact that blame was placed on popery, though this too was a means of attacking the Tories, than in the fact of engagement in the printed battle over historical interpretation: Whig writers were drawn into contesting the symbols of civil war memory.

Indeed, having vigorously asserted that the Tories were responsible for summoning the spectre of the 1640s and 1650s, Whig pamphleteers then sought to turn things on their head: "For the mentioning of that war with reflection and bitterness, serves only to make men remember three hasty Dissolutions of Parliament, and Twelve years want of one, with some other things which fell out in that space, all which preceded and had too great an influence towards the causing of it."[22] Lamenting that the Civil War had been dredged up in the debate at all, actually served to legitimise a presentation of old grievances against the crown. Whether these grievances held application for the Exclusion Crisis and Charles II was not directly tackled, but certainly they resonated powerfully and acted as a reminder of the potential abuses of power now and in the future. The pretext that Whig writers were merely

---

[21] *An Account of the Several plots* (1678), p41
[22] *An Impartial account* (1681), p8

responding to the selective memory of Tory pamphleteers provided the opportunity for Whig polemicists to themselves advance their own selective readings of the past. They raised subject matter which was beneficial to their arguments - references to Charles I's personal rule of the 1630s and to the Irish massacre of 1641[23] being two prime examples of this.

A theme frequently expounded upon by Whig writers was that outward loyalty to Charles II displayed by Tories was an unreliable guide to their inner loyalties. For example, in assessing the campaign of loyal addresses of 1681 the verdict from one Whig pamphlet was: "how unuseful these Addresses are, being rather stuffed with Flattery, than filled with Loyalty as may be apparent from that Richard Cromwell, who was visited with magnificent Addresses, but when Deposed, found not one of them faithful Assistants."[24] The message is simple enough: Tory loyalty was hollow and insincere. Yet what is significant is the historical instance employed. The parallel of Richard Cromwell is used *against* the Tories. This runs counter to normal patterns of Exclusion Crisis debate, in which Whigs were continually tarred with the brush of republicanism. The form of the loyal address was perceived to have significantly developed under the republic: "It is noted that the first contrivance of Addresses was from Oliver Cromwell."[25] Therefore the opportunity existed to attack the Tories for utilizing this medium and accordingly to expose their loyalty as bankrupt. This demonstrates well that the task of invoking historical symbolism was rarely straightforward. Even the 1650s could be made to work against Tories.

The re-evoking of the Civil War heightened fears that history was repeating itself and that a new civil war against Charles II was imminent: "the Old Tragedy acted over again."[26] Whigs stood accused of bringing about the result. Unsurprisingly, Whig writers were eager to refute and disarm the charge. Therefore we find declarations in certain Whig texts such as: "I will not take up Arms without the King's Commission, or enter into any Association,

---

[23] *An Accompt of the Bloody Massacre in Ireland* (1678), p1-8
[24] *An Historical account of the rise and progress of addressing* (1681), p2
[25] *An Historical account* (1681), p1
[26] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681), p2

to commence in his life-time, against his consent."[27] These statements were often more qualified than they appeared at first sight and were riddled with hidden caveats (like the phrase "in his life-time" which pledged loyalty to Charles II only, not James). The salient point though, is that such protestations of innocence sought to take the sting out of the basic accusation against Whigs, that they were driving the nation toward disastrous rebellion.

Yet even the idea of a new civil war could be made use of by Whig polemists: "we dread the effects of a new Civil War. We dread Romes yoak, to us 'tis hateful grown, and Rome will seem a Monster in our Throne."[28] Here the threat of renewed conflict itself becomes the mechanism to turn the argument around and focus on the Jesuit menace threatening Charles II. Propagandists on both sides were endeavouring to change the shape of discussion and to frame the debate in the most advantageous form possible: in this endeavour, the memory of the Civil Wars was vital.

(iii) Charles II: Providence and the Battle of Worcester

From those eventful two decades of national unrest which preceded the Restoration, it was the battle of Worcester with which Charles II was most personally associated.[29] Partly this was a consequence of timing. Charles's escapades in England and Scotland during 1650-1, of which Worcester was the centrepiece, were the first significant actions taken by Charles as King after his father's death. As such they represented the entrance onto the political stage of Charles II as an independent actor. This episode, more than any other, was singled out by propagandists after 1660 as of special import and as meriting particular prominence. For the present purposes the question is how this memory of Worcester was shaped and projected: of how its ideological meaning could be made applicable to a later period.

---

[27] *A Tory Plot* (1682), p40
[28] *The Medal Revers'd.* (1682), p9
[29] A point drawn out by Harold Weber, 'Representations of the King: Charles II and his Escape from Worcester' in *Studies on Philology*: LXXXV (1988), p489-509

128

After the Restoration, and especially during the era's first flush of exuberance in the early 1660s, a flood of texts celebrated the battle and its aftermath.[30] This established a language of symbols redolent of defeat, triumph and deliverance. Crucially in the late 1670s and early 1680s - during the Exclusion Crisis in other words - there was a second wave of Worcester texts. A good example of this is the tract *Boscobel or, The Compleat History of His Sacred Majesties Most Miraculous Preservation after the Battle of Worcester* which had originally been written and published in 1660 but was reprinted and made newly available in 1680. Moreover, there were also entirely new accounts of Worcester produced in the 1680s and, just as importantly, a plethora of asides made to the battle by the poets and pamphleteers of the Exclusion-era.

At first glance Worcester seems a strange moment for loyal propagandists to latch onto. After all, the battle had been a fiasco for Charles's forces, who were comprehensively trounced and scattered by Cromwell's army. Yet defeat, as will appear, was central to the story that these propagandists wished to tell, and, indeed, defeat enabled Worcester to be elevated to the status of national myth.

However in order to mythologize Worcester the fact of the defeat did, it was true, have to be neutralised. This was primarily achieved in two ways. Firstly, praise for the bravery and heroism of the young Charles was a standard feature in such texts.[31] Secondly, it was considered necessary, even in 1683 after so much time had elapsed, to exonerate Charles of culpability for the battle's outcome. The odds, it was asserted, were almost impossibly stacked against our youthful hero:

"Neither...[was he] served much better at Worcester fight by such...Loyal-cheats, when...out of a slavish fear of cruel Usurpers...they most cowardly sneak't in a Corner, and

---

[30] For our purposes the texts produced in the 1670/80s are of principle interest, but it is important to acknowledge that many of the notions in these tracts built on a foundation laid by Worcester texts of the 1660s.
[31] For example, Thomas Blount, *Boscobel or, The Compleat History of His Sacred Majesties Most Miraculous preservation after the Battle of Worcester* (1680)

forc't His Majesty (for want of assistance) to fight with a handful (as it were, and some of them disloyal too) against a multitude."[32]

Charles emerges blameless from the debacle: this was the view being emphatically restated in the 1680s. Indeed, precisely because the battle had been a defeat for the crown it became even more important for loyalist writers to take possession of its meaning and symbolic power. The notion that Charles had led his forces to total obliteration was potentially damaging in the extreme. Therefore the battle was used instead, both in the 1660s and the 1680s, to demonstrate the strength of Charles's character: "Nor is our Hero to be thought less stout...by the Rout."[33] Charles was unbowed and defiant: an unconquerable royal spirit, then and now.

The interpretative reading of events was, inevitably, a highly selective process. The fact that Charles attracted very little popular support on his march south was an aspect of the story conspicuous by its absence. Moreover Charles's adoption (and subsequent total abandonment) of the Solemn League and Covenant is generally ignored entirely by these later Worcester texts. The embarrassing insincerity of Charles's actions is simply neglected or glossed over. In so far as the Scots do feature in these narratives, it is as an unreliable and untrustworthy dissenter ally.[34] Implicitly the lesson contained would seem to be that knowing who one's true (Anglican) friends are is a blessing indeed - a sentiment, from a Tory perspective at least, with obvious applicability to 1678-83.

Two features from the Worcester story were given especial prominence: (i) the disguised escape of the King after the battle and, (ii) the oak tree which sheltered Charles during that escape. The picture of the young Prince's flight through the country, in the guise of a

---

[32] *The True loyalist: or, the Subjects duty to his Soveraign* (1683), p47

[33] Thomas Heynes, *The triumphs of Royalty in the person of King Charles II a poem* (1683), p5

[34] *The True loyalist: or, the Subjects duty to his Soveraign* (1683), p47

common man while evading Cromwell's forces, was a standard feature in Worcester texts.[35] Primarily this aspect added romance and danger to the tale. It also enabled defeat to become triumph. By shifting the narrative focus from the battle itself, a royalist humiliation, to the escape afterward, the purpose of the story became a relation of how Charles successfully escaped to safety: the loyalists were thereby provided with a 'happy ending' to the Worcester legend.

In general the disguised-escape aspect was given greater stress in Worcester texts dating from the 1660s than those from the 1680s.[36] It may have been that the central conceit - of Charles shedding a disguise to reveal his true royal identity - worked better in the immediate post-Restoration context where it could function as a metaphor for the process then underway. After all, the Restoration itself was a shedding of an old self by Charles and an adoption of his 'true' identity, that of King. In 1660 it was vital to proclaim that Charles was rightfully King. By 1680 political imperatives had changed; no-one doubted that Charles was King, the issue at hand was what happened to the crown next.

Yet, while perhaps less pronounced than in the 1660s, references to the Worcester disguise were not totally absent from tracts in the 1680s. One poem for example recounted that: "The King in a Poor rustic Habit dress't, l'twas the first time he ever us'd Deceit; though greatness still his sacred Looks express't."[37] The disguise acts only to underscore Charles's innate royalty: his looks betray his royal person because, it is supposed, his divinely ordained position could not be concealed by mere clothes. However, this extract from 1683 is also significant for its preoccupation with honesty and deceit. Charles's genuine nature is asserted and the use of deceit considered alien to him. Why such an assertion was considered necessary is important. It perhaps reacts pre-emptively to counter an anti-myth

---

[35] Again, another aspect inherited from 1660s texts like Blount, *Boscobel or, The Compleat History* (1660)

[36] It is absent, for example, from a text like *The True Loyalist* (1683)

[37] Abraham Cowley, *An heroick poem upon the late horrid rebellion His Majesties Happy Restauration: And the Magnanimity and Valour of his Royal Highness James Duke of York* (1683), p10

of the Worcester story: a reading in which a duplicitous Prince attempts to escape self-inflicted disaster by hiding his real self behind a mask. Such a conception would feed into suspicions of Charles, well established by 1680 after twenty years of his Kingship; not least relating to Charles's shadowy foreign dealings. The Worcester escape could thus act to establish the traits of deception and secrecy early in Charles's character. We therefore see loyalist writers attempting to mobilize against any such anti-myth by using the Worcester escape to trumpet the King's faithful and indomitable nature.

The second critical feature of the Worcester escape was the Oak tree. It was the Oak in whose branches Charles had famously hidden whilst escaping. This tree becomes the single most prominent and enduring symbol of Charles's story.[38] But what did the Oak actually symbolise? And what new meaning was attached to the Oak by the altered context of the Exclusion Crisis?

With no symbol was Charles II more personally associated than with that of the Oak. First and foremost it was emblematic of his survival during the Civil Wars and his ultimate triumph: "Blessed be the Oak, let it for ever be...Preserv'd him from the raping Vultures quest, From whence he bore like Noah's Gentle Dove, a Branch the Emblem both of Peace and Love."[39] The Oak had saved Charles. And Charles had saved England. It therefore became the definitive and enduring symbol of royal deliverance from the hands of tyranny: a sign of his providential favour.

Particularly during the 1660s the Oak became an icon of Charles and of his story. Yet, crucially, such symbolism could and did adapt to changing circumstances and take on new connotations. The tree was, for example, explicitly linked to the political strife of 1678-83. "For when th'appearing Bustles of the State, seem'd to disturb our Studies of Late, under the spreading umbrage of your Oak we sate securely from the Thunder-stroak."[40] The shelter

---

[38]   Which is to say that the Oak occurred in representations of the King more frequently than other 'symbols' associated with Charles.
[39]   Heynes, *The triumphs of Royalty in the person of King Charles* (1683), p9
[40]   *A Pastoral Copy presented to His Majesty at Cambridge* (1681)

provided by Charles II to his subjects is likened to the great branches of the Oak. The tree had passed through the Worcester narratives and into Charles's royal iconography: it provided a symbolic mode redolent of refuge and protection, and was applicable far beyond the confines of Worcester texts.

The civil war narratives in general, and the Worcester-Oak imagery in particular, were saturated by providential notions of history. The concept of providence was perhaps exploited by Charles II's apologists to a greater extent than any other Prince before or since. Divine care was absolutely integral to the telling of Charles II's life story. In many ways, it was that story. For loyalist writers the manifest evidence of God's guiding hand was abundantly apparent in Charles's experiences during the Civil War: in his miraculous escape after Worcester, his European exile, and his peaceful Restoration to the crown of his homeland. All these events were interpreted and located firmly within a providential framework: "The truth is his life hath been a continual Scene of providence, and danger even from his Cradle."[41] This constituted much more than merely a generic language of praise which habitually attributed divine care to all monarchs. Rather, such statements stemmed from and represented the mythology of the Restoration. The wondrousness of the providential overarch to Charles's story was presented as a distinctive hallmark: marking Charles out as especially blessed, even when judged against other Princes, contemporary or historical.

Yet though the basis of such claims was 'apparent' in Charles's past, providential favour was by no means presented as an historical oddity. Instead divine favour was shown to be vital and current.[42] The present was viewed in the context of the past. Modern 'miracles' were considered against the backdrop of this remarkable providential custody of Charles, and as an ongoing attribute of his function and role. For example Charles's escape from the Rye House Plot in 1683 was presented within an existing pattern of understanding established,

---

[41] Hesketh, *A Private Peace-offering* (1684), p21
[42] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p25

not least, by his escape from Worcester: "never did any Righteous King receive more strange and miraculous Deliverances, nor He himself ever a Greater, than this last [i.e., Rye House]."[43]

The linking of providence past and present is striking. It enabled an ongoing moral authority - an accumulation of divine endorsement stretching back three decades - which also empowered the efforts of those who proclaimed themselves the defenders of Charles. Inherently therefore, expressions of admiration or wonder at royal providential protection were also exhortations for loyalty and obedience to the King. In this conceptualisation, the greater the ever expanding catalogue of adversity faced (and overcome), the more explicit was the proof that Charles bore divine approval. These loyalist providential texts fulfilled the same fundamental purpose, whether they were focused on the miracles of Worcester and the 1650s or on the Rye House Plot and the 1680s. They offered an ideologically-driven homage to Charles II: "Let us Esteem and Honour Him as the Gift of God, and receive Him as a new Present from Heaven."[44]

(iv) Charles I and the cult of Martyrdom

That Charles II was the son of 'the martyr' was a fact rarely far from the surface in loyalist representations of him. The effect of such references to Charles I, as will be shown, were twofold: (i) they acted as evocations of outrage at the regicide, summoning up the righteous indignation of 1649 and making it available as a dynamic for the 1680s and, (ii) they offered a sympathetic rendering of Charles II and his past suffering. The articulation of both these aspects held important implications for the political situation of the Exclusion-era.

Appearing in post-Restoration literature, the death of Charles I was frequently personalised and framed in terms of his son; it may have been a national calamity but it was even more so Charles II's personal tragedy: "Hell by his Saints this Princes Father slew, Slew? Murther'd!

---

[43] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p21
[44] Barne, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge* (1683), p25

Martyr'd!"[45] The hope was that evoking Charles I's fate could help empower his son, thirty years later, in dealing with his own opponents. In part this is rendered explicable by the direct coupling of the two periods: "Having thus Misused the Father, may they prove more kind unto the Son...But, being heir to the crown, He must...be heir also to their Cruelty."[46] In Tory texts Charles I's grisly end acted as a warning to those uncertain where the current political crisis, if pushed too far, would lead. As one pamphlet counselled Charles II bluntly, "therefore beware your Head."[47]

Critically, the perpetrators of the regicide were unequivocally linked with the opposition of Charles II. Those responsible (or perceived to be so) for the trial and execution of Charles I were asserted to be the fathers, metaphorically speaking, of exclusionist Whigs: "the Son of these men...they have suck'd in their Fathers Disloyalty."[48] In this sense oppositional figures in the Exclusion-era - many of whom would have been mere children in 1649 - could be held responsible for Charles I's death. This transfer of blame from an earlier to a later generation was assisted by the labelling of Whigs as nonconformist subversives. Thereby the archetype of the 1650s Puritan fanatic dovetailed neatly into that of the contemporary dissenting Whig: "[those] notoriously active in the destruction of the Royal Martyr, and have been Teachers of the People in Conventicles since the Return of his present Majesty."[49] The implication being that Protestant dissenters were agitators and trouble-makers in both eras. However, what made Charles II's England different was a foreknowledge of the potential consequences of instability. The resurrection of the martyr cult in Exclusion-era texts was a cautionary tale with a stark message: do not let history repeat itself.

Such a line of attack was powerful and potentially ruinous for Whigs. It is perhaps not surprising therefore to find Whig writers responding to these Tory provocations. The

---

[45] *The Glory of the English Nation* (1681)
[46] L'Estrange, *Theosebia, or, The Churches advocate endeavouring the promotion of Loyalty to our King* (1683), p15
[47] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681), p3
[48] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681), p4
[49] Pomfret, *Passive Obedience, stated and asserted* (1683), p27

historical parallels drawn by the Tories between 1678-83 and the Civil Wars generally, and with the regicide specifically, were categorically rejected by Whig pamphleteers. Such historicism was dismissed as inaccurate, partisan, and self-serving:

"Nor is it easie to be imagined, how the mention of the late war comes to be brought upon the Stage at this time of day, seeing most that were...actors in it are dead and gone; and for their Children (witness many of the most violent and high flown clergy) they are commonly found to be of Principles directly contrary to what they were."[50]

The intention was to break down any binding association between 'opposition' to the Crown in the 1640s and 'opposition' to it in the early 1680s. The extract cited above attempts to achieve this by arguing that most former-Roundhead families now occupied very different political positions - with many even producing Anglican clergy. The Tories' civil war rhetoric could thus be made to rebound upon their own faction. In denying that old Cromwellians were, literally, the fathers of the latter-day Whigs, the intention was to further dissociate the one from the other, in order that exclusionists appeared not to be the heirs - literally or metaphorically - of a 1650s ideology.

Moreover, Whig pamphleteers reminded the nation that superficial signs of loyalty should be treated with caution. Had English Catholics, they asked, not shown loyalty to Charles I? Yet: "Their Fidelity to their soveraign appear'd in its true Colours, when they were so earnest with Oliver to accept of the Crown."[51] The vital point, as stated by Whig propagandists, was that opposition to Charles II had nothing to do with supporting the regicide, and did not derive its justifications from the ideologies of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate.

---

[50] *An Impartial account* (1681), p8
[51] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p8

The Restoration: Memory and Myth

In a sense, the Restoration marked the conclusion of Charles II's story. It represented the culmination of the King's mythologized history. It is absolutely key to understanding the projection of royal power post-1660: the Restoration passed into collective memory and it offered propagandists a commonly understood framework of reference to exploit. But while the Restoration may have been considered the completion of a providential cycle of history, it also marked, in practice, the commencement of Charles's reign. It is then reasonable to inquire what new political meanings became attached to Restoration memory after 1660, and to ask how its history appeared different when viewed through the prism of the Exclusion-era.

The most basic purpose, as will be shown, of references to the Restoration was to rally support to the King. They were an evocation of the memory or national spirit of 1660. Many texts containing such references appeared around 1680 and 1681 - the two decade anniversaries, respectively, of Charles's return to his native land and of his crowning in Westminster Abbey. It is ironic that the worst political crisis for the monarchy since 1660 happened to occur at the most natural moment of the remembrance of the institution's re-establishment: this coincidence added yet further charge to already powerful symbolic notions relating to the return of the King.

(i) The Restoration and its place in History

The Restoration, as represented in print literature, constituted nothing less than a rebirth for King and nation alike: "that second Birth of Charles our King, True Laws, true Faith, new Life, new joys did bring al were transported, 'twas a continual Spring."[52] In the person of Charles II, national religion, law and government had been, at a single stroke, restored to their 'proper' state. This, at least, was the officially sanctioned historical memory to be propagated in perpetuity.

---

[52] *The Glory of the English Nation* (1681)

From the vantage point of the early 1680s, as will become clear, the Restoration was shown to be a posthumous vindication of Charles I against the forces of republicanism and also a dynastic triumph for the Stuart line. The placing of Charles II's return in a wider historical context is significant. The event was presented as an absolutely critical moment in the chronicles of English history. It was supposed the equal to any historical point which had gone before it: "'tis from the Restauration, [we mark] the New Epocha of this Kingdome."[53] The Restoration, proclaimed loyal apologists, was the beginning of a new and glorious chapter in the life of the nation. Its historical uniqueness lay in the fact that it was vital both as a beginning and as an end: "At length impose an end to twenty years of wretched Rage, and dismal Melancholy...the true golden Age is now begun."[54] Importantly such a stance actually ran counter to the fiction of official royal pronouncements. It was an established 'fact' that Charles II's reign was backdated to the time of his father's execution in 1649 - no break in the royal line was permissible (as implied in the idiom: 'the King is dead, long live the King'). Printed literature paid no more than nominal deference to this convenient fabrication: what mattered was real power, and therefore the year 1660 became the date from which a new historical era was dated.

When viewed from a loyalist standpoint the enthronement of Charles II marked the completion of a providential cycle of history: "God miraculously delivered You...he mercifully with-held the blow...And he did it, that we might one day see you seated on the Throne of Glory."[55] Charles II's story - culminating in the Restoration - gave the Civil Wars meaning. For post-Restoration 'royalists' it meant nothing less than history redeemed.

However, the meaning of this seismic historical event, like all historical memory, could change with time. The years 1678-83 are a prime illustration of this. For example, during the 1660s it was frequently remarked in printed pamphlets that the most miraculous element of the Restoration was its peaceful nature. This is also true of texts dating from the 1680s.

---

[53] *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p1
[54] Cowley, *An heroick poem upon the late horrid rebellion* (1683), p34
[55] *An apostrophe from the Loyal party* (1681), p1

138

Wonderment at this peaceful revolution would, therefore, appear to be a point of commonality and continuity in Restoration narratives over two decades: "[God] honoured him by the wonderful restoration of him to his Fathers Throne without the least opposition."[56] However, the very different contexts of the 1660s and the early 1680s must also be considered. In the latter period there was an anxiety - tangible in print literature - that peaceful days may suddenly and calamitously be about to end. Therefore, even if the language used changed little from the 1660s, Exclusion-era expressions of admiration for the peaceful Restoration took on an extra resonance: they acted as pleas for unity and restraint in a heated and precariously balanced political situation.

Certainly in the late 1670s the Restoration remained a powerful historical memory; a kind of national foundation myth. Even the weather on the day of the coronation had passed into collective memory. So that allusions to thunder and lighting giving way to clear skies could be made enpassant, in the expectation that the reader would understand the change in weather conditions (twenty years previously) metaphorically: stormy times had given way to better days after the Restoration.[57] Such references may seem incidental, but they demonstrate the astonishing extent to which the Restoration had permeated national memory.

The business of interpreting the Restoration's place in the annals of history was, however, open to various (potentially rival) retellings. In the assessment of a Whig tract, for example: "The King's happy Restauration, did somewhat...stop the Papists carreer, so that they were constrained a while to demur and alter their Measures, yet the same restless and ambitious Spirits have acted all along, ever since the Restauration, to this very Day."[58] By this reading the Restoration becomes less definitive; marking not so much an entirely new era as merely a hiatus in seditious Catholic activity. The Popish Plot thereby becomes another watershed moment: the point at which the Jesuits in England again resurfaced and appeared in their true colours.

---

[56] Long, *The History of Joshua applied to the case of King Charles II* (1684), p22
[57] Heynes, *The triumphs of Royalty in the person of King Charles II* (1683), p6
[58] *An Account of the Several plots* (1678), p45

As we have seen, a sort of Restoration revivalism occurred in many of the printed texts of the Exclusion-era. The story of Charles's return was therefore lovingly retold in every detail: from his landing at Dover, to the bells, bonfires, and celebrating crowds that greeted him through the streets of the capital. One aspect of this story that was given particular prominence in this retelling was that of popular rejoicing: "through London made your glorious way...so many came this Triumph to behold you'd think the whole world London did contain; numberless leaves in woods as soon are told."[59] There were two main parts to the printed expression of such sentiment: firstly the assertion of the enormous popularity of Charles II circa 1660, and secondly the related notion that the Restoration represented the moment when the nation existed blissfully as one: "Bonfires at Night did make this joyful Isle seem but as one great glorious Blazing Pile."[60] Through these narratives pamphleteers in the 1680s were holding up this historical instant as a mirror to their own time, which, with fractiousness gripping society, appeared to be the very antithesis of 1660.

The crucial point is that this historicism and retrospective celebration of the Restoration was undertaken with one eye on the present. London's reception of the young King in the 1660s formed the central plank in the concept of popular adulation. Direct comparisons were made between the London of then and the London of now (very much the capital of dissent and of Whiggism): "What hath bewitch'd you now O Londoners? From Loyal-subjects, to turn mutineers! Is not the King the same, God that day sent?"[61] The memory of 1660 was used to cast shame on modern-day opponents of the crown: they were betraying the Restoration and all that it represented. This was a clever line of argument, for it offered a fresh variation on the well-worn accusations of republicanism levelled at Whigs. Undoing the Restoration, of course, meant a return to republican government. These 'Restoration narratives' often presented the political landscape of the early 1680s in a stark language of civil war opposites: either one favoured Charles and the institution of monarchy, or the

---

[59] Cowley, *An heroick poem upon the late horrid rebellion* (1683), p32
[60] *The Glory of the English Nation* (1681)
[61] *The Glory of the English Nation* (1681)

Whigs and Cromwellian modes of rule. Such arguments were very much personalised around Charles II. The mythology of the King was that of the nation's story itself.

Charles's victorious return in 1660 could act as a metaphor for the current difficulties he faced. Just as he had been before, so Charles would again triumph over circumstance, however adverse:

"his Restauration being a Miracle in the sight of all the world...Never had a Prince a harder task, than ours hath had, coming to Govern a People, that are...said to be more ungovernable more fickle and changeable than other Nations, but being broken into Factions and Differences, and leven'd with the loose principles of Rebellion and Usurpation as we were."[62]

Hardwired into the post-Restoration psyche was the lesson that the nation should trust and unite around Charles II, otherwise, it would take the retrograde step of lurching back towards civil war. For loyalists the Restoration symbolized improvement: moral, economic and political. Charles II would: "leave them [the English people] in...a Condition as to their Religion and Liberties...much better indeed...then he found them."[63] Nothing in the intervening two decades of post-Restoration history was mythologized as 1660 was. The Restoration represented *the* key moment in Charles's story: the exultant home-coming and the defeat of his mortal enemies. The revival of Restoration national memory during the years 1678-83 condemned the latter-day enemies of the King for failing to learn from the nation's past.

---

[62] Hesketh, *A private Peace-offering* (1684), p18
[63] *The English-man's Happiness* (1681), p3

Loyalist writers regularly indulged in effusive and hyperbolic praise for Charles and the benefits derived from his return: "Thanks for the Numerous Blessings which you shed like th' impartial Sun, on every head."[64] But how was the nation depicted as profiting from Charles's rule? What were the benefits of the Restoration? Loyal scribes set about amplifying the supposed profusion of gains that a fortunate nation received directly, as they attributed them, to the benevolence and excellence of Charles. As has already been shown, the Restoration was synonymous with peace.

Accordingly Charles II was portrayed as a man of peace: "Great Sir! 'Tis Justice that supports thy throne...thou art triumphant in the midst of peace, Thy glory by reflexion does increase; for that's thy Subject's, is thy happiness."[65] The English King was no blood-thirsty tyrant who shone only in times of war. Rather he was a Prince who derived his glory from his subjects' continued happiness. Therefore, it was asserted that the natural state of the Kingdom under a King such as Charles was a peaceful and happy existence. In an Exclusion context this extolling of the King as peacemaker carried censure: it was the malcontent minority who had lately disturbed the nation's proper equilibrium. Such political dissent was presented as a personal ingratitude to the King; the absence of armed strife in the intervening years since 1660 being directly accredited to Charles: "'Tis you, Great Sir, that gives us peaceful days."[66]

The theory, as expressed in such texts, was that Restoration peace enabled trade to flourish which in turn led to prosperity. It was claimed that Charles had pushed English commercial interests to the furthest reaches of the globe: "To thy vast ships Heav'n give a prosperous gale, that now o're all the floating World prevail, May thy Pow'r spread, as far as they can sail."[67] Charles was projected as the champion and guarantor of English trade: a form of

---

[64] *The Poets address to His Most Sacred Majesty* (1682), p2
[65] *Philo-Carolus Consisting of three points* (1680), p15-16
[66] *A Pastoral Copy Presented to His Majesty at Cambridge* (1681)
[67] *Philo-Carolus Consisting of three points* (1680), p21

reaffirmation of his Kingly power. Indeed, the theme of trade restored had appeared as early as Charles's coronation procession in 1661; where it had featured on two of the four panegyric (and heavily didactic), triumphal arches.

Yet this enduring notion of a 'commercial Restoration' seemed almost to imply that trade had hardly existed before 1660, or that it had ceased to function appreciably after 1649. This concept of a trade-interregnum was, perhaps, actually indicative of the exact opposite of its stated and intended meaning. It is suggestive of the uncomfortable reality for Tories that trade had certainly not ground to a halt during the 1650s: associating Charles II so personally with successful trading represented, perhaps, an over-compensation for loyalist insecurities over the fundamental viability of the Cromwellian economy.

Ironically, given the pacifistic rendering of Charles's image that resulted from the peaceful Restoration, it was strongly asserted that trade should be backed with force: "The British Oak bravely rides Admiral Amidst the Floating Forest, every Sail Pays Homage to this God o'th watry Main."[68] Mastery of the oceans and an assertive trading prosperity often went hand-in-hand in pamphlets. The imagery of the navy as the *"British Oak"* and *"the floating forest"* was again allusive of Charles: summoning up his escape from Worcester and the Oak tree which had protected both Prince and nation, and transposing this protection into defence upon the high seas.

The sea bore particular importance in print propaganda due to its symbolic association with Charles II. Not only, as we have seen, was the sea linked to the King through trade but it was also loaded with association because of his landing at Dover in 1660 - which ended his period of exile and heralded the Restoration. Thus the sea, trade and the Restoration occupied a triangular locus in royal iconography: each could evoke resonant echoes of the other. "The great Palladium of Three sinking States...From out this chaos; in the Eastern Skies...the New-born Sun...The Ark stood still, so long to Seas consin'd...Now Loyalty firm

---

[68] *An Heroick Poem to the King, upon the arrival of the Morocco and Bantam embassadors* (1682), p5

143

Land and Footing found and Io Carole thro' all the Isle did sound."[69] Oceanic and nautical imagery - whereby Britain itself becomes a floating isle on a sea of troubles - further served to foster this Restoration mythology.

The subtext of these naval metaphors was perhaps less to do with British power abroad than domestic political concerns: for, in a general sense, they exhorted the reader to rely on the stewardship of Charles. Even expressions of British naval prowess explicitly framed in international terms had implications for politics at home. Britain under Charles II, it was claimed, was a rising power: "By the whole world the Ocean's Neptune stil'd, and your three Kingdoms shall your Trident be...What Madness is it, Holland, to contend with England for the watry World's Command?...With Waves by nature Soveraign Britain's Crown'd."[70] There was a sense of national mission-statement: the articulation of a long-term strategic destiny interwoven with the language of Restoration mythology. One could perhaps comment that this visionary notion (in the 1680s anyway), required a mythological expression due to the lack of any more practical evidence to substantiate it. After all, the ignominious post-Restoration wars of 1665-7 and 1672-4 against the Dutch hardly merited such assertions.

Nonetheless, the evocation of a mimetic rivalry in international waters (with foreign nations generally and the Dutch specifically) acted also as a call for national unity: creating a 'negative other' against which to unite. By implying that the growth of British power abroad could be undercut by events in domestic politics, pressure could thereby be brought to bear for renewed loyalty to the crown. That the sea already occupied an important place in iconographic representations of Charles made easier and more effective this transference of symbolic meaning.

---

[69] *An Heroick Poem to the King* (1682), p1-3
[70] Cowley, *An heroick poem upon the late horrid rebellion* (1683), p38

It is possible that the sea offered a 'safe' way to associate the King with being a dynamic presence in the nation's defence.[71] While Elizabeth's victory over the Armada could be evoked in representations of Charles II, militaristic imagery relating to European land wars was almost totally alien to such projections. This may be because the concept of continental intervention - even in an abstract and poetic form - would have been too reminiscent of the delicate European balance of power, of Louis XIV's expansionist ambitions, and of Charles II's Francophile foreign policies. Moreover the recent record of English intervention abroad was hardly uniformly glorious.[72] Ironically the most potent examples of military prowess were probably Cromwellian, and these, for obvious reasons, were off-limits to loyalist scribes in the 1680s. To present Charles in an overly militarised manner could, therefore, invite scorn and derision. Indeed, it would also be to increase the pressure on Charles to harness British military might to the cause of European Protestantism. Whereas a rhetorical strategy of hailing Charles as the King of the oceans, of trumpeting an English maritime presence stretching to the Indies and back, and of encouraging the notion that the Restoration had stoked the fires of trade (where both the Dutch and French were rivals), was a confluence far more likely to succeed in maximising the popularity of the King.

As we have seen, post-Restoration England was held to have benefited massively from Charles's restored rule: not least through the 1660's supposed twin-legacy of peace and trade. "Happy thou art, fair Isle, happy thy Name, and free, whiles Loyal to thy King."[73] Crucially, 'happiness' and 'freedom' (like their cousins 'peace and trade') are tabulated as being equivocal and dependent upon loyalty to the crown. While the people remained true to their Prince, they would continue to live secure and experience prosperity. This kind of loyalty-equation fed into notions, established in royal projections of the 1660s, that the Restoration marked the start of a new golden age.

---

[71] As discussed in Chapter Seven, Charles II at times appeared to be a static figure, lacking dynamic representations of military valour.
[72] In particular England's brief participation in the Thirty Years War.
[73] Heynes, *The triumphs of Royalty in the person of King Charles II* (1683), p14

Yet by the late 1670s this golden age rhetoric, though still present, had by necessity been toned down somewhat.[74] After all, twenty years had lapsed in which time the reality of economic conditions under the monarchy seemed to many little different from those under a republic. Therefore during the period 1678-83 unbridled promises of a golden future were not the order of the day. In texts dating from those years we find, on the one hand, slightly reproachful reiterations of what the King had achieved for his people by the act of returning in 1660, while, on the other hand, a series of promises that the subject's happiness would continue to be paramount and would continue to improve under Charles II. The political crisis currently engulfing the country thereby served as a contrast to a nostalgic vision of the Restoration: "never did a Nation injoy more by a King than ours hath done by this...never were people more happy, then we might be under him if we please, and were not the fault our own."[75] The nation stood admonished by such comparisons, while the King was utterly exempted from any blame in provoking the crisis. Yet for loyalists, the 'Restoration myth' also provided the solution to the present set of difficulties. What was needed was a return to the national state of unity and loyalty last seen in the early 1660s: then, and only then, would England fully experience the glories of life under Charles's kingship.

The existence of a 'Restoration mythology' is vital to our understanding of the uses of historical memory in Exclusion-era debate. We are dealing with an ideologically motivated loyalist construct: a vision of English history, centring upon the civil war years, in which Charles II filled the role of national redeemer and in which a providential cycle of history found in the Restoration its completion and apotheosis. This post-Restoration reading of the recent past amounted to a kind of national foundation myth - highlighting 1660 as a

---

[74] Even a text like Heynes, *The triumphs of Royalty in the person of King Charles II* (1683) was less lofty in its 'golden age' rhetoric than that of its 1660s counterparts, p3-14
[75] Hesketh, *A Private Peace-offering* (1684), p18

146

watershed moment, from which all subsequent events traced their genesis. In this shaping and manipulation of collective memory, iconographic textual representations of the King formed the central feature. Charles II's life story became the subject for scores of tracts, and that story, in turn, became a paradigm essentialising recent English history as such.

The set of symbols which gave form to this 'Restoration myth' was not summoned from nowhere, but rather was built upon a well established tradition. Those symbolic representations employed during the years 1678-83 had already permeated public consciousness, as they mobilized royal iconography set out during the 1660s. Crucially however, the altered context of the Exclusion-era gave new purpose to – and subtly shifted - the meaning of the Restoration myth. The long shadow of this myth fell differently upon the ground in the changed light of the crisis. The set of royal images which emerges from 1678-83 continues, but also contrasts with, those derived from the 1660s. Thus what we witness during the Exclusion Crisis is the re-deployment in print of an old armoury to fight new political battles. The Restoration myth changed the political debate; in the process, its meaning was itself changed.

Chapter Six: Charles II and the Duke of Monmouth

The Duke of Monmouth was perhaps the first figure to shoot to 'stardom' without being engaged in military heroics. He was almost entirely a 'creation' of the media. Which is to say that the polemical print thrown up by the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis produced, in a very brief space of time, a potent set of representations of the young Duke which utterly dominated public perception of his short life. These have, to an extent, exerted a similar influence over later historiography of Monmouth.[1] It seemed to contemporaries a time when truth was nine tenths perception: "A time most fit...to turn all things...into Ridicule, and to set up Folly and Lyes so like to Truth, that the Vulgar can scarce see the one from the other."[2] This climate made possible the setting up and brief flowering of a personality cult devoted to a hitherto relatively little known figure.

The object of this chapter is to view the Exclusion-era through the prism of literature focusing on Monmouth. Such an approach offers a fresh perspective on the crisis and helps to uncover the relative strengths and weaknesses of Tory/Whig appropriations of Charles II. The comparison between representations of the Duke and those of the King reveals important points of commonality and of difference. The chapter is divided into two main sections. Firstly, the progressive stages of Monmouth's 'arrival' in the political debate (i.e. his image creation) will be examined - with the presence of the King detached and analysed. Secondly, representations that dealt directly with the Duke's personal relationship with Charles II will be considered.

---

[1] J.N.P. Watson, *Captain-General and Rebel Chief* (1979), Violet Wyndham, *The Protestant Duke: A Life of Monmouth* (1976)

[2] *An Answer to a Scoffing and Lying Lybell, Put forth and privately dispersed under the Title of A Wonderful Account of the Cureing the Kings-Evil, by Madam Fanshaw the Duke of Monmouth's sister* (1681), p1

The Creation of the Duke of Monmouth 1679-83

In considering how representations of the Duke developed over the period, and in explicating the rationale behind why particular aspects of the Duke's life became 'propaganda battlegrounds', the presence of Charles II as a point of reference is crucial. Monmouth, as we shall see, was frequently fashioned by polemicists in the King's image, but, just as importantly, he was at times deliberately shown to be different from Charles. Four subsections will in turn consider case-studies relating to different aspects of Monmouth literature: each, as contentious and re-occurring points of friction, constitutes a major theme in the canon of printed Monmouth texts.

(i) Monmouth and Military Valour: the Battle of Bothwell Bridge

During 1679 more printed material relating to the Duke of Monmouth was produced than in any previous year of his life.[3] The content of this output was dominated by one event above all - the battle of Bothwell Bridge. On 22 June a royal army under Monmouth's command defeated a force of rebellious Scottish Covenanters on the banks of the river Clyde. In the following months this victory provoked a flood of pamphlets in London, the overwhelming majority of which were devoted to praising the Duke.

Significantly Bothwell pamphleteers frequently stressed that Monmouth's actions were undertaken with official sanction; that the Duke was fulfilling his royally appointed function. In one sense, this rendered Monmouth a 'safe' figure in domestic politics: a faithful adjunct to Charles II and a servant to the royal will. Yet many of these texts also portrayed Monmouth as much more than this. Frequently Bothwell tracts underscored Monmouth's empowerment as the King's proxy.[4] The royal army had been under his auspices. In negotiations before the battle it had been he who had represented Charles: acting in the King's name and speaking with the King's voice. Bothwell pamphlets effectively depicted

---

[3] Based on a survey of the existing archive material.
[4] For example: *An Exact Relation of the Defeat of the Rebels at Bothwell-Bridge* (1679), p3

Monmouth as a Prince of the realm, a notion which allowed Monmouth to appear as a powerful political figure (it was this sense of power which rendered him potentially 'dangerous' to Tories).

Bothwell was used in print as an illustration establishing Monmouth to be an extension of the King, yet, paradoxically, the battle was also used by pamphleteers to exhibit the Duke's independence. Bothwell Bridge was represented not simply as a victory for the crown, but as a great personal triumph for Monmouth. The Duke basked in an almost universally favourable verdict. A typical extract, for example, relates that when Monmouth crossed the border, "all peoples fears began to vanish, and his Graces so undoubted courage and conduct, inflamed then with happy expectations, the which accordingly succeeded."[5] It was Monmouth who had crushed the insurgents and it was Monmouth who had restored stability in a chaotic situation. The battle thus marks the Duke's 'arrival' as an autonomous figure on the political stage - or, rather, it denotes the public recognition of this assertion. The Duke now appeared to be a serious player in English politics.

The power of Monmouth as a Whig symbol lay in the fact that, on the one hand, he was empowered by the royal identity of his father, while, on the other, he was not perceived to be constrained in his actions by this fact. The Duke was a royal 'Prince' not restricted to Tory conceptions of loyal behaviour. Thus the 'Monmouth persona', as it existed in print, could represent almost an alternative Charles II. A figure strongly reminiscent of the King yet different in certain key crucial regards (e.g. Monmouth's supposedly stronger anti-papist stance). This is not to say that the Duke was offered as an alternative *to* Charles II, but rather, perhaps, as an alternative *of* Charles II - a younger version of the King, an imagined Charles that existed before he was misled by evil counsellors and, crucially, something approximating the Charles that could, if he embraced the so-called opposition, exist once again. Popular desires for the King to be more muscular in his protection of the realm were thereby projected onto the character of his son. In crushing a Covenanter army Monmouth

---

[5] *The Full and true account of all the Proceedings in Scotland. since the Rebellion began* (1679), p7

was doing what Charles I had failed to do in 1640, while simultaneously avenging the indignities inflicted on Charles II in 1650 by his Covenanter 'ally' – the appearance of replaying royal history (only this time making good on the outcome) vastly increased the Duke's value as a Whig symbol.

One respect in which the printed depictions of Monmouth differed significantly from those of his father was in the centrality accorded to military valour. By and large the image of Charles II was not that of a highly militarised King.[6] The Duke of Monmouth, by contrast, was presented in a bellicose light. Most accounts of the Bothwell episode contained a relation of the battle itself, which was widely attested to have been an absolute victory. This success, as we have seen, was credited personally to His Grace. In particular praise was lavished upon Monmouth's peerless command of the troops, his tactical acumen and his generalship.[7] The seeds were being sown for the reception of Monmouth into the pantheon of great military heroes. His bravery became a point of focus for eulogy: "Our gallant General...gave fresh proofs of his Conduct and Courage in this Affair...without the least apprehension of danger."[8] The Duke was hailed as a young Alexander or as Mars reincarnate.[9] One report of Bothwell claimed that royal forces had been outnumbered, though observed: "But their Number did but serve to advance great Monmouth's glory, to chastise a lesser force, would not have become his story."[10] There was dramatic license in this effusive praise of Monmouth. Nonetheless, the crucial point is that print media was becoming increasingly instrumental in shaping notions of "his story". The trumpeting of a new icon of heroic war-like virtue was a significant political development.

Appearing in numerous accounts of Bothwell - and therefore becoming a part of Monmouth's 'story' - was an anecdote relating that his Grace had ordered wounded prisoners to be treated by his own surgeon. This supposed act drew much admiration from

---

[6] As discussed in Chapter Five.
[7] *The Full and true account of all the Proceedings in Scotland* (1679), p8
[8] *A Further and more particular Account of the Total Defeat of the Rebels in Scotland* (1679), p2
[9] J.F, *Englands Lamentation for the Duke of Monmouth's Departure* (1679)
[10] *Jockeys Downfall: A Poem on the late Total Defeat given to the Scottish Covenanters* (1679), p1

scribes for Monmouth's "Princely Clemency and natural Goodness."[11] The praising of the Duke's 'natural goodness' could be read as an implicit recognition of his royal claims. Certainly he was being portrayed not merely as a warrior but was also as possessed of King-like compassion. Representations of Monmouth were revealing the very model of the perfect Prince: mighty yet merciful.

Did these hagiographic representations of a 'perfect Prince' amount to a concerted effort to promote Monmouth as Charles II's successor to the throne? It is crucial that Bothwell tracts be contextualised within their historical moment. Expressing admiration for Monmouth's Princely virtue in say 1670, was hardly the same action as doing so in the summer of 1679. The dangerous drama of events is vital: between May and September of 1679 the first exclusion bill passed the Commons, elections for a new Parliament were taking place, and, when Parliament did reassemble, the unresolved issue of exclusion was again was put before it. It was from June onwards, in this incendiary atmosphere, that Bothwell literature began pouring out from London printing presses. In this highly charged and partisan moment, Monmouth was undergoing an accelerated absorption into public consciousness as both Charles's son and as a military hero. Given that Monmouth was being mooted in certain quarters as a possible alternative to the Duke of York[12], such material could not fail to take on political resonance. The seemingly innocuous language of praise is therefore transformed into something highly contentious.

Yet many Bothwell texts do not directly tackle the wider state of the Kingdom. And very few, if any, directly consider the issue of exclusion. However, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the volatile political situation lurks just out of sight behind all of these accounts. This does not mean that every positive utterance toward Monmouth was therefore a veiled advocacy of him as Charles's successor: such an equation would be misleading. We

---

[11] Robert Hamilton, *For the Right Noble and Potent Prince James Duke of Bucclengh and Monmouth* (1679), p1
[12] A minority Whig position to be sure, but nonetheless an unsettling one for Charles II and his Tory supporters.

can say with confidence though that these Bothwell pamphleteers were engaged in the business of grooming the Duke: presenting him to the public - all of these accounts were designed for public consumption - as a popular embodiment of heroism. This could be understood as a self-conscious attempt to construct a rhetorical counter-weight to the Duke of York, or, indeed, as a means to up the ante in order to pressurise Parliament into exclusion. Bothwell tracts were not without political agenda or devoid of implication for Charles II merely because they did not engage in direct succession debate. By 1679 the very undertaking of praising Monmouth had become a political action.

This latest triumph at Bothwell was also cause for pamphleteers to revisit Monmouth's past. He was Charles's unimportant and illegitimate offspring no longer. Retrospectively the Duke's life was re-examined and re-interpreted. In a sense in the late 1670s and early 1680s Monmouth underwent a process of hyper-incorporation into national consciousness. In particular his exploits in continental Europe were rapidly singled out and harnessed to the notion of military heroism spawned by Bothwell.[13] That many of these military escapades occurred in the service of Louis XIV was conveniently overlooked. After Bothwell, for example, there followed debate as to whether Monmouth's greatest triumph had been found at Mastrick or Mons: "Here...begins a repitious glance on thy Heroick Actions...And all, at length, in loving Chorius joyn, saying, 'Tis Scotland, Scotland, makes him shine."[14] The battle of Bothwell bridge marked the watershed in popular recognition of Monmouth: he was now firmly fixed in public imagination.

It was a common tactic of polemicists on both sides to exploit patriotic associations in relation to Charles II in order to further their arguments.[15] However, this victory on the banks of the Clyde afforded a useful opportunity for London-based pamphleteers to extol (or perhaps invent) a new patriotic champion. They saluted "the Stout English...of great

---

[13] Monmouth had fought with France against the Dutch in 1672, and with the Dutch against the French in 1678; W.K. Thomas, *The Crafting of Absalom and Achitophel: Dryden's "Pen for a Party"* (1978), p26

[14] *News From Windsor: Being the Duke of Monmouth's Welcome* (1679)

[15] A point made in Chapter Five.

153

renown"[16] who had put the rebel Scots to flight. One poet wryly observed that the Scot intended England more mischief than the Turk.[17] Monmouth was reinvented as the personification of renewed national greatness: "thou...here meet England's Love as great as Scotland's fear...See how the English-men already crow'd - to pay their Thankfulness in vollies loud, more of their conquerour than conquest proud."[18] Monmouth had come of age as a great English hero. Even Scotland, it was said, now worshipped the Duke: "the Scots next to their God and Thee [Charles II], Fear'd and Ador'd, [Monmouth] like a new Deity."[19] This extract from 1679 gives an early indication, perhaps, that Monmouth was presented with a 'pan-Protestant' appeal: enemy to the rebel Scots only, not to dissent in general. In any case, this "new Deity" was rendered all the more potent by being a symbol of national pride, ensuring maximum identification with the nation at large. As an English Protestant 'Prince' Monmouth had the potential to be a truly national figure and to appeal to a constituency broader than any other 'opposition' individual could. Indeed, it could be argued that the reach of Charles II alone had greater symbolic potential.

Just as praise had become politicised, so too had patriotism. The patriotic sentiment around Monmouth did not exist in an apolitical vacuum; rather the adulation must be seen against the backdrop of the political climate to which it was explicitly linked. The Duke's return from Bothwell was seen as crucial to protect Charles II: "Thrice Welcome English Darling...Thy Presence is now requisice at home. Now when a Foe, more dangerous than Scot, Does 'gainst our King and our Religion plot."[20] Monmouth had helped secure English safety abroad, it was now time for him to do the same at home. The exact part Monmouth was to play in saving the nation was left deliberately vague by pamphleteers. Crucially the fallout from the Popish Plot revelations had not dissipated in the summer and autumn of 1679, and a suspicion bordering on paranoia was still rife: "Now when the Nation scarce

---

[16] *The Battell of Bodwell-bridge, or, The Kings Cavileers Triumph* (1679)
[17] *Jockeys Downfall: a poem on the late Total Defeat* (1679)
[18] *News From Windsor* (1679)
[19] J.F, *Englands Lamentation for the Duke of Monmouth's Departure* (1679)
[20] *News From Windsor* (1679)

knows who is who, and all suspect each other as untrue...you (Great Sir) like Morning Sun arise...Now Pope and Devil, we defie you all, Now do your worst, our Monmouth's within call."[21] It is worth noting that the sun was a traditional metaphor for Kings and that Monmouth was increasingly described using regal terminology. Moreover the metaphor appeared prophetic: the Duke was the rising sun, the up-coming man. As exclusion was heatedly being debated in Parliament, such symbolism was highly charged and, from a Tory perspective, this elevation of Monmouth to the status of national hero appeared sinister indeed.

This raises questions as to the extent to which all Bothwell literature was Whiggish in sympathy. Is it possible to argue even that the Duke of Monmouth was an 'anti-Charles II' symbol? On the surface, it would appear a simple issue: the raising up of Monmouth in print was preparing the ground, a softening up process before the push to offer him as an alternative to the Duke of York. Yet, as discussed, while this may be so in part it is certainly not the complete picture. There was, for example, an anti-dissenter thrust to certain Bothwell tracts which tended to focus upon the bloody aspects of the rebellion, such as the murder of Archbishop Sharp of St Andrews. Tales were re-produced about the ransacking of the Archbishop of Glasgow's house, including a significant reference to a portrait of the King: "they finding his Majesties Picture, tore it down, and after in an hundred pieces, thereby manifesting their rebellious Pride, and vile esteem of Majesty."[22] Though the story was probably apocryphal its symbolism was unmistakable: the Presbyterian rebels were bent upon destroying monarchy itself. Into this violent situation of rebellious dissenters strode Monmouth, restoring order and the rule of the King. Given the strong association between religious dissent and the Whigs, Bothwell created, at least in theory, the possibility that Monmouth could be depicted as an ultra-loyalist (even Anglican) symbol: the King's faithful

---

[21] *News From Windsor* (1679)

[22] *The Full and true account of all the Proceedings in Scotland* (1679), p6

lieutenant who had crushed the nonconformist insurgency. In so far as this vision went there was nothing inconsistent with, or obnoxious to, Tory sensibilities.

Taking into account the 'loyalist' depiction of Monmouth and the double-association of the term 'Whig' (the meaning of Scots rebel giving way to that of English opposition at around this time)[23], is it possible at this early stage to view Monmouth as a 'Tory' symbol? Perhaps the answer can be found in a seemingly straightforward reference to Monmouth as: "Great Prince, our Champion for Loyalty...We need no Bulwark, but our General."[24] This perfectly demonstrates the ambiguity which can arise from linguistic generality: Monmouth was certainly ascribed with "loyalty" but was also hailed as a "bulwark". The problem lay in the interpretation of these words - or more exactly, in their application. Whether a "bulwark" was thought loyal or not depended upon perception of the danger faced. After the Popish Plot, when official responses to the threat posed seemed to many to be effete and half-hearted, it was possible for Monmouth to be seen as defender of the nation *despite* the King and his court.

It is also true that in 1679 the overwhelming majority of Bothwell literature was one-sided: devoted to hailing the Duke in tribute. This suggests that the Duke - for whatever reason - was yet to come fully within the sights of the Tory press as an enemy target. The Whig cause was inherently oppositional. Yet association with Monmouth, as one so close to Charles II, seemed to support Whig writers in their professions of innocence and helped them to maintain the fiction that the Whig cause was essentially loyalist. Fundamentally Monmouth was simply better suited for Whig purposes and as time passed the Duke became

---

[23] This important linguistic peculiarity relating to the term 'Whig' in certain Bothwell tracts should be noted. For example one printed account observes: "There was the Duke-Monmouth...with Canons and Muskets the Whigs for to fell, the silly poor Whigs got many a knell, when they came to the Battell of Bodwell" (*The Battell of Bodwell-bridge*, 1679). The original usage of 'Whig' - before it became associated with the exclusionist party in England - meant precisely a Scots rebel. In this earlier sense, without other connotations, all Bothwell texts were 'anti-Whig' in viewpoint. However, it was around this time (1679-80), that the newer meaning of 'Whig' was just beginning to emerge. The deployment of the term in relation to both could be a deliberate attempt to undermine 'the Whigs' in England by conflating the two meanings. After all, the term 'Whig', like that of 'Tory', began life as a term of abuse.
[24] *News From Windsor* (1679)

increasingly associated with that faction. It became correspondingly harder for Tory propagandists to appropriate Monmouth positively. The idea of Monmouth as loyal to the King was an asset to Whig scribes: it was therefore a notion that they fostered and propagated.

During the final years of the crisis (after 1681), representations of Monmouth became far more diffuse. Significantly during this period 'party' friction between Whig and Tory became more clearly demarcated in print - during the 'Western Progression' for example, it was stated that the Duke: "hates all base Pretences; no Tory Masquerade, with Popish sham-Pretences."[25] Monmouth had become unmistakably a partisan figure, a Whig talisman and anti-Tory icon. Merely to dislike Monmouth, insisted Whigs, was to render oneself suspicious. For: "Brave Monmouth, Englands Glory, [was] hated of none but Papist and Tory."[26] At the time of Bothwell Bridge it had been possible, if only just, to hail Monmouth a praiseworthy figure of by-partisanship: "In Scotland Jemmy's Hand dispers'd the Whig and Tory."[27] However, as the political situation evolved this become increasingly difficult, until it could be presumed automatically that attacks on the Duke originated from Tory hands: "[For]Tories and Papists all agree to blast his spotless fame."[28]

It seems clear enough that the process by which Monmouth emerged as an unambiguous Whig symbol began in earnest with accounts of the battle of Bothwell Bridge. By 1682 Whig poets could lament, with reference to the battle, that the King had failed to understand the Duke's worth: "Brave Monmouth's out of Favour...Bothwel-Bridge is now forgot."[29] It was crucial to Whig efforts that Monmouth, irrespective of how independent and oppositional his actions, was presented as a 'pro-Charles' figure - loving and loyal both to his King and to his country. Not all Whigs advocated Monmouth's accession to the throne.

---

[25] *Young Jemmy An Excellent New Ballad, To an Excellent New Tune* (1681)
[26] *Englands Darling, or Great Brittains Joy and hope on that Noble Prince James Duke of Monmouth* (1681)
[27] *Young Jemmy An Excellent New Ballad* (1681)
[28] *Young Jemmy An Excellent New Ballad* (1681)
[29] *A New Ballad from Whig-land* (1682)

Indeed, the vast majority of Whigs emphatically did not favour him. Yet the Duke held a disproportionate value for the Whig cause: providing them with a 'loyalist' symbol to evoke in pamphlets and a rhetorical shield behind which to shelter while applying pressure on Charles II. It was, therefore, in the interests of Whigs that Monmouth should become a major public figure.

(ii) Exile: 'Our Guardian in Mortal Form'

Monmouth's brief period of exile to continental Europe during 1679 formed one of the key episodes in his 'invention' in print. Which is to say that the exile received massive attention from writers, predominantly Whig writers, who reported the Duke's departure as if it were a matter of national importance, and, in a sense, by so doing ensured that it become just that. Ironically for the Duke he was forced to depart for Holland not long after Bothwell, just, in other words, as myriad tracts were circulating and his stock was rising exponentially. That Charles felt it expedient to order the Duke off the political stage was, perhaps, indicative of the increased importance that Monmouth's growing profile gave him. The exile prompted much speculation about the personal relationship of Monmouth and Charles II.[30] The focus of this section though, will be on how the exile acted to redefine the relationship between the Duke and the nation - and how echoes of Charles II and the 'Restoration myth' were incorporated in this effort.

The episode of the exile was magnified by print literature, politicising the figure of the Duke yet further. An outraged Whig media decried the banishment, though not, as will be shown, the King who had imposed it, declaring instead that the exile had been desired and engineered by papists.[31] Therefore Monmouth's departure provided more proof that he stood in opposition to dastardly Papist schemes. If Bothwell had established the theme of Monmouth's bravery, then the exile produced the notion of Monmouth being 'wronged'.

---

[30] An aspect which will receive attention later in this chapter.
[31] J.F, *Englands Lamentation for the Duke* (1679)

The Duke was depicted as an innocent party unjustly punished: having done nothing untoward he had been relieved of his offices and expelled from all three Kingdoms. Was this the proper reward for a national hero? Whig writers presented Monmouth as they presented themselves: as a wronged loyalist. His royal, or semi-royal, status appeared to validate their claims in this regard.

If Monmouth was wronged by his exile the blame for it was not attributed to Charles II, even though it was the King who had compelled the Duke's exit. Monmouth had, claimed Whig writers, been astonished to find His Majesty's affections so suddenly withdrawn. In the estimation of Whig pamphleteers this provided evidence of the existence of dark influences at work in court, misleading the King at every turn: "his [Monmouth's] Enemies...had long waited for an opportunity to ruine him...blacken him with many very Hainous crimes...although it be impossible for them to proved any one of them."[32] The enemies of Monmouth were, it was implied, also the enemies of every Protestant Englishman. The basic assertion - of Monmouth's goodness unjustly maligned - was designed to garner sympathy and elicit identification. Moreover, it fed into a more general alarm about the unseen forces of popish menace. Having established the notion of Monmouth as the nation's bulwark, any decline in his fortunes could but profit the enemy within. Never was the Kingdom in more danger than in Monmouth's absence.

The exile provided useful propaganda fodder for two principle reasons. Firstly, it was presented as potentially being the end for Monmouth. It is important for us to lay aside foreknowledge of what was to happen later and rather understand a contemporary viewpoint. The possibility that this moment marked the end of the Duke as a political entity must have seemed very real: there were no guarantees that he would ever return. Aside from other considerations this would deprive Whig polemicists of a valuable card to play. Therefore each stage of Monmouth's exile was meticulously recorded by the Whig media, a

---

[32] *An Historical Account of the Heroick Life and Magnanimous Actions of the Most Illustrious Protestant Prince, James Duke of Monmouth* (1683), p90

mechanism which kept the Duke constantly in the public mind, maintaining interest in his movements and fortune. This process commenced immediately upon Monmouth's departure: "Let England lament...And with their fervent Sighs keep full his sails...[but do not despair for] a Ball thrown hard against the Ground, rises much more, upon a fair rebound."[33] Such tracts exhorted the people to keep the faith in order that Monmouth might rise again upon fair rebound. His arrival in Holland was similarly marked by a flurry of celebratory tracts giving thanks for his safe journey, made all the more sweet by the Duke of York's own exile to Edinburgh not long after. Without these tracts the danger was that Monmouth would simply fade from public awareness. Printed propaganda therefore obviated the purpose of the exile.

The second reason why the exile attracted such attention from Whig writers was because it offered them the opportunity to model Monmouth in the image of his father. It evoked memory of Charles II's own past - and therefore of the attendant rhetorical treasury surrounding the 'Restoration myth' which could be brought into play, finding new application and meaning through Monmouth's story.[34] Charles II too had been a young man exiled across the sea before, of course, returning in triumph to bring peace to a troubled nation by reclaiming the throne. Was Monmouth also destined to return and become King after a similarly dramatic reversal of fortune? Whig writers did not, generally speaking, push the analogue to this extreme, though the possibility of such an eventuality was always implicit. Rather Whig pamphleteers were content to accentuate the parallel between Monmouth and his father, thereby strengthening the young Duke and keeping his symbolic value alive during his banishment.

Significantly Whig pamphlets now sought to present the Duke, again like his father, as a player on a European stage: "Who art to Europe, as to Britain dear: No Land or Country but

---

[33] *Upon the Departure of His Grace, James, Duke of Monmouth* (1679)
[34] *England's Over-joy at the Duke of Monmouth's return* (1679)

160

has heard your Fame; In every place is known Great Monmouth's Name."[35] Monmouth was shown as an exiled Prince, treated and respected as such. The reports of his reception in Amsterdam stressed that it in every way corresponded to his "quality and birth."[36] This trend represented an attempt to turn the exile, which was essentially a rebuke for Monmouth, into a veritable propaganda asset. The episode was used to strengthen his claims to Princely status by portraying him as the son of Charles II operating as a European royal on the international stage.

By not explicitly making the claim that Monmouth would return as King, Whig scribes were protected when he did not. Even so, the Duke's return could still be represented as a type of second Restoration from across the Channel: "For none did e're a richer Treasure bring, except the ship which brought Great Charles our King."[37] The re-emergence of Monmouth in England completed the circle of banishment, exile and return. His reappearance in London (without leave to be there), in November 1679 occurred just days after the capital had witnessed massive popular demonstrations of Pope-burning. Although the Duke was not received at Court, the return was nonetheless a triumphant moment for the Whig press. Panegyrics hailed the homecoming of a valiant hero: "to whom this our Isle is more oblig'd than Egypt unto Nile."[38] The tide of popish conspiracy would now begin to recede, it was claimed, for Monmouth was back: "Our Guardian Angel in a mortal form, will drive thy Thunders back, and quel thy storm."[39] Although not made explicit, Monmouth appeared almost to replace the King in Whig literature as the nation's protector: a younger and more vigorous champion who was un-befuddled by evil counsellors.

The Duke was henceforth viewed by Tory writers as a loose cannon: entirely independent and divorced from court respectability, and, to all intents and purposes, an enemy to Charles

---

[35] *A Congratulatory Poem on the Safe Arrival of His Grace James Duke of Monmouth* (1679)
[36] *A True Copy of a Second Letter, From a Friend in Utrecht* (1679), p2
[37] *England's Over-joy at the Duke of Monmouth's return* (1679)
[38] *England's Over-joy at the Duke of Monmouth's return* (1679)
[39] *Englands Happiness Restored, or A Congratulation Upon the Return of his Grace James Duke of Monmouth* (1679)

II. Whig pamphleteers, by contrast, continued to represented Monmouth as being semi-detached from the King, explaining the independence of his actions as resulting from his own sense of moral imperative. Whig polemicists suggested that far from damaging the Duke's reputation, the events of exile had shown Monmouth's true worth. For, it was said, Monmouth was now more prized than ever: "Have you not seen after a cloudy Day, the rising Sun next Morn appear more gay?"[40] According to Whig propaganda the experience of exile had merely served to deepen the affinity between Duke and nation.

(iii) The Western Progression: Popular Adulation

The idea of popular approbation is integral to depictions of the Duke of Monmouth. The Duke's 'Western Progression' was the single most important event in the creation of this perception of Monmouth as popular hero. Whig writers used his popularity to apply pressure on the King. The crucial point is the implication that the wide-spread adulation received by Monmouth would be lavished on Charles II too, were he only to change policy direction. The Duke was filling a vacuum left by the King's perceived disengagement from his people.

During the summer months of 1680 Monmouth toured the West Country visiting, among other places, the important centres of Bristol, Bath and Exeter. For the historian the tour is heavy with overtones of Monmouth's later rebellion. More importantly for our purposes, this progression was widely reported by the London print media at the time, and there is a discernable sense in these texts that it had struck a nerve: "many Discourse...of Late have been bandyed up and down by all Parties in this Kingdom touching your Grace...[and] hath administered so much Noise and Talk among the Vulgar."[41] The travels of the Duke had caught the public's imagination and running through all these accounts was a charge of popular excitement. Whether this charge was a true reflection of the tour or represented the exaggeration of pamphleteers is a moot point. Monmouth appeared in these texts as an

---

[40] *England's Over-joy at the Duke of Monmouth's return* (1679)
[41] C.F, *A letter to His Grace the D. of Monmouth* (1680), p1

unpredictable dark horse who was powered by public adulation, a dangerous combination indeed.

The level of popular acclaim for the Duke was represented as being considerable. Pamphlets detailing the western journey uniformly reported a groundswell of support for Monmouth in every place he journeyed; drawing massive crowds of cheering well-wishers in each town and village. One witness estimated that on a single day more than 20,000 had flocked to glimpse the Duke.[42] The reporting of such an outpouring of public support was almost unprecedented. Importantly it evoked memory of, and comparison with, Charles II's heady return after the Restoration: "never since his Majesties happy Restauration, had the good occasion to see amongst them their King, or any of his Royal Family until now."[43] Again Monmouth seemed to be embodying a younger more popular version of Charles.

Such displays of popular support persuaded some that England would survive the current popish threat: "I am perfectly convinced...[because] I saw that incredible...confluence of people of all Qualities, Sexes, and Ages, meet to welcome a Protestant Duke into these Countries."[44] The operative phrase here is "a Protestant Duke". Potent displays of admiration for Monmouth were interpreted as expressions of mass anti-Catholic sentiment, and, by extension, of an emotive anti-Yorkist outpouring. Toasts were drunk to Charles and his son, pointedly excluding the King's brother and next in line of succession.[45]

Monmouth was coupled with Charles II against York. From these West country crowds there arose "great shouts crying, God bless our King Charles, and God bless the Protestant Duke."[46] As often as not Monmouth is thus styled; not simply as *a* Protestant Duke but as *the* Protestant Duke - indicating a centrality of identification in popular consciousness. *The* Protestant Duke existed in opposition to *the* Catholic Duke. Therefore his travels and the popular rapture they garnered were viewed as political expressions of Protestant interest.

---

[42] *A True Narrative of the Duke of Monmouth's Late Journey into the West* (1680), p2
[43] *A True Narrative of the Duke of Monmouth's Late Journey* (1680), p4
[44] *A True Narrative of the Duke of Monmouth's Late Journey* (1680), p1
[45] *Monmouth and Bucceugh's Welcom from the North* (1685), p1
[46] *A True Narrative of the Duke of Monmouth's Late Journey* (1680), p2

Significantly, printed Whig material in this period also became more pronounced in its attacks on the Duke of York. One satirist imagined a conversation taking place between two neighbours, a Mr Monmouth-shire and a Mr York-shire. The former was a simple, but true-hearted patriot, the latter a scheming Machiavel. Mr York-shire informs his companion: "a man in a Religious Cloak may walk incognito, carry Vice on with Virtues Face, present his Friend a Dagger; when he expects but a How do you; and a shake by th' hand."[47] Such satirical attacks played to the well established anti-Catholic prejudges but they also offered direct comparisons between Charles II's brother and his son.

Monmouth's Western Progression was seen as a tour-de-force of Protestant defiance in a way that the actions of Charles II simply could not be. Support for Monmouth became a barometer for anti-popery. The "signals of joy"[48] for Monmouth were taken to be measurements of the public mood and of the health of Protestantism. Or, as one Whig phrased it: "In this may the Papists plainly descerne how generally the People conceive a dislike and detestation of their false Absurdities."[49]

Accordingly Whig pamphlets made York into the direct antithesis of Monmouth. The tactic of direct comparisons between the two Dukes was one increasingly employed by Whig propagandists. The subtext of such contrasts implicitly asked the reader to view the two Graces in a face-to-face confrontation. The question of which was preferable as King may have been rarely posed explicitly, but it was just as surely present in such relative evaluations. Thus in 1682 when Monmouth again toured the country (this time the north-west) and again provoked Tory censure, Whigs directed their protests toward York: "A Popish Duke goes where he will, and none dare ask him why...well guarded he can march about...but if young Jemmy once a year, goes out to take the air, then he's a rioter we hear

---

[47] *A Dialogue Between Monmouth-Shire, and York-Shire. About cutting Religion according to Fashion* (1681)
[48] *The Protestants Joy, or the Relation of His Grace the Duke of Monmouth, His Reception and Congratulation in the City of London* (1680), p2
[49] *The Protestants Joy* (1680), p2

(Oh Judge if this be fair)."[50] The point is that the two Dukes were increasingly presented as locked into a mimetic rivalry: what damaged one, favoured the other. In Whig eyes Monmouth occupied, at the very least, a position of parity with York; if York may legitimately tour the country, then so too may Monmouth.

Even the medium of praise itself was affected by this correlative rivalry. For example the Whig song *Monmouth and Bucleugh's Welcom* was to be performed, *To the Tune of York and Albany's Welcom.*[51] A Tory song in praise of York had been co-opted and rewritten with the lyrics in adoration of Monmouth: thereby appropriating and subverting the original Tory sentiment. In this propaganda war between the two Dukes even melody was a battlefield to be contested.

From a Tory standpoint this pro-Monmouth trend was disturbing indeed. Tory polemicists generally used Charles (rather than York) as a point of comparison to critique Monmouth. One writer warned the Duke not to permit fame to go to his head, reminding Monmouth that his responsibility lay first and foremost in loyalty to his King: "Men...have made such a Bustle of late. Now as Your Grace is...by Duty...olig'd...mind no other Interest besides that of the Common Good...[for] you are in the Eye of the People, and Belov'd by all."[52] Such statements were cautionary: imploring Monmouth not to push things too far, and threatening him with dire consequences if he did. However, this extract also betrays a sense of fear. After all, even Tories conceded that Monmouth was "belov'd by all", and the coupling of public favour and charismatic Protestant heroism was a powerful coalescence. There is a definite undertone within Tory literature that this represented an extremely unsettling development; an anxiety that 'the People' stood with Monmouth when their duty as subjects required allegiance to Charles II exclusively.

Inherent within the reporting of popular acclamation was a virulent Protestant-based patriotism. There had been patriotism in the Bothwell tracts of course, but what was new

---

[50] *The Down-Fall of the Whiggs: or, the Duke of Monmouths Journey into the North* (1682)
[51] *Monmouth and Bucceugh's Welcom from the North* (1685)
[52] C.F, *A letter to His Grace the D. of Monmouth* (1680), p3

165

after the 'Western Progression' was the centrality of Protestantism. Monmouth was hailed as "our dear true Protestant Englishman."[53] Whig scribes exploited this patriotic sentiment, praising the "rustick sincerity" of the crowds made up of so many "worthy English Gentleman", who gathered to express their "hearty English love."[54] The salient point was that 'Protestantism' was depicted as synonymous with 'Englishness', and that Monmouth was the embodiment of both.

The equating of Monmouth as the popular emblem of Protestant Englishness (and anti-Catholic symbol), required some response from Tory polemicists - it was simply too powerful a set of associations to be allowed to stand unchallenged. The result was increased personal attacks on Monmouth. The Duke was an ambitious rabble-rouser, asserted Tory writers. He scurrilously courted "the shouting throng"[55] to further his own interests. This very action demonstrated why he was unfit to wear the crown: "With Bows...and little Arts, you try a rude, unthinking Tumults love to buy: and he who stoops to do so means a thing, shows He, by Heaven, was ne're designed for King."[56] A true Sovereign did not need to court support among the lower orders. Comparisons with Charles II in this context functioned to excoriate the Duke's pretensions.

There was no longer any ambiguity in Tory representation of Monmouth's motives: he was aiming for the throne. In the wake of the 'Western Progression' Tory propagandists did not attempt to contest the notion that Monmouth was popular, but they did try to subvert it. One poet sneered that: "'tis fit the Peoples Son, should be the Peoples Heir."[57] The inference was clear enough, it was appropriate that Monmouth, as a bastard, should engage the common people's affinity, for, in the final analysis, he was no better than they.

In turn, the rhetorical counter-measures deployed by Whigs involved cranking up the pitch of anti-Catholic rhetoric yet further: "May the Almighty keep the good Dukes life, from

---

[53] *A True Narrative of the Duke of Monmouth's Late Journey* (1680), p3
[54] *A True Narrative of the Duke of Monmouth's Late Journey* (1680), p4
[55] *Advice to His Grace* (1682)
[56] *Advice to His Grace* (1682)
[57] *A new narrative of the Old Plot* (1683)

Hellish Plots, from Popish Gun or knife."[58] Through such vivid exclamations Monmouth became a kind of living Protestant martyr, the focus for unsuccessful popish persecution. For example the bloody murder of Monmouth's associate Thomas Thynne in February 1682 - shot five times after his coach was stopped by armed horsemen in London - was treated by Whig writers as tantamount to an assassination attempt on the Duke himself (who had been with his friend earlier that same evening). Significantly, this incident was not simply located within the generic framework of *a* Catholic plot but specifically equated to *the* Popish Plot. "Now Monmouth's friend a second victim falls, the bloody Villians skill'd ith' Murtherous sin, Sr. Godfry's Murther new Act or'e ag'in."[59] Act two of the Popish Plot had begun. This attempt to revive the emotional immediacy, and sense of danger, which had previously been created by the initial revelations and unfolding of the plot during 1679-80 granted Monmouth a primacy of place alongside Charles which he had not had during the original Popish Plot. A letter purporting to be written from the Pope to Monmouth, published in 1682, warned the Protestant Duke that one way or another he would be killed: "if Godfrey's Cravat will not sie your neck...we have an hundred little way."[60] It was a cause for celebration that papists had failed to "overwhelm the Glories of this Noble and Loyal Peer."[61]

Monmouth was especially targeted by Jesuits, claimed Whigs, for no reason other than "because...he stood in their way."[62] In this sense the Duke was coupled with Charles II as a principle opponent of popish perfidiousness. No one thanked God for York's deliverance from the Popish Plot because he was not considered to be its target. Monmouth's life was now interpreted in correlative opposition to the papist menace: the greater his star was in the ascendancy, the further the level of danger dropped.

---

[58] *A Hew and Cry after Blood & Murther: or an Elegie on the most barbarous Murther of Thomas Thinn, Esq* (1681)
[59] *A Hew and Cry after Blood & Murther* (1681)
[60] *A Letter from His Holiness the Pope, To the most illustrious Protestant Prince, James Duke of Monmouth* (1682), p1
[61] *The Protestants Joy* (1680), p1
[62] *The Rose of Delight* (1680)

As Monmouth became progressively seen as a more overtly partisan figure, Tory pamphleteers increasingly sought to tie him to the Whigs' leading lights. A tactic that Whig writers themselves observed and denounced, Tories were testing "if either wicked Wit or Diabolical Art can draw off your Affections from the Duke of Monmouth, the Earls of Shaftsbury, Essex, & C."[63] In Tory texts the link between Monmouth, Shaftesbury and others was used to taint Monmouth by association. It also acted as a counterbalance to the association fostered by Whigs between the Duke and the King.

Shaftsbury, in particular, became the target of Tory jibes casting him as a kind of twisted father figure to Monmouth. Tories sardonically styled Shaftsbury: "the great Patriot, and next under God and Dr. Oates, the supreme Saviour and Defender of the Nation."[64] The Earl, not renowned for his stature, was also mocked as "the pigmy."[65] A fact which contrasted with his towering ambition: "May not little Anthony, once in a chair of State look Tall."[66] This referral to small physical stature contrasts sharply with references made by Whigs - including those relating to height[67] - between Monmouth and his royal father. Also contained in such imagery was the notion of the world turned upside down: where the little man (Shaftsbury) controlled the bigger one (Monmouth), a comparison suggestive of a disturbing re-ordering of society.

The imagined relationship between Monmouth and Shaftsbury formed a central plank in Tory assaults upon the Duke. If Monmouth was the face and figurehead of the Whig cause, then Shaftsbury was the true mastermind of the operation. Were Monmouth ever to gain the throne then Shaftsbury would be the real power behind it, making himself "a second Cromwell."[68] According to Tory scripting, the Earl cajoled the Duke with promises: "They'l

---

[63] *The Lady Grey Vindicated: Being an Answer to a Popish Pamphlet* (1681), p1
[64] *The E. of Shaftsbury's Expedient For Setling the Nation. Discoursed with His Majesty in the House of Peers* (1682), p3
[65] *A New Song. To the Tune of Robin Goodfellow* (1682)
[66] *A New Song. To the Tune of Robin Goodfellow* (1682)
[67] Discussed later in this chapter.
[68] *A New Song. To the Tune of Robin Goodfellow* (1682)

lay Three Kingdoms at our Feet...By Christ, we'le Both be Kings!"[69] If Shaftsbury provided the Tory press with their most effective 'hate figure', the closest equivalent in Whig propaganda was the Duke of York. One Whig propagandist even echoed the 'two Kings' rhetoric applied to Shaftsbury and Monmouth in complaints over the power of the Duke of York: "We've almost now two K---s ith' Land."[70] York's freedom of action was presented by Whig writers as a diminishment of Charles II's authority. The same may be said in reverse for Monmouth and Shaftesbury's activities in Tory representations. Both sides desired Charles to clamp down on the other - which they claimed insulted the King with their boldness - and each side framed this appeal by a demonising of its enemies.

Tory pamphleteers used the idea of the Duke as a Whig stooge to depict him as an enemy of the Church of England, this despite Monmouth's personal adherence to Anglicanism. Roared on by his Whig supporters, they claimed, a King Monmouth would savage the Church: "The Bishops and Clergy, I'll hang up in Chains, Till none but the Saints of my Party remains."[71] In evoking deliberate overtones of the 1650s Tories played to Anglican fears concerning dissent, religious fragmentation and chaos. Yet in Whig pamphlets Monmouth appeared to embody a pan-Protestant identity, existing, as we have seen, in opposition to the Catholic Duke. In this regard the Duke was extremely useful to Whig propagandists seeking to make Toryism and Catholicism interchangeable by fashioning the party as, "the Popish-Tory crew."[72] Tory scribes on the other hand, attempted to exploit Whig associations with dissent to recast 'the Protestant Duke' as being the 'Presbyterian Duke'.

---

[69] *A New Song Upon the King of Poland, and the Prince of the Lord of Promise* (1682)
[70] *The Down-Fall of the Whiggs* (1682)
[71] *The Young Bastards Wish, A Song* (1685)
[72] *A Hew and Cry after Blood & Murther* (1681)

The aspect of the 'Western Progression' which sparked off the most furious and invidious debate was the issue of the King's Evil. The basic 'facts' of the matter were that a sick girl, after rushing to touch the Duke of Monmouth, had miraculously been cured. Pamphlets verifying the truth of this incident were rapidly produced, including lists of eye witnesses. Henry Clark challenged the unbelieving to come and see signed statements from those present: "Whoever doubts the truth of this relation, may be satisfied thereof by sight of the original under the hands of the Persons before mentioned, at the Amsterdam Coffee-House in Bartholomew lane."[73] Clark's evidence may, however, have been undermined by the common knowledge that the said establishment was a notorious den of Whiggery.

The reasons for this controversy are not hard to discern: Monmouth now seemed 'conclusively' possessed of an innate royalty - here was the manifestation and proof. After all, Edward the Confessor, "a good King tho' a Popish Saint...[imparted] this gift of Healing...to descend upon his legitimate successors."[74] The episode appeared to provide evidence that Monmouth was a "legitimate successor". Moreover, performing the King's Evil was an act more closely associated with Charles II, who revived it, than with any monarch since the Middle Ages.[75] Needless to say the Duke's apologists seized upon the story, mobilising the Whig press to extract the maximum value from it.[76] The King's Evil tale enabled Whig writers to circumvent Charles II. That the King denied Monmouth's legitimacy became less important - or, at least, less insurmountable an obstacle - when events seemed to be proclaiming the Duke's royal powers so clearly.

In order to re-empower Charles II it was therefore crucial that Tories responded to this propaganda coup of their opponents. A favoured Tory retort was to deride the young girl at

---

[73] Henry Clark, *His Grace the Duke of Monmouth Honoured in his Progress In the West of England In an Account of a most Extraordinary Cure of the Kings Evil* (1680), p2
[74] *A True and Wonderful Account of a Cure of the Kings-Evil by Mrs Fanshaw, Sister to his Grace the Duke of Monmouth* (1681), p2
[75] Hutton, *Charles II*, p134
[76] A wider discussion of the Duke of Monmouth's illegitimacy will follow in a later section, here the focus will be specifically on the King's Evil.

the centre of the story, the supposed recipient of Monmouth's miracle: "But had you seen the skittish Jade, you would have thought her Drunk or Mad"[77], scoffed one broadside. The labelling of the girl as 'Jade' was a quite deliberate ploy – the term being contemporary slang for a prostitute. She was an unreliable witness and hardly to be trusted. By thus contesting the basis of the tale, the intent was to undermine and invalidate the entire episode.

Satire was another tactic much employed to discredit Monmouth. One broadside stated that true Kings had natural powers of Lion taming, and joked that Monmouth should make for the Tower posthaste to try his luck with the beasts within.[78] Another Tory polemic also played with the idea of the Duke's transforming power of touch. Monmouth could indeed transform the nation it mocked, but hardly for the better: "To touch a Kingdom for Kings-Evil, He means to make it for its health, a common-whore, a common-wealth."[79] There was a hard political edge to such mockery. The allegation that Monmouth could bring to pass a second English republic after Charles II was a serious charge, and potentially highly damaging to the Duke's cause.

The 'King's evil' situation was complicated considerably when new stories surfaced adding an additional twist to the tale. Accounts began appearing which claimed that Mrs Fanshaw, Monmouth's sister, had also been performing the King's Evil and demonstrating curing powers. An anonymous pamphlet observed: "now who is there than can question the Legitimacy of our excellent Prince...[when] Heaven hath given him and his sister of curing the Kings-Evil, pleads so loudly in his behalf."[80] These new tracts purported to be sympathetic to Monmouth and to strengthen his claims.

However, certain Whig writers smelt a rat; suspicious of a possible Tory smear campaign. There had never been much credible suggestion that Monmouth's mother, Lucy Walter, had had a daughter by Charles II. Walter had given birth to a second child in the early 1650s but

---

[77] *The Oxford Alderman's Speech to the D. of M.* (1681)
[78] *Grimalkin, or, the Rebel-Cat* (1681), p1
[79] *A Canto on the New Miracle by the D. of M curing a young Wench of the Kings Evil* (1681)
[80] *A True and Wonderful Account of a Cure of the Kings-Evil* (1681), p2

the young King had refused to recognise her as his own. Therefore the effect of material relating to Monmouth's sister was twofold: (i) it stretched still further the credibility of the original story regarding Monmouth performing the King's Evil, and (ii) by indirectly raising the issue of his sister's parentage, it questioned the sexual morality of Monmouth's mother. Both aspects impacted negatively on Monmouth. Part of Monmouth's usefulness to opposition scribes was that this 'royal' symbol defused charges of republicanism made against Whigs – Tory propagandists thus sought to damage the Duke by questioning his 'royal' status and by associating him with republicanism.

Some Whigs therefore suspected that this represented deliberate disinformation: that these accounts relating to Monmouth's sister were not, as they purported to be, sympathetic to the Duke but that their true purpose was precisely to damage his reputation. The Kings Evil incident: "In the Vulgars eyes should seem to give him...[a] claim to legitimacy, and so to Succession...[therefore] they raised in Opposition to that, this story of his Sister...upon which the Libeller makes many Joking Discounts, scoffing at the Protestant Religion, and the Dukes legitimacy."[81] This assertion of Tory black propaganda cannot be written off as Whig paranoia. It is just about conceivable that two Whig writers could have been working at cross purposes by arguing opposing positions - there was no 'blue-print' in this propaganda war controlling the output of material. However in this specific case it is unlikely. It is hard to imagine any self-appointed well-wisher of Monmouth envisaging benefit for their champion being derived from such stories. Far more probable is that the authors of these texts were pursing private interests: be it for their own financial gain or for the Tory cause. Not only did these stories discredit Monmouth performing the King's Evil, but they also shifted attention away from Monmouth's strength (his status as Charles's son) and onto his weakness (his illegitimacy).

Identifying such tactics was a relatively easy task, thwarting their effect was much more difficult. The Whigs therefore launched a counter-attack upon such narratives as Catholic

---

[81] *An Answer to a Scoffing and Lying Lybell* (1681), p2

slurs. There was no doubt that the author of these lies was "some Jesuit", whose work was undertaken "with little wit, and much malice."[82] This was simply a mechanism to abuse the good Duke "because they judge him to be an obstacle, and that no small one."[83] Demonstrating the underlying (nefarious) motive of such tracts was central to Whig responses. The only hope for popish plotters, stated Whigs, was that the Duke of York would succeed to the crown, and they were willing to utilise all imaginable black arts to achieve this end. However, that this Tory ruse against Monmouth had, to some extent, worked, can be gleaned from the fact that Whigs were left hopelessly wishing that, "the libeller...be found out and well beaten."[84]

Familial Relations: the King and his Son

Any claims Monmouth had to the crown rested almost entirely on a notional sense of legitimacy afforded to him as the King's son. It will be argued that there were deliberate attempts to blur the distinction between a son and an heir. The depiction of Monmouth's relationship with the King took on crucial significance for both Whig and Tory arguments. The manner in which the familial bonds of James Scott were represented and exploited in print is therefore an important dimension of Exclusion-era political discourse.

(i) The Father-Son bond

Unsurprisingly Whig material frequently emphasised the father-son relationship that existed between Charles and Monmouth. "Long may the King and his best Son, Be blest with Joy and Peace"[85], declared one Whig propagandist. "Brave Monmouth, I love Charles and

---

[82] *An Answer to a Scoffing and Lying Lybell* (1681), p1
[83] *An Answer to a Scoffing and Lying Lybell* (1681), p2
[84] *An Answer to a Scoffing and Lying Lybell* (1681), p2
[85] *Monmouth and Bucceugh's Welcom from the North* (1685), p1

173

thee"[86], gushed another. These are examples of attempts, through print, to couple father and son: to harden the popular association of the two and make it more difficult to cast the pair asunder in the mind's eye. The intention was that Monmouth's name should equate automatically with being the King's son.

One favoured Whig tactic of expressing this familial bond was through physical comparisons of father and son. The Duke was described as: "Being a Young, Comely, Tall, Proper, Black Gentlemen...[which together with] the Majesty of his Presence, concluded it to be the Duke of Monmouth."[87] Such descriptions directly evoked Monmouth's parentage. Charles II was famous for his height - at over six foot he was exceptionally tall by contemporary standards. The King was also noted for processing a dark complexion, to the extent that he could attacked by reference to the "black bastard."[88] Therefore the re-occurring allusions to Monmouth's stature and his 'black' complexion served to reinforce the sense of his kinship with the king.

The action of honouring the Duke, claimed Whigs, was itself a form of honouring Charles II. This ideologically useful sleight of hand was accomplished precisely because of the association built up between father and son: "Who was it, that gave you [Monmouth] Wings to soar like an Angel...but the King, your Father...because he love you...because you were his Son."[89] This can be seen as a form of pre-emptive self-defence by Whigs. If Monmouth's glory was attributable to his royal father, then how could praising him be the subversive act Tories claimed it to be? By stressing Charles's parental love for his son the Whigs were provided with a moral disclaimer; they could operate under the pretext that pro-Monmouth propaganda was entirely a-political, or merely 'loyalist' in a generic sense. Whether this fairly transparent display of innocence was convincing is another matter, but it did afford

---

[86] *The Rose of Delight* (1680)
[87] *An Account of the Apprehending two Persons supposed to be the D. of Monmouth and Sir Thomas Armstrong* (1683), p1
[88] Fraser, *King Charles II*, p10
[89] *A Seasonable Invitation for Monmouth to Return to Court* (London 1681), p1

Whig material at least a veneer of respectability to mask arguments which were essentially oppositional in nature.

Between 1640-2 the forces of opposition to Charles I had claimed to be acting on behalf of the King *despite* the King himself. Similar arguments were employed between 1678-83 in regard to Charles II. However, the presence of Monmouth on the political stage was one way in which the later period was significantly different. He provided the Whigs with a royal symbol behind which to rally and, superficially at least, to legitimatise their cause. No real analogue of the Duke had existed in 1640.

From a Tory perspective these efforts at forging popular identification of Monmouth with Charles II were threatening and demanded contestation. After all, the assertion of this familial bond provided the Duke with a degree of protection; the proximity of association allowing Monmouth to shelter in Charles's shadow. Tory writers seeking to unpick this association faced a difficult task: attacking the son, but not his royal father, required a delicate balancing act. For illegitimate or not, Monmouth was still "Caesar's offspring and son."[90] Yet frequently, as we will see, Tory polemicists were willing to sacrifice Charles II on the altar of their attacks on the Whigs and on Monmouth.

It was vital for Tory scribes to tackle the concept of 'royal blood'. This notion had become an important one in Whig literature: "Consider", asked one broadside addressing Monmouth, "what you are...Remember, that your Veins are filled with Royal Blood."[91] Moreover, this blood was not merely royal, but that "of Charles the Good and the Great running in his veins."[92] The subtext of such utterances implicitly presented Monmouth as a possible successor, by narrowing and obfuscating the distinction between the King's 'son' and the King's 'heir'. For example Monmouth was, on occasion, described as being Charles's 'natural son', a phrasing which could be mistaken by the ill-educated as meaning 'legitimate

---

[90] *Englands Happiness Restored* (1679)
[91] *A Seasonable Invitation* (1681), p1
[92] *The Duke of Monmouth's Case, with all the very strange Crimes and Misdemeanors alledged against His Grace* (1682)

heir'. A distinction which became even more blurred after the King's Evil furore following the Western Progression.

Therefore the main line of attack followed by Tories involved highlighting Monmouth's illegitimacy. Indeed, many Tory tracts positively revelled in it. The Duke was possessed of "Infected Blood"[93] and expectations must be low of such a man: "Streams will run muddy where the Spring's Impure."[94] John Dryden joined the chorus of mockery, sarcastically observing Monmouth to be: "High by descent, by Vertue higher yet, which make the people crowd to kiss thy feet."[95] The fundamental purpose of these attacks was to dispel any confusion or grey area which existed between the categories of 'son' and 'heir'. The Duke's illegitimacy meant he was not, and could never be, heir to the throne. Such an occurrence would violate the very tenets on which society was built: "Bankrupts bawl'd for Property, And Bastards for Succession."[96]

Therefore Tory propaganda abounds with sarcastic references to Monmouth, his background, and his "fair Mothers womb."[97] Lucy Walter in particular became a target for attack. One commentator suggested that if the reader could believe in any miracle: "Faith we'll believe...[Monmouth's] Mother was a Maid."[98] Absent from these attacks is any kind of depiction of the King or his relationship with the said lady. There was, after all, a fine line between libelling Lucy Walter a whore and implying that the King was a whoremonger. Tory propagandists generally played it safe by focusing exclusively on impugning her virtue and omitted reference to Charles II entirely. Nonetheless, the King's morals were left very much open to question.

---

[93] *The Ghost of Tom Ross to his Pupil the D. of Monmouth* (1683)
[94] *The Ghost of Tom Ross* (1683)
[95] John Dryden, *Sol in Opposition to Saturn, or, A Short return to a late tragedy call'd The Duke of Guise* (1683); Dryden had also famously lampooned Monmouth in *Absalom and Achitophel a poem* (1681). As the figure Absalom, the Duke appeared as Charles II's dim-witted "beautiful murdering bastard" Thomas, *The Crafting of Absalom and Achitophel*, p28.
[96] *A new narrative of the Old Plot* (1683)
[97] *The Oxford Alderman's Speech* (1681)
[98] *The Oxford Alderman's Speech* (1681)

Within Tory literature the assertion that Monmouth was a bastard was accepted as gospel truth. However, malicious attacks on Lucy Walter had another aim rather than simply re-asserting her son's illegitimacy, their function was also to cast doubt upon Monmouth's paternity. Thus even the truism that the Duke was the monarch's son was questioned. With such a woman, asked Tory polemicists, could one ever really be certain of paternity? There was a degree of old fashioned mudslinging at work: tainting Monmouth by association with sordidness. Again, Charles II was potentially damaged by this approach, but the priority of Tory propagandists appears to have been attacking the Duke (if at cost to the King's reputation).

Effective assaults on Monmouth's origins helped to foster a portrait of an ambitious and perfidious schemer who was aiming as high as it was possible to aim. One Tory broadside informed the Duke that he was: "Base as thy Mothers Prostituted Womb, the King's Betrayer, and the People's Slave."[99] This tract played with the idea of parental influence, declaiming Monmouth: "From Sydney's Blood Your Loyalty did Spring; You show us all Your Fathers but the King."[100] Monmouth is depicted as a wrecker of monarchy itself, metaphorically identifying him not as heir to Charles, but to Algernon Sidney and his republican legacy.

How did the Whigs respond to such slurs and defend their champion? Certainly the insinuation that Charles might not be Monmouth's father was emphatically rejected. Had the King not called young James to his side, recognised him, and shown him favour? A sympathetic 1683 account of the Duke's life represented Charles as a devoted father, who had publicly treated Monmouth as his son ever since the Restoration: "to demonstrate his Paternal Love, and to render his own happiness the more compleat, [Charles] ordered him to be brought to Court, that so he might alwayes have him in his Royal Presence."[101] Such

---

[99] *The Ghost of Tom Ross* (1683)
[100] *The Ghost of Tom Ross* (1683)
[101] S.T, *An Historical Account* (1683), p14

open demonstrations of the King's love, maintained Whigs, left no room for ambiguity regarding Charles's paternity.

The question of the Duke's illegitimacy was, however, another matter again. One Whig response to this problem was to simply to deny the charge. There existed long standing claims alleging that a secret marriage had occurred in the 1650s between Lucy Walter and the young Charles, whilst exiled in Holland. It is possible that some Whig scribes earnestly believed this to be the case. While for other Whig writers (possibly a majority of those who espoused the suggestion), it represented merely a rhetorical ploy. Either way, fostering the notion helped to complicate the issue of Monmouth's origins. Used in support of this assertion were claims that as a baby he was taken from Holland to Paris as 'Prince of Wales'. Also cited as evidence was the veneration which royalists had apparently shown to Monmouth's mother while she was held captive in the Tower under Cromwell: "During her abode about London, the Cavaleers...carried themselves towards her with a profound Reverence...treating her as a Sacred Person, serving her on the knee."[102] Whigs maintained that these 1650s royalists had believed that a marriage had occurred.

There began appearing in printed pamphlets of the early 1680s a story citing the existence of a 'Black Box' containing a marriage contract between Charles and Lucy Walter. It was alleged that this explosive proof had been consigned by the late Lord Durham to the custody of Sir Gilbert Gerard for safe keeping. However, the tale aroused much Whig suspicion: "there was never so much as a suggestion given out, till of late, of any such thing as a Black Box...[it] is a meer Romance, purposely invented to show and ridicule the business of the marriage."[103] Some, in other words, detected another Tory attempt to discredit Monmouth by whatever means necessary. It was entirely possible to believe that a secret marriage had taken place, yet still disregard the story of a box with a hidden treaty inside as pure bunkum. The predictable result of the uproar was that Gerard was called before the Privy Council and

[102] S.T, *An Historical Account* (1683), p9
[103] Robert Ferguson, *A Letter to a Person of Honour, concerning the Black Box* (1680), p1

forced to deny the charge. The concept of the 'Black Box' became a repeated Tory jibe, taunting Monmouth to produce this unassailable confirmation if it existed. Moreover in April 1680 Charles even took the extraordinary, and humiliating, step of publicly refuting, before his brother and assembled judges, that any such marriage had occurred.[104] This may however have been counter-productive, simply giving greater profile to the allegations and fuelling a sense that there was no smoke without fire.

Another Whig argument was simply to content that Monmouth's bastardy mattered little. "Why should...Mothers, Sisters, or Wives Sin, be a reproach to him, that's next of Kin?"[105] asked William Wycherley. The circumstances of the Duke's birth were not his fault and nor should they detract from his manifest virtues. Polemist and conspirator Robert Ferguson went further: "Nor hath Bastardy itself been an Obstruction to the confering of the Crown upon a person...[either] Q. Mary or Q. Elizabeth, must be so Blazon'd."[106] Such statements raised a wealth of controversial questions over the political philosophy of monarchy. Questions which Ferguson, a subscriber to a radical form of contract theory, was only too willing to engage in. The salient point in relation to Monmouth however, was that radical arguments conceding illegitimacy as being no bar to the throne were now being advanced.

It was even possible for Whigs to note in prayer that: "May the Crown keep the line; Brave Monmouth we happier shall be."[107] Significant in this expression is the idea that crowning Monmouth after Charles's death would be to *keep* the line, not alter it. This was based upon the simple concept that Monmouth was the King's eldest son, and therefore should be next in line. A son, after all, trumped all other relations in the royal succession, including brothers. Even Tory propaganda could acknowledge that if Charles, "had ever a Child of his own Legitimate, he would much rather have him reign, than his Brother, or any of his Brothers

---

[104] Fraser, *King Charles II*, p387
[105] William Wycherley, *Epistles to the King and Duke* (1683), p1
[106] Ferguson, *A Letter to a Person of Honour* (1680), p3
[107] *The Rose of Delight* (1680)

Children."[108] The difference lay in the willingness of certain Whigs to overlook the issue of legitimacy and assert Monmouth's rights as the King's son.

(ii) Loyalty to the King

Of extreme importance to the Whig rhetorical approach, both in general and specifically with regard to Monmouth, was the concept of loyalty to Charles II. Much panegyric poetry in praise of Monmouth stressed his unwavering devotion to his King. Obviously the Duke was never presented by his sympathisers as seeking the crown. Rather Monmouth's only interest was the defence of King and country: "Now, base Rebellion, shrink and disappear; Retreat to Hell while Monmouth liveth here."[109] This quotation discards a significant proviso almost incidentally. The nation is safe, it declares, *while* Monmouth liveth here. Whig writers presented security as equivocal: were Monmouth to be sidelined or marginalized these threats to the nation would resurface and grow.

The notion of Monmouth as a kind of ultra-loyalist provoked a sharp Tory counter-blast: "Remember what Relation, Sir, you bear to Royal Charles; Subject and Son you are; Two Names that strict Obedience does require."[110] In this instance the tables are turned on the much vaunted father/son relationship. If Monmouth was indeed Charles's son, then he owed the King a double allegiance. Through their print the Tories informed the Duke that if he sincerely wished to be considered loyal, he must stop swimming in Whig waters, till then, he would be viewed with disdain.

Much of the debate during the Exclusion period was infused by a sense of urgency. One reason for this was an awareness of Charles II's aging.[111] "May Heav'n preserve the King, that he may run a long long race"[112] implored one poet. There was more to such references than simply formulaic maxims wishing his Majesty good health and a lengthy reign.

---

[108] *The E. of Shaftsbury's Expedient for Setling the Nation* (1681), p5
[109] *News from Windsor* (1679)
[110] *Advice to His Grace* (1682)
[111] A factor noted in Chapter Four.
[112] *A Hew and Cry after Blood & Murther* (1681)

Elizabeth had died leaving no designated successor, were Charles II to expire with the crisis unresolved the consequences could be grave. Whigs sought to concentrate minds on the immediacy of the problem: if Charles died tomorrow, then England would have a Catholic King. Even Tory broadsides noted the King's aging, but concluded with pride that: "his Majesty was none of those that grew more timorous with age, but that rather he grew the more resolute the nearer he was to his grave."[113] His Majesty would remain strong in the face of Whig pressure and demands.

This factor of age took on an interesting new dimension when related to Monmouth. "May his most Royal Father live to see, Him...obtain sole Victory. And be a pattern to his Royal Son."[114] The expressed desire is that Charles II live long enough to tutor Monmouth, allowing the Duke to follow in his father's footsteps - although whether in the capacity of King is left unsaid. Certainly the (relatively) advanced years of Charles II were used by Whig writers as a contrast to Monmouth, who was often styled 'Young Jemmy' or as 'the lad'. For example: "Young Jemmy is a Youth, who thinks its no transgression, to stand up for the Truth and Protestant Profession."[115]

Yet this trend is not as straightforward as it would at first appear. When the above quotation was written and published in 1681 Monmouth was 32 years old, hardly making him an adolescent. However the point was that Monmouth appeared young in relation to both Charles, and perhaps just as importantly, to the Duke of York. The King's brother was a mere three years younger than Charles. Accentuating Monmouth's youth became a deliberate Whig tactic: allowing the Duke to appear as an attractive and vigorously youthful counter-weight to his aging Catholic rival. Ironically, York's relatively advanced years may have counted in his favour: for his age seemed to lessen the possibility for a Catholic dynasty ruling in perpetuity.

---

[113] *The E. of Shaftsbury's Expedient for Setling the Nation* (1681), p5
[114] *Upon the Departure of His Grace* (1679)
[115] *Young Jemmy An Excellent New Ballad* (1681)

Given that loyalty formed a central theme in Whig pamphlets, the response of Whig polemicists when Monmouth was demonstratively out of favour with the King becomes of increased importance. The two clearest examples of such a situation came during the period in 1679 when Monmouth was exiled, and then again three years later when the Duke was arrested.

When the Duke was forced to depart, bound for Holland and into exile, there could be no pretence that this constituted anything other than a breach between the King and the Duke. As was shown earlier, Whig propagandists adopted a tactic of lament. This banishment, they maintained, was a dreadful mistake: "That King's unsafe...whose strongest Pillar's lost, and leans, alone...That King art thou, great Charles, now Monmouth's gone."[116] The nation was left exposed to danger for Monmouth had, it was said, "Atlas-like"[117] borne the weight of the Kingdom on his shoulders. Importantly this increased national threat was expressed through the renewed personal vulnerability of Charles to popish conspirators. Monmouth's exile conformed to, or was represented as conforming to, the pattern of devious papist plotting: "He, who alone could their dire Acts prevent, must be remov'd that so your Breast might be, more open to each daring enemy."[118]

Such exile texts attempted to increase Monmouth's perceived worth to the nation. They implored England to pray for divine protection of Monmouth, that he may in turn come back to protect the nation. The time had arrived, according to Whig writers, for the people to state openly the regard in which the Duke was held (and in so doing demonstrate the strength of 'opposition' support). For Monmouth: "Next Heav'n and Charles we trust in Thee alone...May Charles as well in his true Monmouth trust."[119] Accordingly, the curtailment of Monmouth's exile was interpreted as signifying a rapprochement between the King and his

---

[116] J.F, *Englands Lamentation for the Duke* (1679)
[117] J.F, *Englands Lamentation for the Duke* (1679)
[118] J.F, *Englands Lamentation for the Duke* (1679)
[119] *A Poem of Congratulation on the Happy Return of His Grace James Duke of Monmouth* (1679)

son - the end of an exile from his father. One Whig poet declared that all were, "Happy since warlike Monmouth long Exil'd, is to his Royal Father reconcil'd."[120]

The Tory reaction upon Monmouth's return was to call the Duke to heel. They seized upon the idea of exile, not from England but from his own father. Endeavouring to exploit this notion one Tory writer imparted some advice to the young Duke: "After a long Exile from your Father's House, and Heart...immediately fly into the Embraces of your Father; who, I doubt not, hath Arms open to receive you, if you came to Him with a Heart truly Penitent."[121] The operative word being 'penitent'. Monmouth had shown himself deficient in loyalty and obedience, he may now have a second chance to redeem his character, but, to do so, genuine repentance for his actions was required. Monmouth appeared in some Tory literature almost as the figure of the prodigal son: a testament to the mercy of his father perhaps, but nonetheless a rather pathetic wretch, certainly not a model Prince. This notion is particularly prevalent after the Rye House Plot, the absolute downfall of Monmouth's relations with the King: "Pitty the frailties of his Youth, & accept of his unfeigned submission and sincere Repentance...voluntarily, to lay himself at his Fathers Feet."[122]

Yet even after Rye House, Charles forgave Monmouth: his execution was avoided and (eventually) another foreign exile imposed instead. For Whigs, the King's repeated refusal to damn Monmouth irrevocably was a continued source of hope. While the possibility of reconciliation between father and son remained, might not the King one day be similarly moved toward his child's succession? Thus when the Duke unexpectedly returned to London in October 1680 his movements about the city were accompanied by appreciative crowds (and scribes) and anticipation grew of an imminent resolution between King and Duke. In this sense, as long as Monmouth remained alive, the Whig cause would never completely expire.

---

[120] *Englands Happiness Restored* (1679)
[121] *A Seasonable Invitation* (1681), p2
[122] *The Happy Return, or, An Account of his Grace the Duke of Monmouths Surrendring himself* (1683), p2

The second moment when Monmouth was not simply out of favour, but publicly rebuked, came with his arrest. In September 1682 Monmouth was arrested (albeit only briefly). Significantly one account detailing these events felt compelled to issue a disclaimer, absolving the author for any reactions his words might provoke: "The following Narrative is not calculated with a design to inflame parties...but an innocent endeavour to gratifie the inquisitive."[123] The flames of the Popish Plot may have been largely extinguished, but Monmouth, it would seem, was still an incendiary figure.

Ostensibly the Duke was arrested because "of several Riotous and Tumultuous Assemblies caused by his Grace."[124] His recent tour of the north-west had appeared to many little short of incitement to rebellion, and had proved the final straw. Whig accounts of the arrest were at pains to highlight that no duress had been necessary, that Monmouth had read the warrant and then, "readily and Cheerfully submitted to...and immediately repaired towards London."[125] Whig writers used this supposed phlegmatic indifference in the face of adversity to imply a moral impunity on the part of the Duke, which foretold that the current setback would be merely temporary and would soon be reversed.

The Whig press put on a carefully staged show of bewilderment. Only the Tories could misinterpret such an innocent tour: "the Malice and Rage is so great against the Protestant Religion, that it blinds them...[otherwise] they would not have accused such a Person on so frivolous occasions."[126] If thousands in Chester had broken the peace by crying for God's blessing to be upon Charles II, the Protestant Religion, and the Protestant Duke, what, asked Whigs, could be wrong with such a display? The name of the King was thereby skilfully weaved into the defence of Monmouth.

In explaining the arrest, Tory pamphleteers did not focus exclusively upon the progression through Staffordshire and Cheshire, but rather detailed a litany of Monmouth's 'crimes'.

---

[123] *A true and impartial account of the Duke of Monmouth's being taken into Custody* (1682), p1
[124] *A true and impartial account* (1682), p1
[125] *A true and impartial account* (1682), p3
[126] *The Duke of Monmouth's Case* (1682)

Chief among these was attempting to interfere with the succession, "with which neither He, no nor the Parliament, have any right to meddle."[127] Significantly, among the grievances levelled against the Duke was the production of Whig broadsides. It was asserted that Whigs acted, "in consort with his Grace to roar out Treason in Ballads."[128] Monmouth, it seemed, was finally to be held accountable for the propaganda in his praise.

Overall it becomes clear that the symbolic potential of Monmouth was used in Whig tracts to appeal to popular sentiment and to apply pressure on the King to move in a 'Whiggish' direction. This endeavour was attempted by presenting the Duke as an alternative version of Charles II: a wish-fulfilling embodiment of youthful English Protestantism. As the son of the King, Monmouth also supplied the Whigs with a veneer of loyalist respectability. Dangerously oppositional tracts could present themselves as being no more than praise for a charismatic member of the royal family.

The Duke of Monmouth is the ultimate case of a media created 'persona'. He was the twig on which the imagery of visions and desires could crystallise their assertions. His importance in the print debate is therefore disproportionate to, or, at least, not dependent upon his role as an actor on the political stage. The 'invention' of Monmouth is of crucial significance: Monmouth's presence as a component and consideration in this debate altered the political topography of the crisis. Whigs always had the 'Monmouth card' in reserve to play if need be: the threat of throwing full support behind his pretensions to the crown promised, at the very least, a disputed succession, and, in all probability, a rebellion or even a civil war. The more popular Monmouth became the more potent this threat appeared. Of course most Whigs had no wish see 'King Monmouth' enthroned, but the very existence of

---

[127]   *The D- of M-s Case Stated in Cheshire, Somewhat differing from that Printed in Town* (1682)
[128]   *The D- of M-s Case* (1682)

this loose cannon greatly strengthened their hand and leverage over the King. Therefore Whig writers deployed their arts in puffing up Monmouth, offering him to the English people as their new hero and champion.

Moreover, the Duke provides a useful example of the effects that propaganda can have. Printed pamphlets were more than mere idle words: the Duke gained a personal following during the Exclusion Crisis directly as a consequence of the lionising polemic in his honour. This heady sense of momentum led him, perhaps, into believing too much of his own myth and beckoned him toward calamity. The tragic final act of 'Monmouth's story' came at the battle of Sedgemoor and at the 'Bloody assizes' that followed.

Chapter Seven: Charles II and the Duke of York

This chapter concerns representations of James, Duke of York, in Exclusion-era print literature. Of particular significance are the multiple and complex ways in which references to Charles II were incorporated into arguments that centred on his brother. The symbolic power of the King, as we will see, was exploited both by those who engaged in attacking and in defending the Duke. The familial bond between these two royal brothers therefore became the stuff of political interpretation.

Our discussion is divided into two main sections: (i) the first examines James and Catholicism, and seeks to explicate how York's religious faith featured in the arguments of pamphleteers and what implications this held for Charles; (ii) the second section relates to James the man, and considers representations of his character and of his relations with the King.

James and Catholicism

(i) The Popish Plot

The effect that the furore over the Popish Plot had on perceptions of Charles II and of the Duke of York was considerable. Fear of a Catholic succession was widespread and deep rooted in the late 1670s and early 1680s. Literature from this period jostles with a myriad of nightmarish scenarios predicated on a papist monarch taking the throne: mass conversion to Catholicism, destruction of the Church of England, the massacre of Protestants in their sleep, a French take-over of the country, the utter loss of liberties (including Parliament), the ripping up of Magna Carta, and the introduction of absolutist monarchy.[1] Tracts dealing with the Popish Plot both tapped into this nexus of fear and, in so doing, perpetuated and propagated it. The thrust of these powerful suspicions of a Popish Plot was directed against

---

[1] Fears which were evident in texts such as John Tillotson, *A Sermon Preached November 5. 1678 at St. Margarets Westminster* (1678), p18-36

the King's brother. How Charles II was included, and indeed exempted, from such arguments relating to James is a vital aspect of contemporary polemic.

It was widely held that the intention of the plot had been to,"Deprive, Depose, Deject, and Disinherit our said Sovereign Lord the King."[2] This was a Catholic conspiracy which sought to separate England from her Protestant faith by striking at the King personally. It was not a plot against the Duke of York. York was, in a sense, the odd man out in "the discovery of that horrid Plot, both against his Majesties Person, and the whole Kingdom."[3] The Plot, as it was taken to exist in most pamphlets, was directed against every subject in the Kingdom except the King's brother himself and his Catholic interest.

Although the 'facts' of the plot were fluid and subject to change, there was a general understanding that Charles II was to be assassinated in order that James might take his place. If the death of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey had been decisive in catapulting the plot to national prominence, then, as will be shown, it was the accusations against Edward Coleman which sucked James into the vortex. The charges against the secretary to the Duchess of York (and the former secretary to the Duke himself), brought the plot uncomfortably near to James's door. Suddenly questions were raised over York's conduct and complicity in a plot against Charles. The letters written by Coleman, and seized as part of the plot investigation, were published in their original form[4], but just as importantly the salacious details that they contained were picked out and recycled into countless poems, ballads, and tracts. Widely interpreted as an indictment of Coleman himself, these letters also seemed to implicate James and, perhaps, even the King himself.

The question of York's relationship to the plot became an issue of increasing importance. Consequently the relationship between the two royal brothers also took on new significance. At Coleman's trial the Lord Chief Justice observed of his letters: "The Duke's name is often mentioned...sometimes it appears...against his will, and sometimes he might know of it...You

---

[2] *The Tryal of Edward Coleman. Gent. For Conspiring the Death of the King* (1678), p8
[3] Gilbert Burnet, *A Letter, written upon the Discovery of the late Plot* (1678), p1
[4] *Mr Coleman's Two Letters to Monsieur l'Chaise. The French King's confessor* (1678), p1-23

do seem to...use the Duke of York's name to drive on the Catholick cause."[5] This observation perfectly embodies the ambiguity of the situation. Where could the line of James's complicity be drawn? Was he in league against his own brother the King? James's religion expanded the plausibility of such theories: "when they [English Roman Catholics] once renounced their Religion, no wonder they should renounce their Nation, and their Prince too."[6] The Duke of York's allegiance to Charles II was now exposed to doubt and was a matter for discussion and conjecture.

The Tory press attempted to protect James from this onslaught. The Duke of York had not been part of any plot against Charles: "The Duke gave neither Birth nor life to the Plot...[moreover he was even] clear'd by Dr. Oates."[7] Had James known of the scheme against his brother he would have ensured that the plotters were "frustrated of their Design."[8] Moreover the Duke had, claimed Tory pamphleteers, also been a victim and a target of the plot: "Their design...is to destroy him after they have killed his Brother...unless he will give assurance that he will ruine the Protestants of these Nations."[9]

Yet, in a sense, such statements made York into an unwitting accomplice of the plotters. For, as Parliament itself declared in April 1679, the mere fact of James's Catholic faith attracted and encouraged the activity of plotting against Charles.[10] Even if York knew nothing in advance of the specifics of the Popish Plot such activity was nonetheless engaged in on his behalf by his co-religionists. The Duke's faith, almost irrespective of his own actions, appeared to render him a party to subversion.

To counteract York's guilt by Catholic association, Tory writers often stressed his brotherly love for Charles: "the Duke was a Good Catholic, yet he had a tender Affection to the King...[there was] No hope of the Dukes Compliance...[he would never] consent to the

---

[5] *The Tryal of Edward Coleman* (1678), p74
[6] *The Tryal of Edward Coleman* (1678), p8
[7] *The Case Put, Concerning the Succession of His Royal Highness the Duke of York* (1679), p12
[8] *The Case Put, Concerning the Succession* (1679), p14
[9] *The Case of Protestants in England under a Popish Prince* (1681), p29
[10] *England's Safety: or the Two Unanimous Votes* (1679)

Assassination of the King, his Brother, Massacre...[or the] Firing of his Towns."[11] References to massacres and to the destruction of towns summoned up the spectre of the 1640s; an era redolent for Tories of royal unity and victimisation. The Popish Plot, like the Civil Wars before it, had not been a conspiracy against the King only, but also against "the Royal Family of the Stuarts...condemn'd to be cut off, Root and Branch; and namely the King, Duke of York, and Prince of Aurange."[12] James hereby appears in solidarity against the plot, standing shoulder to shoulder with Charles and even with that icon of European Protestantism William of Orange.

By contrast, in oppositional pamphlets the Duke frequently appears as a definitive symbol of Catholicism; consequently located and considered by pamphleteers in a separate category to the King. What was new after the Popish Plot was the extent to which anti-popish notions tangibly coalesced around the Duke: making James the visage and paradigm of national anxiety. Such a rhetorical approach enabled Whig writers to aggressively decry the plot, the government, and even the Duke, without explicitly attacking Charles II. It was precisely the enemies of the King who were the declared target of such polemic. James's Catholicism had been apparent since 1673 (at least), yet it was not until 1678-9 that the full-force of Protestant suspicion and antipathy toward Rome latched onto York with a ferocity it had not had previously. What the Popish Plot did was to open the Duke - his actions and his character - to scrutiny as never before, within a framework of apparent national emergency. Therefore the heat created by the plot facilitated a fusion of popular popish prejudice and James personally: unleashing the whirlwind of anti-Catholicism upon him.

Whig writers sought to empower themselves by defining 'support' in relation to the King. If, they maintained, you were a well-wisher of Charles you should support the efforts of Whigs to fully investigate the plot. Yet, increasingly this loyalty equation was extended and applied to York. To follow the Duke of York, said some Whigs, was to accept and endorse

---

[11] *The Case Put, Concerning the Succession* (1679), p14
[12] *The Case Put, Concerning the Succession* (1679), p14

popery: "If you stand for the D' Interest, do you not undoubtedly...stand for the Pope."[13] Whig scribes progressively personalised the danger and centred it firmly on James. For Tory propagandists it was imperative to break the association between York and his faith, and to prevent him from appearing synonymous with popery and nothing else. In this effort evoking the name of the King became critical. To support Charles II was to support his brother: "those who are obedient to His Majesty, will love the Duke of York; because the Duke's Principle are (as all good Subjects ought to be) to serve God, and Honour the King."[14]

However the close association between James and Charles could be made to work against the King. York was used by some Whig writers, as we will see, to tar the reputation of his brother. Particularly damaging to James (and by extension to Charles) had been the revelations of the Duke's interactions with France. The Coleman correspondence, which proved secret negotiations had taken place between the Duke and the French court, also stated that: "the interests of our King, and in a more particular manner, of my more immediate Master the Duke, and his Most Christian Majesty [Louis XIV] be so inseperably united, that it was impossible to divide them without destroying them all."[15] This, together with the similar revelations made the returning ambassador to Paris Ralph Montagu, seemed to condemn both brothers alike.[16]

Yet the moral outrage generated by such accusations often appears selective, with James the one singled out for particular and disproportionate rebuke.[17] James was made the lightning rod for suspicions of his brother and of the English court. Charles emerged negatively from these accounts to be sure, but rarely with the same degree of damage inflicted on York. Whig pamphlets usually left open the possibility that Charles II may

---

[13] *A Most Serious Expostulation with Several of My Fellow-Citizens* (1680), p2
[14] John Garbrand, *The Royal Favourite Clear'd with an admonition to the Roman Catholics and an address to His Royal Highness. By a barrister of the Inner-Temple* (1682), pB3
[15] *Mr Coleman's Two Letters to Monsieur l'Chaise* (1678), p3
[16] Hutton, *Charles II*, p364-365
[17] Similarly, after Montagu had made his accusations it was the Earl of Danby, rather than Charles, who received much of the most heated criticism.

change policy direction; redeeming himself by adopting a more appropriate stance to England's neighbours. By contrast opposition tracts rarely, if ever, allowed for the possibility of a 'better' Duke emerging in the future. If Charles was bad, then James was worse. Fundamentally, it was not in the interests of Whigs to criticise the King too severely, whereas the papist Duke could be lambasted with relative impunity.

The inherent danger with the Tory tactic of fostering a close association between King and Duke - of making Charles into a life-jacket with which to save James - was that both royal brothers would drown. Perhaps the best example of James proving a liability which damned the King comes in the central revelation of the Coleman letters: of the discussions, orchestrated by James, to seek French money in exchange for dispensing with Parliament and encouraging Catholic conversion. In this correspondence, publicly released during the crisis, James gave advice to the French on how to win Charles II: "nothing could so firmly establish our Interest with the King my Brother, as that very same offer of the help of his Purse, by which means...I should be enabled to perswade the Dissolving of the Parliament."[18] The suggestion by James that the French could, and should, buy off the English King injured the reputation of both King and Duke. Crucially these and other revelations were seized upon by the Duke's opponents to illustrate what a new Jacobean reign would entail.

Part of the difficulty for the Duke's defenders was that the existence of the plot was so universally believed. It developed a momentum of its own, becoming increasingly difficult for the government to deny, and, once the plot had become gospel truth, it was harder to refute, simultaneously, York's alleged complicity with it.[19] Therefore the Popish Plot helped to propagate a black myth of James, a myth which conformed to well-worn Catholic stereotyping, of autocratic and arbitrary inclinations and of secret French scheming. Much of the rest of the Exclusion Crisis would be spent by Tory writers attempting to discredit this perception and disable its potency. In this regard, appropriation of the King's name

---

[18] *Mr Coleman's Two Letters to Monsieur l'Chaise.* (1678), p25
[19] Indeed, in its initial stages Danby may have fostered reports of the plot for political ends, before rapidly discovering the dangers of playing with fire.

remained central. Vindicating the Duke was, however, no easy task. Even in 1681 the Earl of Shaftsbury could stand before the House of Lords and explicitly state, that, "this plot breaks out, plainly headed by the Duke, his interest and his design."[20]

It was in countering this kind of damaging assertion against James – fuelled by Popish Plot fear – that made the later Rye House Plot such a propaganda coup for Tories: "lately detected a torrid Conspiracy, against the Lives of the King and the Duke of York, the established Government of Church and States, and the Liberties of the English Nation."[21] Rye House, supposedly planned by dissenters and republicans, flipped the political situation on its head: reversing the roles of villain and victim derived from the Popish Plot, and placing Charles II and the Duke of York firmly in the same position and on the same side.

(ii) Protestant History and the Catholic Prince

All parties engaged in the Exclusion propaganda battle made reference to and evoked national memory in their arguments. In particular interpreting the biographies of the two royal brothers, and setting these interpretations against a sense of national destiny, was a recurring rhetorical ploy. The Civil Wars cast an inescapable shadow over the Exclusion Crisis. For Tories, recent history acted as a warning to those inclined to meddle in royal affairs: disaster and armed conflict would be the inevitable result of such impertinent folly in the 1680s, just as it had been in the 1640s. Those enraged by the prospect of a Catholic monarch should reflect, maintained Tory writers, that it had been Protestant fanatics who caused the last disaster: "I cannot find so much as one Papist in the whole list of Regicides."[22]

The Whig press also evoked historical memory in making contemporary political points regarding Charles and James. Nothing, it was claimed, could better demonstrate the danger posed to Charles II by Catholicism than England's own history. The truth of this was self-

---

[20] *A Speech lately made by a noble peer of the realm* (1681), p2
[21] *The Presentment of the Grand Jury for the Town and Borough* (1685)
[22] *The Case Put, Concerning the Succession* (1679), p36

evident in the red-letter days of national memory: the Armada, the gun powder treason, the Irish rebellion (each of which was frequently re-visited in Exclusion-era tracts). One episode from England's past, however, was given especial attention by Whig writers: the reign of Queen Mary.

The preoccupation with this period was less to do with Charles than with his brother. Mary could function as a cautionary tale directed against James. "Is it possible you can forgot Queen Mary's dayes? The number of Martyrs that then suffered? Enough to shew you the sad effect of a popish successor's coming."[23] The era of Mary was therefore explicitly linked to the current crisis: "there were never such hopes of [Papist] success since the Death of our Queen Mary, as now in our days."[24] The point was that this historical analogy brought the debate forcibly back to James in terms massively disadvantageous to his cause. Other moments embedded in the national consciousness demonstrated equally well the Catholic menace threatening Charles, but none so neatly painted James into a corner. Depicting James as a latter day Mary Tudor offered up a new rallying call: "no Queen Mary in Breeches."[25] The English knew that nothing good would come of a popish successor, for they had experience of one already: "never forget the cruel Bonfires of Queen Maries short life."[26]

Moreover the linking of Mary with James also worked to circumvent Charles II. For the objections of the current King could be countermanded with reference to royal history. Charles II may trust James, but English history suggested his subjects should not. The Mary parallel was doubly dangerous to James because some believed that Edward VI had altered the line of succession in favour of Lady Jane Grey (to exclude Mary from the throne).[27] The

---

[23] *A Most Serious Expostulation with Several of My Fellow-Citizens* (1680), p2
[24] *The Tryal of Edward Coleman* (1678), p69
[25] *Vox Populi Vox Dei; or, Englands general lamentation* (1681), p1
[26] *The Established Test, In order to the Security of His Majesties Sacred Person* (1679), p47
[27] Certainly Robert Ferguson and other writers used English history in this way to cloud the issue of royal succession; *A Letter to a Person of Honour* (1680), p3

precedent of which, if established, would enormously strengthen the hand of exclusionists against loyalist arguments.

Tory polemicists attempted to provide reassurance regarding a future under James by reference to the Duke's personal history. In other words, to extrapolate from the past his virtues and achievements and project them forward in order to dispel concerns about his future Kingship; indeed, even, to predict a glorious new Jacobean age. First and foremost James' part in the Civil Wars had to be interpreted. It was a standard aspect of biographical accounts of the Duke's life produced in the late 1670s and early 1680s to devote considerable space to this formative period. His experiences during the 1640s - of capture, escape and exile - were woven into these narratives. The young Prince was depicted as coping bravely throughout, even when he fell into the hands of "the English Attila"[28], before "miraculously escaping...[having to] forgo his Native Land; and cross the swellling flood."[29] These texts read as reverential adventure stories, designed to generate sympathy and impress the reader with the fortitude of the young hero: "early he thrust his budding glories out."[30]

For Tory propagandists the main problem with mythologizing James's experience of the Civil War was one of differentiation. There was a danger that the Duke of York would appear merely as a pale imitation of his brother. Charles's own (more dramatic) exploits of capture, escape, and exile during the 1640s and 1650s were well established. Moreover Charles, unlike James, had actually been in command of royalist forces during the 1650s. Indeed, since the Restoration key moments from the King's past had been carefully woven into collective memory through the projection of royal imagery.[31] The retrospective placing of the young Prince James at his brother's side during these momentous times enabled the Duke, partially at least, to share in the reflected glory of the King's celebrated past. Yet, at

---

[28] *Day-Fatality: or, some observation of Days, Lucky and Unlucky, concluding with some remarques upon the Fourteenth of October* (1679), p4
[29] *A faithful compendium, of the birth, education, heroick exploits & victories of His Royal Highness* (1679), p2
[30] *A Congratulatory Poem on His Royal Highnesses restauration* (1684)
[31] See Chapter Five.

core, this was a story of national redemption very much personalised around Charles II. It was the definitive story of the King. At best James could hope to emerge from this 'Restoration myth' as a Catholic, and thus less desirable, version of Charles II.

Therefore, between 1679-83 a recapitulative account of York's life was offered by Tory literature. James's apologists focused, by necessity, on the post-Restoration era – the dramatic cycle of civil war and Restoration had effectively been staked out as the territory of Charles II. These biographical narratives purported to acquaint the reader with James and to guide them through his many glories. Those daring to pontificate upon the royal fate of James, "must be acquainted first..[with he] whom all ought t'admire."[32] The purpose of these biographic texts was firstly to recast notions surrounding the Duke before opposition assertions against him set too firmly in public imagination, and, secondly, to sketch a 'positive' identity or persona for James which would be separate from that of Charles II.

Propagandists sympathetic to the Duke seized, for instance, upon the example of the Fire of London. Superlative-laden praise for York's fire-fighting heroics had been a repeated theme in printed literature dating from the late 1660s, and the spirit of these narratives was revived in the late 1670s. On the night of the fire in 1666 the Duke had: "exposed his person to a thousand dangers...[with his own hands] breaking open Pipes and Conduits...reach'd Buckets as nimbly as any of the common people....for several Nights and Days (without sleep) was seen in all parts, giving the necessary Orders."[33] Such descriptions portrayed a diligent and brave Prince, working ceaselessly for his people. The Great Fire of London represented a major moment in the life of the nation, the memory of which resonated throughout the reign (including during Exclusion Crisis). Crucially, the efforts at fire fighting were, and remained in the early 1680s, more closely associated with James than with Charles II. Therefore the episode offered Yorkists the chance to create a heroic persona for James which was distinctive, and existed independently of that of his brother.

---

[32] *A Congratulatory Poem on His Royal Highnesses restauration* (1684)
[33] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p12

However, in the very different context of 1678-83 these Fire of London narratives may also have acted metaphorically: England was now faced by another type of conflagration, a political crisis, which James again was valiantly endeavouring to beat back. In 1666 the fire had been allowed to destroy the capital city, this time however, unless checked, the whole nation could be subsumed in its flames.

Whig writers, in response, alleged that the fire had been the work of Catholics, and Charles Blout even went so far as to dispute James's actions:

"in our great Fire of London in 66 (if you will believe either Mr Bedlow's Relation, or the Account which was then given in to the Committee of Parliament appointed for that purpose)...There is one most eminent great Papist, who in the Time of that Fire pretended to secure many of the Incendiaries, but secretly suffer'd them all to escape...for a Popish King, or a Popish Successor, cannot but rejoice in the Flames of such a too powerful City."[34]

This kind of sentiment sought to revise and undermine the memory of James as hero, a task made easier when Charles and James were not paired together (as they were not in fire narratives). Dealing with York's achievements individually from Charles's allowed Tory propagandists to set out a distinctive Ducal persona but, in so doing, York was rendered an easier target for Whig polemic, which could launch excoriating criticism of him without condemnation of the King.

The second episode from the post-Restoration era which became a significant component in the hagiographic construction of 'James' was the Dutch war. Again, the war marked a point of differentiation with Charles. This conflict was used to depict the Duke as a patriotic hero. For most of the 1660s James had operated as High Admiral to the English navy, and he was heavily involved in the conduct of the second Dutch war. Imagery of the sea was particularly prevalent in representations of James: "This most Great Prince is extreamly

---

[34] Blout, *An appeal from the country to the City* (1679), p25

Illustrious in Sea-Matters."[35] The Duke of York was depicted as the protector of England's coastline. Thus during his exile in Holland the seas around Britain had, it was said, become more dangerous: "The Turks! who ne're so insolent were grown T'approach our British-coasts, till you were gone."[36] His return to office in 1684 was, therefore, marked as a moment of triumph by Tory pamphleteers; once again the fleet celebrated "Our English Scipio to whom Rome's must yield."[37]

The image of the patriotic seafaring hero of the Dutch war was contrasted with York's present treatment: "I say the people ought not to forgot the many Heroick and Valiant actions he has done for his Countrey, how bolding and willingly he has Ventured his Blood and Life...[yet now faces the] fate of being Banish'd by those people, to whom he had brought the Crown of Victory."[38] The texts focusing on military bravery sought to re-ignite the nation's admiration for their Prince: James as misunderstood patriot, whose triumphs against the Dutch were now being wilfully obscured. York's apologists asserted that, irrespective of his alleged popery, James understood the interests of England on the international stage. The Duke appeared as a more active and dynamic presence than Charles II; while the King remained safe in London, James had commanded the fleet in battle against the Dutch.

It is easy for the historian – influenced by post-Glorious Revolution hindsight - to overlook the regard with which York's generalship was prized prior to 1688. While Charles II was, occasionally, portrayed by pamphleteers as a model of military valour (and the Duke of Monmouth was frequently styled so) no figure on the English political landscape enjoyed such a close association with martial spirit and military exploit, on both land and sea, as the Duke of York. His achievements on the battlefield were recounted and proclaimed: "How oft our Mighty hero did Excell in Glorious Acts! How oft...His Enemies did Defeat...But all

---

[35] John Gibbon, *Prince-protecting providences, or, a Collection of some historical passages* (1682), p5
[36] *To His Royal Highness the Duke upon His arrival* (1679)
[37] *To His Royal Highness the Duke of York, upon His return to the care and management of the Navy of England* (1684)
[38] *A Letter from a person of Quality in Scotland, to a person of honour in London* (1681), p2

His Godlike Acts no Tongue can tell."[39] This image of James was rendered as deliberately evocative of Henry V and the pantheon of English military heroes. In this sense, military greatness was a distinguishing feature of James's character, marking him out from Charles II.

Paradoxically, in addition to asserting James's heroics during the Dutch war, his supporters also maintained that the war had been undertaken against York's advice.[40] In part these assertions insulated him from the inglorious outcome of the conflict. Yet it was also beneficial for the Duke to be presented as resistant to war against the Dutch, a fellow Protestant nation and a co-resister of French power. Such denials therefore provided James with anti-French credentials.[41] He was no stooge of Louis XIV, but rather a Prince who had already proved that he would pursue a fiercely independent foreign policy, unlike, perhaps, Charles II. The exaltation of James over the Dutch war could serve as a veiled attack on Charles II for embarking on the ill-advised war. It was, however, maintained that whatever York's initial misgivings, once hostilities had commenced he fulfilled his patriotic duty estimably: "exceeding all the Admirals in Christendom, as much by his bravery, as he did by his birth."[42] Thus the Dutch war was presented as proof of both his military genius and of his willingness to follow an anti-French foreign policy. Both of which were virtues absent, or at least open to question, in the character of Charles II.

It was vital that Tory writers attempted to offset or invalidate the suggestion of a French bias in both royal brothers. This was no easy task when a letter, apparently written by James himself, was in the public domain stating: "his [Louis XIV] Interest and mine...so clearly linckt together, that, those that opposed the one, should be lockt upon as Enemies to the other."[43] The Tory counter argument, which referenced the memory of the Dutch wars and other military exploits, claimed that far from being infected by French influence James alone

---

[39] *On the Arrival of His Royal Highness the Duke into England* (1680)
[40] *A Letter from a person of Quality in Scotland* (1681), p13
[41] A theme which will be dealt with more thoroughly later in this chapter.
[42] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p13
[43] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p24

had the requisite strength to stand up to Louis XIV. "I believe it may do my Country good, whose Interest, as well as Glory...to have a Prince of Martial Spirit Reign Over Us, by whose Valour our almost withered Lawrels may once more be planted in French-ground...with the Bloud of our implacable Enemies."[44] This kind of emphatic rebuttal was designed to undermine the notion that a Catholic monarch meant a Francophile monarch. The concept of James as a military hero capable of taking on the mighty French also enabled the Duke to offer England something which Charles II did not. The extent to which Tory writers were willing to use the French 'other' in an effort to unite the nation in loyalty behind York is significant: "Like Mouse and Frog the King and Commons 'gree, and the French Kite their Discords glad to see: But as you're fearful to be made a prey, know 'tis your interest now to obey!"[45]

One problem with James's history of anti-French military engagement was that this notion, so vaunted by Tories, was based in part on the Duke's fighting of the French during the late 1650s: "witness Spain, what worthy Praises there his Vallious won, his very name made haughty France to tremble."[46] Yet, while it was uncontested that in fighting for Spain James fought against the French, it was also true that in doing so he fought against English troops: "the power of France, nor English Rebels (for at that time they could be term'd no less) there in league durst brave his noble fury."[47] This placed Tory writers in an awkward position. For while these English soldiers of the 1650s had operated under a Cromwellian command, they were nonetheless still Englishmen. Evoking this memory may well have received a favourable response from James's Tory supporters, but its expression was likely to have a polarising effect on a wider audience. James's participation, while in the service of a foreign Catholic Prince, in the killing of English soldiers abroad blunted the edge of the story's propaganda value. Opposition to the Dutch war therefore offered Tories a more useable anti-

---

[44] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p1
[45] *A Poem on the happy return of His Royal Highness from Scotland* (1680)
[46] *A faithful compendium* (1679), p2
[47] *A faithful compendium* (1679), p2

French citation from James's past. Accordingly Tory texts made more frequent reference to the Duke's supposed Dutch war heroics than they did to his military engagements with the French.[48]

If comparisons between the royal brothers in which Charles emerged unfavourably were used to bolster the identification of James as being anti-French, the same can also be said in reverse. The marriage, and Protestant dynastic alliance, of James's daughter Mary to William of Orange was presented by the King's champions as evidence of Charles II's resolve to resist Louis XIV's expansionist ambitions. Mary, "was not to be lookt upon as the Dukes Daughter, but as the Kings, and a child of State, and so the Dukes consent not be much considered in the disposal of her, but the Interest only of State."[49] Royal propagandists thereby sought to establish Charles II as a block on France, even at the expense of James's reputation. York is rendered either as an obstacle to the marriage or as an irrelevance to it: "He [Charles II] called his Nephew the Prince of Orange into England...and gave him in Marriage the Lady Mary, against the will, as was believed, of the Duke of York...which methinks is a sufficient testimony that this King withdrew himself entirely from France, and...the French so understood it."[50] The King was no one's creature: not the French King's nor that of his brother the Duke.

(iii) James and Catholicism

"If a man Writes, or Speaks, or Reasons against them, he is presently a favourer of the Papists, a Lessener of the Plot, and run down with Nonsense and Clamour."[51]

---

[48] For example, *A Letter from a person of Quality in Scotland* (1681), p2
[49] *Mr Coleman's Two Letters to Monsieur l'Chaise* (1678), p10
[50] *Reflections upon the conduct of the King of Great Britain* (1682), p3
[51] *The Case Put, Concerning the Succession* (1679), p37

How the Duke's apologists set about the task of defending a papist Prince to a Protestant nation is important. One way in which Yorkist texts attempted to do so with reference to Charles II, was by outlining a 'royalist' identity incorporating support for both brothers. Defending the Duke, it was claimed, was a defence of monarchy itself. Conversely, those who attacked James were condemned as anti-monarchical: "Those that do hate a King will loath this Prince...faithful Subject prove, Then Charles and James wou'd both receive y' in love."[52]

In this way Tory writers sought to break free from the strangle-hold of popish association. "Still the old cheat, religion is the cry, and made the ram to batter Monarchy."[53] The word "still" is telling. The charge was heavy with civil war overtones: the insinuation being that Exclusion represented a continuation of the radical ideas of the 1640s and 1650s. Therefore within Tory literature there was a clear effort to argue that opponents to Charles II (and to James) were political and religious dissenters infused with republican passions: "What Previledge has a Phanatick to blow up Government, more than a Jesuite?"[54]

Whig scribes deliberately sought to drive a conceptual wedge between Charles and James; to break apart the Tory's polarising framework that divided the nation into essentially civil war categories of rebels and royalists. For Whig writers the issue of exclusion in particular divided the brothers, turning on the Duke, not on considerations relating to Charles. Tory propagandists tried to exploit this Whig line of argument. It was a gross impertinence to treat Charles II, as Whigs did, as if he were already dead: "Nay, where's their Love to our present King; since they thus consider him as if he stood in specie in Westminster-Abbey and not at White-Hall with the Scepter in his Hand."[55] Moreover, the Exclusion debate was concerned with an alleged, but not uncontested, problem (James's Catholicism) based on a future scenario (him becoming King): "why must there be all this stir about the D. whom 'tis

---

[52] *A Poem on the happy return* (1680)
[53] *On His Royal Highness's Return* (1679)
[54] *The Case Put, Concerning the Succession* (1679), p38
[55] L'Estrange, *Theosebia, or, The Churches advocate Endeavouring the promotion of loyalty to our King* (1683), p23

more than probable he may not survive his Brother, for whose long Life, I am persuaded, he, as well as all honest Subjects, does heartily Pray."[56] Rather than fixate on the Duke, Whigs should demonstrate their loyalty in the present to the King.

In any case, Tory polemicists asserted that the policy of exclusion was as much about the King as it was about the Duke. For once the precedent was established empowering parliamentary interference with the line of succession, then the institution of monarchy was sunk: "Disinheriting the Duke, and Deposing the King...[are] Coupled, that you shall very rarely find the one without the Other...The King no safer, then the Duke...upon This Principle, there needs no more than to say, that any King is a Papist, to Depose him."[57] Part of the defence of York was therefore personalised around Charles II. Tory writers framed the debate not simply around excluding James, but presented it as being about deposing Charles. The enemy of York: "has as little kindness for His Majesty, as for his Royal Brother; and not one jot more for the Church of England, then for That of Rome."[58] The King and the Duke were both targets of exclusion, and they stood united against it: "May this Stupendious way of Plotting cease...conspire no more two Princes fall, they sit too near to thunder, and you'll sure be hit."[59]

Religion was the most obvious means by which Whigs differentiated between James and Charles: "the D. be a Papist, as none deny him, now; he's a Heretick...from us, and what shall we...not do by the Papists, as they would by us?"[60] Yet was the Duke of York a Roman Catholic? This is a lost question of the Exclusion Crisis. It was certainly asked between 1678-83[61], yet it tends to be entirely overlooked by historians (there is, after all, no cause for

---

[56] *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p18
[57] *The Case Put, Concerning the Succession* (1679), p23&25
[58] *The Case Put, Concerning the Succession* (1679), p4
[59] *A Congratulatory Poem upon the happy arrival of His Royal Highness* (1682)
[60] *A Plea to the Duke's answers* (1680), p4
[61] John Garbrand, for example, was consistent and vehement in his denials of the Duke's Catholicism. Garbrand wrote three lengthy tracts in the space of as many years: *The Grand Inquest, or a full and perfect Answer* (1681), *The Royal Favourite Clear'd* (1682), and *Clarrior e tenebris: or A Justification of two books* (1683). Each pamphlet was emphatic in its rejection of James's Catholicism.

us to doubt James's Catholicism). Yet the Duke's conversion was not universally accepted by contemporaries - it was simply incorrect that "none deny him" to be popish. It is clear that in the late 1670s it was generally believed that James was papist but it was not an uncontested fact. Again, the King was used to defend his brother. It was argued that Charles' decision to exile James to Scotland did not prove the existence of his brother's Catholicism, but rather that the King wanted to protect James from unfounded libels: "For, when his Majesty commands his Brothers absence, Is it not to stop the mouths of the most malicious? And, is their spiteful calling of the Duke Papist; Or, inclining him towards Popish Councils called, by his Majesty, any thing else, than a Pretence?"[62]

In general however, most Tory writers accepted the existence of the Duke's Catholic faith. It was incumbent on Tory pamphleteers therefore to explain James's religious conversion. The Whig media viewed James's Catholicism as a rejection and betrayal of everything for which England stood. Worse still, this spiritual defection marked York out as different from the King. James and Charles alike had been born outside the Roman faith, yet only York had abandoned the English church and embraced manifest error. The Duke's enemies maintained that this revealed much about James: what kind of a man would turn his back on the light to wilfully seek out the Pope? Even a self-declared loyalist could wonder at such a spiritual journey: "I beseech your Highness therefore to satisfie the World what could induce you to a change."[63]

The question of why James switched religious sides was a thorny one for those sympathetic to him. No case could be made for the merits of Catholicism (or rather, the advancing of such a case would only serve to damage to Duke's cause). Many biographers adopted selective amnesia as to the when and the why of his conversion. Instead the Test

---

[62] Garbrand, *The Grand Inquest* (1681), p15
[63] Philamax Verax, *A Letter to His Royal Highness the Duke of York* (1681), p3

Act was often used by biographers to introduce the topic of James's new faith into his story - appearing fully formed and unexplained.[64]

Other Tory pamphleteers blamed the experience of civil war for James's Roman Catholicism: "the late unnatural Rebellion, drove his pious Father to that necessity that he was not able to keep nor maintain His Family, or educat His children as he would."[65] Implicitly James's subsequent defection to popery is attributable to a faulty religious education in his formative years. Again however, the Protestantism of Charles II posed a problem, undermining the special pleading of York's apologists: the common 'input' of the brothers (education and traumatic youthful experiences) only serving to contrast the dissimilarity of religious 'output'. James's supporters found explaining his faith problematic and struggled to develop a definitive vindication of their champion - not least because all such arguments in defence of York were undercut by comparisons with Charles II .

The Duke's propagandists did, however, pursue an alternative rhetoric strategy. A recurring theme in Tory literature was the possibility of a spiritual reverse-course. The Duke may, it was true, have wandered from the Anglican church but who could say that he would not, in time, return to the flock along side his brother the King? The nation should trust to God's providence: "If he be a Papist now, who can tell but the powerful operations of the Holy Spirit may be changing his Sentiments."[66] The reaction of Whig writers to such sentiments was incredulity. For even if York adopted an outward adherence to Protestantism who would credit the sincerity of it? "Should...[he] receive the Sacrament a thousand times, and take Oaths all the way from Holy-rood House to St. James's, yet the people would scarce believe the reality of...conversion." [67]

---

[64] *Reasons for the Inditement of the D. of York presented to the grand jury of Middlesex* (1680), p1-3
[65] *A Brief Account of His Sacred Majestie's Descent* (1681), p5
[66] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p9
[67] Verax, *A Letter to His Royal Highness the Duke of York* (1681), p8

"The future will prove Loyal, calm, and wise...To us it cannot but assurance bring, that a good Man can make as good a King."[68]

Tory propagandists employed a multitude of legal, historical, scriptural and political arguments in upholding the 'proof' of James's unalterable right to succeed Charles II. They also, however, sought to allay popular fears and emotions at the prospect of a Catholic King: "Popery in the single person of the Prince, whatever is said to the Contrary, is consistent enough with the welfare of the Subjects, though of another perswasion."[69] Significantly for our purpose, the case for this assertion was personalised to James. Two subsections will consider different aspects of this 'character' debate: (i) James's absolutist character, and (ii) the relationship between the royal brothers.

(i) Absolutist Characteristics

One of the nightmares aroused in the English imagination by the prospect of a Catholic King was that he, in this case James, would inevitably seek to turn himself into an absolutist monarch. Absolutist government, it was supposed, was the inevitable terminus of the path which led a Prince toward Roman Catholicism. Therefore the character of James became highly significant: had he already exhibited absolutist tendencies? Or was it possible to argue that this Duke would buck the Catholic archetype and prove to be a different sort of ruler?

Observations regarding the temperament of the Duke of York were a frequent feature of Exclusion-era texts. These general appraisals of the Duke's character were often dissimilar to representations of Charles. James was widely credited with being a strong character: "it's

---

[68] *On His Royal Highness's Return* (1679)
[69] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p10

not unknown, that the D. is a wilful person, and naturally most obstinate."[70] This extract

comes from a hostile Whig source where one might expect to find such comments. Yet even

among friendly Tory writers similar characteristics were acknowledged in James's

psychological makeup: "He hates above all things a perpetual fluctuation and unsteddiness in

the measures and politics of government...therefore (he) is constant and inflexible in his

resolutions, which often created him great and dangerous enemies."[71]

At times these character judgements of James read like critiques of Charles II. The

constancy remarked upon in James's personality was presented by Tory writers to be an

admirable quality. Here was a Prince who would not be buffeted by the winds of indecision

and irresolution. These were the very failings for which Charles was often berated, of policy

vacillation and personal unscrupulousness.[72] In this sense James emerged favourably from

comparisons with his brother.

Yet, in fostering this notion of James as resolute and inflexible Tory writers created a rod

for their own backs. They left the Duke open to suggestions of displaying absolutist traits -

which is to say an imposition of the ruler's will irrespective of counsel, law or consent - not

least when this aspect was coupled with James's reputation for being, at heart, a soldier: "he

is of a Martial and Souldierly Temper, patient of cold, heat, hunger, thirst and all the toyls

and fatigues naturally incident to war."[73] Pamphlets which stressed York's military nature

underscored the image of a hard and resilient character. Moreover, these accounts also acted

as implicit threats to his opponents: if the crisis were pushed to the point of civil conflict,

then James would be compelled to bring his martial expertise to bear against his enemies.

The strong association of James with militarism (an association much weaker in

representations of Charles II) was made to count against the Duke by opponents. It was

claimed that before the Test Act had thrown York out of office, a Catholic take-over of the

---

[70] *A Most Serious Expostulation with Several of My Fellow-Citizens* (1680), p4
[71] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p10
[72] As discussed in Chapter Four.
[73] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p11

military had begun. Catholic officers were: "quickly brought in, made Governours of our Castles and Garrisions, Captains and Colonels of our Forces, yea even Captains of our Men of War."[74] This insidious creep of papists into positions of power, it was maintained, had been halted only because James had lost his position to dispense patronage. The hellish scenario of a papist officered army, commanded by a brilliant military-minded Prince like James, had been averted because Parliament's influence had prevailed upon Charles II. Yet once Charles was gone and James became King, might he not again make moves toward creating a Catholic standing army?

Exclusionist propaganda warned the nation that such an unflinching Prince, so unlike Charles II in disposition, would not turn a blind-eye to the attacks launched against him, but would await his moment before inflicting a terrible revenge: "if you put the power in his hands he will not easily forget what our parliaments have done."[75] From this perspective James was absolutist both by personal inclination and religious disposition. Whether the two existed independently of each other or were interrelated was a moot point. What mattered was the implication that no subject nor liberty was safe in James's hands.

A difficulty for Tory propagandists was that the very act of making an argument to mollify these concerns itself acted to perpetuate the problem: articulating the danger, even if only to refute its validity, helped to reinforce suspicion that liberties were indeed under threat - that there was no smoke without fire. In this regard, the rhetoric of personal testimony became important to Tory efforts at countering accusations of York's latent absolutism. A good example of a 'personal testimony' text is *A Letter from a Person of Quality in Scotland* dating from James's period of Scottish banishment. The narrator's voice is that of the convert: one who stood firm in opposition to James's succession but underwent a Damascine conversion and now was a Yorkist proselyte. This transformation was not brought about by

---

[74] *A Most Serious Expostulation with Several of My Fellow-Citizens* (1680), p2
[75] *A Most Serious Expostulation with Several of My Fellow-Citizens* (1680), p4

"argument and reason...[which] could not any ways shake me."[76] Previously the author had, he claimed, known the Duke only by repute and had "received his characters at second hand."[77] Yet during James's exile in the northern Kingdom, "the personal knowledge of his very many Excellencies and vertues...has made me justly think him...no ordinary man, but one worthy of the greatest crown in Europe."[78] By stating that first-hand experience of York's virtues - undistorted by malicious misrepresentations - revolutionised perception of James, the text implicitly asked the reader if they too may not have been misled in their views of the Duke.

The narrative stance of a convert allowed the voice of a text to sound all the louder, and its positive endorsement of the Duke to ring out with even greater resonance. It is entirely possible that the anonymously authored piece may have been a work of fiction, a disingenuous adoption of the conversion story by a skilled propagandist to ensure maximum effect. The salient point though is that the tactic provided the appearance of authenticity. Tracts on both sides of the divide claimed to reveal the 'true' Duke and the device of the first-hand account was therefore extremely useful.

In part, this helps to explain why the weight placed on Charles II's good opinion of his brother was so great. There could be no more redoubtable eye-witness to James's virtue than that of the King: "the Great and Heroick Love, as well as just and pious that His Majesty has for his Brother, should be some Argument to his people, not to urge things so violently against the Duke, and so opposite to the Affection of His Majesty."[79]

The period of banishment in Scotland became a repeated topic for Tory propaganda. To English eyes the apparent enthusiasm of the Scots for James seemed strange indeed. For the first time York appeared genuinely popular: "a general joy spread everywhere, through all

---

[76] *A Letter from a person of Quality in Scotland* (1681), p1
[77] *A Letter from a person of Quality in Scotland* (1681), p1
[78] *A Letter from a person of Quality in Scotland* (1681), p1
[79] *A Letter from a person of Quality in Scotland* (1681), p2

that Northern Kingdom."[80] Reports from the north stated that in every town and every village through which York passed, "the people thronged in great multitudes to meet him."[81] James was certainly not used to such treatment in his native England. These accounts of popular adulation were reminiscent of Monmouth's recent progress through the West Country, or, indeed, of Charles II's reception immediately after the Restoration. Reports from the north appeared to demonstrate that a Catholic ruler, or, at any rate, James, could be popular with Protestant subjects.

The exercise of power by James in a separate Kingdom allowed Tory propagandists to develop a Kingly persona for him that was separate from Charles II. James thereby becomes, in a sense, King before his time: "see at once Two Princes in their state; as if Two Suns."[82] Scotland could act as a microcosm for a future Jacobean Britain. That the Presbyterian Scots should have embraced Catholic James was, from an English Tory perspective, an extraordinary occurrence: "that Scotland should out do our Nation in gratitude and kindness seems most strange, a people rough by nature...under a frozen clime, which should be consequence make people harsh and more uncivil."[83] It was a wondrous testament to James's ability and merit (as it was, perhaps, evidence of Charles II's indifference and negligence). For Tories the contented nature of Scotland under the Duke acted as a mirror for England's future: "all may take notice of his signal Kindness."[84] England had nothing to fear from a future King James II but much to gain: "So that the malice of a Banishment intended by his Adversaries, could not prevented the character of a Peace-maker, a worthy Patriot, a grand Politician, a Friend (as well as Brother) to the King, a

---

[80] *A faithful compendium* (1679), p4
[81] *A True and Exact Relation of His Royal Highness* (1681), p3
[82] *A Congratulatory Poem upon the happy arrival* (1682)
[83] *A faithful compendium* (1679), p4
[84] *The Copy of a letter from Scotland, to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, subscribed by eight Archbishops and Bishops of that Kingdom* (1682), p2

210

Joseph."[85] These exile narratives presented Scotland as much improved by James's care, and, in so doing, implied that England too may be better off after Charles II had gone.

Yet the absolutist charge against James remained, and may even have been exacerbated by the Duke's own supporters. For when attacks on their champion began, the response of Tory writers was to stress his strength: "Brave York unmov'd...bear firm as the centre, fix't as th' Northern Star."[86] While this kind of rhetoric was not entirely absent from depictions of Charles II, it was more commonly found in representations of James. Such sentiment was designed to scupper hopes that the Duke may fall on his own sword by abdicating his rights. However, once again James was rendered vulnerable to charges that he was too intractable and too resolute. Statements that the Duke was "a terrour only to the bad,"[87] were hardly reassuring in this regard. By bolstering the notion of a strong Duke who was equipped to ride out the current crisis, pamphleteers unwittingly reinforced the sense of suspicion against him.

Tory scribes often criticised their own King over his over propensity for forgiveness.[88] The Tory critique of Charles's character was that the King's temperate nature constituted a weakness, and that after the Civil Wars in particular he had been too lenient with his enemies. The current crisis was therefore the product of the King's long term negligence. This picture of Charles II, as has been shown, was contrasted with one of James as steadfast and resolute. Yet, as the absolutist charge against James began to bite, Tory propagandists defending him increasingly borrowed aspects from the emollient representations of the King.[89] Exclusion-era biographies of the Duke were at pains to remark upon his powers of forgiveness, James was depicted as a Prince capable of forgetting the injuries done him; therefore the nation had nothing to fear from James, either collectively or individually: "how

---

[85] Garbrand, *The Royal Favourite Clear'd* (1682), p11
[86] *A Congratulatory Poem Upon the Happy Arrival* (1682)
[87] Garbrand, *The Royal Favourite Clear'd* (1682), p9
[88] A good example of this is *An Apostrophe from the Loyal party* (1681), p3
[89] Garbrand, *The Royal Favourite Clear'd* (1682), p5

sollicitous he is about the well-fare of England, even at the very time, when it contrives his destruction."[90]

Integral to fears over absolutism were fears for the future of Parliament. Charles II's relationship with Parliament was frequently represented by the Whig press as being distorted by misunderstanding and the influence of evil counsellors at Court.[91] Such a standpoint allowed opponents of the crown to criticise royal policy without depicting Charles as implacably opposed to parliamentary interests. The Tory supporters of the Duke however, decried a smear campaign against their champion which saw "the Truth oppress'd."[92] The Coleman letters had been printed and publicly released by order of the House of Commons. The subsequent exclusion bills appeared to many Tories to confirm that Parliament was pursuing an anti-monarchical vendetta directed against James.

However Tory protestations against Parliament only played into the hands of their opponents: attacking the institution lent credence to suggestions that "the D. hates our Parliament"[93] (therefore strengthening the distrust that he secretly desired its abolition). Whig writers directed fear for Parliament's survival onto James and his intentions, while broadly letting Charles off the hook (or, at least, positing the possibility that with different advice the King could be prevailed upon to change policy).

A Tory tactic to counter-act the absolutist charge, including that the Duke would discard Parliament, involved turning the tables on the Whig 'character debate'. It may be true, argued Tories, that James was an obstinate and a hard man, but accordingly he also had, "a great Veneration [for the law]…He always held the constitution of the Kingdom as sacred and inviolable, in reference to the people, as He now does in regard of his own right."[94] This was a strong line of defence. The reason that James could never be an absolutist monarch was same reason he must be King: his unwavering commitment to upholding the law and

---

[90] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p15
[91] *A Tory Plot, or, The discovery of a design* (1682), p5
[92] *Great and Weighty Considerations relating to the D. o Y* (1679), p1
[93] *A Most Serious Expostulation with several of my Fellow-Citizens* (1680), p4
[94] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p12

constitution of the Kingdom; that which enshrined his right to succeed Charles II also protected the subject from arbitrary power. At one stroke the Duke's opponents could be disarmed and his rights asserted.

(ii) The Royal Brothers

In a sense the crisis concerned the character of James more than it did that of Charles. It was York, after all, who suffered being "assassinated in effigie...'Tis against the Duke they lay their Siege."[95] Being 'Tory' meant first and foremost supporting James's succession. Indeed, it could be argued that during 1678-85 'Toryism' was defined in relation to James, not Charles II. Obviously Tories were loyalists - and thus supporters of Charles - but the primary issue at stake was the upholding of the royal line, which shifted focus onto York. In swathes of Tory propaganda the principle concern was to "vindicate the Reputation...of this most Illustrious Prince [James], in whom all things center, that are good."[96] Yet, as will be shown, representations of the King were, in many differing ways, integral to these efforts to sure up James's reputation.

"There's no managing of this Discourse, without making frequent mention of his Royal Highnesses Quality and Title."[97] For Tories there was no escaping who James Duke of York was: he was brother to Charles II and the just and rightful heir to the throne. Many loyalist pamphlets communicated a sense of disbelief that such numbers were forthcoming in damning James: "even such...[men of] desperate fortunes...have an ill word for the Duke."[98] That York was the King's brother was continually restated in Tory pamphlets. Representations dealing directly with the relationship between the royal brothers became crucial in both attacking and defending the Duke. Yet depictions of this familial relationship were far from straightforward.

---

95   Garbrand, *The Royal Favourite Clear'd* (1682), p17
96   Garbrand, *The Royal Favourite Clear'd* (1682), p3
97   *The Case Put, Concerning the Succession* (1679), p11
98   *A Just and Modest Vindication of His Royal Highness the Duke of York* (1680), p5

213

Fundamentally Tory pamphleteers used representations of the brotherly relationship to support York. During the Exclusion Crisis Charles II was, said Tory writers, utterly supportive of his brother's cause. Accordingly, the personal relations were portrayed as loving and close between Charles and "his dear and only Brother."[99] This provided the Tories with a fall back position: even if exclusion was accepted as legal (which was a point the vast majority of Tories were unwilling to concede), Charles II would still never grant royal assent to such a bill, "There is yet a Brother; a Prince; and a Friend in the case."[100]

The concepts of loyalty and obedience to Charles II were crucial. James was commended by his supporters for showing total submission to the King: "I hope there is none that will be so foolish, or obstinately wicked, as to perish in the opinion of the Duke's separating himself from the Interest of the King."[101] The Duke had, it was said, never caused trouble for his brother by stirring division or faction. He had, for example, selflessly acquiesced to the imposition of his Scottish exile without any resistance: "When from His Royal Brother came Command, that He forthwith should Quit His Native Land...straight withdrew away, scarce was it spoke, but He forthwith Obey'd...But as the Meanest, Poorest Subject, He His duty show'd, and Brother's Soveraigntie. Immense obedience!"[102] Such a picture of James was designed to counter the more nefarious portraits of him drawn by Whigs. In this context praise for James also functioned as a rebuke to the crown's opponents, highlighting their own lack of obedience to Charles II's will.

Exclusionist attacks on James often focused on his personal failings, and this trend is also true in representations of his relations with Charles. First and foremost Whig polemic attempted to divide the Duke from the King. It was James, not Charles, who had created the waves which buffeted the Kingdom (therefore the fiction could be maintained that the printed attacks on one brother did not constitute an assault upon the other). After all, as the

---

[99] *Albion's Congratulatory; or, a Poem* (1680), p3
[100] *The Case Put, Concerning the Succession* (1679), p17
[101] Garbrand, *The Royal Favourite Clear'd* (1682), p16
[102] *On the Arrival of His Royal Highness the Duke into England* (1680)

Lord Chief Justice charged with trying Edward Coleman noted of the questions raised by the Popish Plot: "they relate to the Duke most of them, little to the King."[103] Whig pamphleteers claimed they had no ill intent toward either Charles personally or to monarchy as an institution. It was James who presented a problem.

Tory writers, by contrast, endeavoured to couple Charles and James in the mind's eye. This helps to explain why the Duke of Monmouth was such an incendiary figure. His relationship with the King, as it was presented by Whig propaganda, rivalled that of James; literature devoted to Monmouth prevented the King from appearing as an exclusively Yorkist symbol. Therefore it was imperative for Tory scribes to discredit the rival Duke.

Monmouth's illegitimacy thus became a repeated Tory jibe – a trend which can be observed in popular song. On occasion, as we have seen, Whig polemicists rewrote Tory songs in praise of Monmouth.[104] Tories used the exact same tactic in support of York against Monmouth. For example the popular Whig ballad *Young Jemmy* praised Monmouth by declaring: "Young Jemmy is a Lad that's Royally descended, with every Virtue clad, with every tongue commended."[105] The tune was appropriated and rewritten in homage to York: "Old Jemmy is a Lad, right lawfully descended; no bastard born or bred, nor for a Whig suspended."[106] The tactic, forced upon Tory writers by Monmouth's growing popularity, was to compare and contrast the respective legitimacy and character of the two Dukes. To Tory eyes there was no contest between them: James was "chief amongst the Princes"[107], while Monmouth was a "mobile gay Fop, with Birmingham pretences."[108] This was a reference to the striking of counterfeit coins in Birmingham, marked with the head of the pretender to the throne. Monmouth was base and false. York was Charles II's brother and his rightful heir.

---

[103] *The Tryal of Edward Coleman* (1678), p73
[104] For example, *Monmouth and Bucceugh's Welcom from the North* (1685)
[105] *Young Jemmy: An Excellent New Ballad* (1681)
[106] *Old Jemmy: An Excellent New Ballad. To an Excellent New Tune, Young Jemmy* (1681)
[107] *Old Jemmy: An Excellent New Ballad* (1681)
[108] *Old Jemmy: An Excellent New Ballad* (1681)

However, by making these face-to-face comparisons between York and Monmouth, Tory writers were, in fact, buckling to Whig pressure. Monmouth's defenders frequently presented the two Dukes as rivals locked in a mimetic struggle (implicitly asking the reader which of the two was preferable).[109] Yet Tories did not consider these rivals to be equals. Therefore tracts devoted to attacking Monmouth through comparison with James, were, in fact, admissions of weakness by York's supporters: recognition that Monmouth's alarming popularity needed to be checked.

In the effort to ensure that association between Charles II and James was perceived as close, Tory writers frequently evoked the memory of their father. God had provided, "so well for us, and to give us so wise a King, and so Illustrious a Prince; Both springing from the Loyns of that Most Glorious Martyr."[110] James could have no better influence on him than that of the two King Charles: "whether he drives more from the Blood of his Father, or the Example of his Brother, is an undecided Question."[111]

It was suggested that the respective roles which James and Charles II were to play in preserving the realm after 1660, had somehow been bequeathed to them by Charles I. "The Royal Martyr e're he fell...he forbad all claims to Charles his Scepter and the Sword of James, Be Charles his scepter ever sacred still, and be the Sword of James invincible."[112] Charles was to rule over the Kingdom while James was to defend it. Both brothers were fulfilling their appointed parts, and, for James, the next step in realising his destiny meant becoming King. The brothers were bound together in "fair conjunction"[113], and to alter the line of succession away from Charles I's sons would be to betray the memory of the royal martyr: "See, see, the injur'd Prince [James], and bless his Name, think on the Martyr from whose Loynes he came: think on the Blood was shed for you before."[114]

---

[109]   As outlined in the Chapter Six.
[110]   Garbrand, *The Royal Favourite Clear'd* (1682), p2
[111]   *Englands concern in the case of His R.H* (1680), p19
[112]   *An Heroick Poem to his Royal Highness the Duke of York on His return* (1682)
[113]   *An Heroick Poem to his Royal Highness the Duke of York on His return* (1682)
[114]   *The Epilogue. Written by Mr Otway* (1682)

Yet Whig writers too could utilize the symbolic power of Charles I. If, as Tory pamphleteers frequently asserted, Charles I had "dyed for the Protestant Religion"[115], then surely it was James who had betrayed the memory of his father. Even the Yorkist John Garbrand (in his effort to disprove James's popery), agreed that: "those who will not allow the Duke to be a Protestant do seem...to condemn His Royal Father, who Educated Him; And also, the clergy of England, and the whole Episcopal Party."[116] James's Catholicism could be presented as an indictment of the Church of England and an abandonment of Charles I. James had turned away from his own father toward the "paternal affection of the Holy Father at Rome."[117]

Tory writers used the figure of Charles I to stress the commonality existing between Charles II and James. Whig pamphleteers attempted to undermine this notion by using religion to pry the two brothers apart and differentiate James. One Tory pamphleteer acknowledged, somewhat despairingly, that for much of the nation these Whig libels: "make more against him [James]...than all his personal services, his quality of blood, his Brother's virtues, his Father's memory and merit, and a rightful title from above 600 years can do for him."[118]

A favoured argument of Whig polemists considered that James's unique position made him more of a threat to King and Kingdom, not less. "His R.H dangerous to his Majesty, because he is both a Friend, and a Brother...in regard of confidence and opportunities; there is no fence against that danger."[119] The attainment of the crown, allied to his papist interests, appeared to establish that James had a motive for plotting against the King, and his status as royal brother attested to his unparalleled opportunity of access.

Indeed, it was also possible for Whig writers to exploit the brotherly relationship to apply pressure on the King. The idea was advanced that the best thing Charles could do for his

---

[115] Garbrand, *The Royal Favourite Clear'd* (1682), p2
[116] Garbrand, *The Grand Inquest* (1681), p25
[117] Edward Stillingfleet, *A Sermon Preached on the Fast-day, November 13* (1678), p43
[118] *A Just and Modest Vindication of His Royal Highness the Duke of York* (1680), p5
[119] *The Case Put, concerning the Succession* (1679), p36

brother was impose limitations on a Catholic monarch.[120] James need not be dispossessed entirely, some form of regency of William or Mary would suffice: "it most certainly be more happy, to remain a Duke and Father of the next successor taking the Throne and reigning in quiet, than to be himself a King and reign only in Blood and with the confusion of his subjects."[121] Such arguments subverted the concept of brotherly love set out in Tory texts, and played on notions of Charles's duty, both as a good brother and as a good King; stopping York being anything other than a notional monarch is presented as an act of kindness to James himself.[122]

Yet York was also the target for Whig invective that sought to replace the picture of him as a loyal brother with representations of him as a nefarious schemer against Charles. The Earl of Shaftsbury, for example, claimed that York's ambition to lay hold of his brother's crown predated not only his Catholicism but even the Restoration itself.[123] According to Shaftsbury, York's design was executed through the mechanism of Charles's marriage. The Earl asserted that James had been instrumental in selecting the match with Catherine of Bragnaza, and had deliberately selected a barren Princess. "This match...contrived by the Dukes Father-in-Law; and no sooner effected, but the Duke and his party make proclamation to the World, that we are like to have no children, that he must be the certain Heir."[124] The notion of a treacherous alliance between the Earl of Clarendon and the Duke of York ensuring that James and his progeny rule was plainly fantastical: Shaftsbury, who was pursing his agenda of a royal divorce, does not relate how James knew of Catherine's

---

[120] It is a noticeable feature in popular literature of 1679-81 that texts discussing possible expedients on a Catholic King were numerically less significant than texts considering out-right exclusion.
[121] *A Moderate Decision of the Point of Succession: Humbly Proposed to the consideration of Parliament* (1681), p3
[122] The focus on 'brotherly' relations that is found in pamphlets raises an interesting 'what if' question of Restoration history: how would the situation have been altered had Henry, Duke of Gloucester, survived throughout his brother's reign and had remained a Protestant? In such a situation Catholic James would have been sandwiched in Exclusion-era debate between his two Protestant brothers – adding yet further difficulty to the position of York's supporters. It is even conceivable that some might have proposed Henry as a candidate for the throne - certainly the third son of Charles I would have been a stronger contender for the crown than the illegitimate Duke of Monmouth. As it was though, this must remain mere speculation for Henry died in 1660, aged just twenty.
[123] *A Speech lately made by a noble peer of the realm* (1681), p1-2
[124] *A Speech lately made by a noble peer* (1681), p2

infertility. Yet James was vulnerable to such fictions. Refuting this kind of allegation by demonstrating James's loyalty to his brother was therefore vital.

However, representations of the royal siblings in Tory texts were more complex than simply placing the two side by side. The willingness of Tory writers to establish James's virtue at the expense of Charles is striking. The strength of Charles as King was used to support James, yet, the perceived weaknesses of Charles as a man were used to underscore James's personal qualities. There was approval for James's "singular Industry and application to business."[125] The Duke's seriousness of mind was reflected in: "his discourses...always pertinent and solid, free from flourishes and a vain and empty ostention of wit, which sorts betters with the levity of the mimical heroes, upon a theatre, then the true Grandeur of real Princes in a Court."[126] Such character appraisals read as barely concealed critiques of Charles II - who was famed for his hedonistic indulgence, wit and indolence. The Duke of York, by contrast, is presented as the intellectually and morally weightier of the two brothers.

These character comparisons helped to establish the future condition of the Kingdom under James. The kingly character of James bore comparison with any English monarch for six hundred years: "[England] would undoubtedly be...happy as under any that swayed the English Scepter since the Conquest...having so many Princely Qualities, though now clouded and kept conceal'd from the eyes of the Nation, by the artifice of his Adversaries."[127] In much Tory literature from the Exclusion period there is almost an inference that James would make a better ruler than his brother. Certainly in accounts of military conflict (particularly, as has been shown, for the Dutch war), there is a sense in which James was presented as a dynamic figure juxtaposed to the static Charles.

More remarkable however, was that even in terms of religious administration it was possible to present James as the superior of the siblings. For example, the tract *The Copy of*

---

[125] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p10
[126] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p10
[127] *Captain Thorogood His Opinion of the Point of Succession* (1679), p10

a Letter From Scotland strove to tackle fears over the survival of the Church of England; ostensibly it was a letter written by Episcopal Scots to the Archbishop of Canterbury in praise of the Duke (armed with the first-hand experience of his exile north of the border). "Since the coming of His Royal Highness [James]...we find our case much changed for the better...we can ascribe to nothing...as to his...gracious owning, and vigilent protection of us."[128] The subtext was that the Church of England need not fear James, who had effectively been acting as Scottish regent, and would be as diligent in his protection of the English Church once he became King in the southern Kingdom. Again however, Charles II does not emerge with much glory from such statements. The assertion that the security of the Anglican church could be so much improved under a Catholic monarch created an impression of Charles' religious stewardship which was hardly favourable.

Tory writers were prepared to represent the King in a 'negative' light in order that James should appear admirable. Conversely, Whig pamphleteers frequently utilized comparisons between the two brothers precisely to show their disapprobation of James. The crucial point though, is that after two decades of rule Charles II was basically secure on his throne, whereas James's chances of occupying it seemed in doubt. Therefore character points could be scored at the King's expense if they were felt to advance James's cause: thus, in Tory tracts, James appears as the more dynamic and the more serious minded of the royal brothers.

In conclusion we may say that the issue of 'character' took on vital significance in Exclusion-era printed polemic; questions over what the Duke of York represented (in the sense of his supposed opinions, inclinations and attitudes) were posited as foreshadowing that which could be expected of him once King. 'Character' was therefore contested as a

---

[128]   *The Copy of a Letter from Scotland, to His Grace* (1682), p1

matter of importance and the evocations of Charles II's name were crucial in this regard. The King was used in the arguments of pamphleteers both in defending James and in attacking him: both trends reveal much about existing perceptions of the King and his brother.

This was not simply a debate expressed through abstract conceits, the question was not only what might *a* Catholic monarch do, but what might *York* do. Therefore efforts to demarcate the parameters of James's character became another front in the ongoing crisis. Representations of James in print could impact upon, and transform, popularly held perceptions of the King. Conversely, representations of the King could alter the milieu in which James was seen and judged. This helps to explain why the brothers so frequently appear in pamphlet literature paired together – offered either in contrast or in commonality. Depictions of Charles and James were rarely without a political subtext.

That, in 1685, James II was crowned King perhaps demonstrates that to some extent Tory polemicists had succeed in their endeavour. Yet the events of, and those leading to the Glorious Revolution reveal that many of the concerns over James and his character proved to be well founded. The Whig pamphleteers of 1678-83 had not simply reflected existing anxiety over James, their tracts had stoked, perpetuated and aggravated this anxiety. In so doing print literature had transformed the political landscape of late Restoration England. In this sense, the words of a Tory pamphleteer from 1679 seem prophetic: "whether the Duke Stands, or Falls, the meer ventilation of the Question opens a Gap to let in all those Calamities upon us."[129]

---

[129]   *The Case Put, concerning the Succession* (1679), p10

Chapter Eight: Conclusion

It is easy to underestimate the impact that the Exclusion Crisis had upon England. In part this is because of the events of the Glorious Revolution which followed. Irrespective of the historiographical debate regarding 1688 and whether it marks (or does not) a crucial watershed in British history[1], it seems clear that in many regards the Glorious Revolution overshadows the Exclusion Crisis. Which is to say that 1688-89 brought the actual deposing of James, rather than the possibility discussed; that Protestant rule in 1688 was actually secured, and that, in the northern and western Kingdoms at least, serious rebellions were not just threatened but materialised and required suppression.[2] One could argue that what was merely contemplated in the Exclusion-era was actually achieved in the Glorious Revolution, and, in so doing, that the events of 1688-9 undid the major 'result' of the Exclusion period and hence also its significance for posterity (i.e. Charles II's victory in ensuring James's succession).

According to this scheme, the Exclusion Crisis appears as a kind of listless dress-rehearsal to the 'real' event which happened a few years later. Yet we should, as far as is possible, reject such teleological readings. The experiences of the Exclusion-era - not least its public debate - changed English society: 1678-83 represents a period of national exposure to polemical ideas and to dangerous possibilities; it affected the nation's conceptualisation of Kingship in general and of Charles II in particular. In Exclusion-era debate we find something of the 1640s resurfacing in a new context, an aspect whose importance should not be lightly discarded in our eagerness to foreshadow the Glorious Revolution.

---

[1] See the introduction to Frank O'Gorman, *The Long Eighteenth Century: British Political & Social History 1688-1832* (1997)

[2] In the lexicon of retrospective historical labelling the term 'crisis' is usually allotted to those periods of serious difficulty where total disaster was nonetheless averted. Crises (unlike 'wars' or 'revolutions') are thus defined as much by what might have happened as by what actually did. To take a more recent example, the Cuban Missile crisis is not the story of an actual nuclear war but of its possibility and narrow avoidance.

It is hoped that this thesis has added to, and altered, established understandings of Charles II and the Exclusion Crisis. The role which the King has been shown to occupy in Exclusion-era debate tenders a fresh perspective on the crisis as a whole by incorporating a novel and vital dimension into our analysis: the image of the King and its popular reception.

(i) Print Culture and Popular Politics

First and foremost this research demonstrates that perceptions of the King affected the directions in which Exclusion debates moved, and, conversely, that those debates reinforced and revised perceptions of the King. At times, the period 1678-83 is written about by historians in a way which renders Charles II almost a marginal figure to the debate in print.[3] The King appears as an actor on the political stage, yet, paradoxically, is largely absent from historiographical reviews of Exclusion arguments. This period was, we are told, concerned only with James's Catholicism or with competing systems of political philosophy. In a crisis centring on exclusion it seems that it is Charles who is excluded, retrospectively airbrushed out, leaving us with an arcane debate unsullied by the crudities of popular politics.[4] Yet if we were to remove all reference to Charles II from Exclusion-era printed polemic we would be left with gaping chasms in almost every text. Arguments were often specific and predicated upon Charles. For contemporaries, this crisis was not simply an abstract discussion about the future; it was a predicament all too relevant to the here and now and urgently requiring resolution. Put simply: the King was central to the debate as it was played out in the public domain.

What are the implications of factoring Charles II (as referent and image of an ideological debate) more fully into our comprehension of the crisis? A proper recognition of the

---

[3] Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed Britain 1603-1714*, p256-259; Coward, *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714*, p325-333

[4] This is not to criticise the work of those historians, such as Richard Ashcraft, who have focused on 'big thinkers' like John Locke or Robert Filmer, enriching our understanding considerably by doing so. Rather the point is that we should be cautious in assuming that those aspects of debate which excite the historian in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries are necessarily those which grabbed the imagination of the man in the street in 1679.

presence of the King in Exclusion polemic shifts our understanding of the period toward contemporary reception; allowing for a better contextualisation of printed texts. We simply cannot understand reactions in the late 1670s and early 1680s to the arguments and representations found in popular print if we ignore or marginalize the figure of the King. To take an approach to the crisis which sets aside representations of the King is to (i) disregard the wealth of popular literature which significantly centres on the monarch[5], and (ii) to overlook the process of oblique or lateral referencing to Charles II.[6]

This system of lateral references is crucial, it enabled arguments which were not directly 'about' Charles to establish a connection with the King.[7] Therefore, as we have seen, everything from accounts of trade to historical allusions and expressions of bawdy humour made reference to, and took account of the monarch; making everything, in a sense, 'about' the King.[8] The range of rhetorical usages that the symbol of the King was applied to was extensive: Charles was, for example, equally central to texts both damning and defending his brother James.[9] Accommodating the King in one's argument was a crucial mechanism: a way to get your voice heard and to strengthen your side's cause. The name of Charles II was used by both sides to empower themselves, to legitimise their arguments and to condemn their opponents.

Arguments which did not naturally fit into a 'loyalist' schematic could nonetheless be made to appear to derive from Charles II's character or interest. Whig pamphleteers sought to appropriate Charles in order to obviate their inherently oppositional nature[10] – it was imperative for Whigs not to appear as closet republicans. Outward professions of loyalty to the King could therefore mask essentially 'disloyal' purposes: Whigs successfully advanced

---

[5] As discussed in Chapter Two.
[6] The King as symbol, considered in Chapter Three, demonstrates the working of this system of lateral referencing.
[7] As outlined in Chapter Three.
[8] A pattern which emerges in those sections of the thesis treating the symbolic potential of the monarch, the representations of Charles's character and the projection of the 'Restoration myth' (Chapters Three to Five).
[9] See Chapter Seven.
[10] This point emerges progressively in Chapters Three and Four.

highly controversial notions under the guise of defending Charles II at a time of national emergency.[11] Arguments were bent and contorted into shapes which fitted with existing notions of the King[12]; while, simultaneously, representations of Charles were subtly revised to meet ideological needs.[13] The system of lateral reference to the King goes to the heart of the quest for national and cultural identity in this period: revealing the matrix of aspiration and ideology which underpinned printed tracts.

The nominal submitting of arguments before the King – the apparent and enacted kowtowing to the crown that is found in pamphlets - may initially appear to be a form of deference. Implicitly it suggested that any text which was overtly disloyal to Charles could be rejected. Yet, incorporating Charles into printed invective was actually a means to take control of the symbol of the King: to make the King appear to support, or at least to potentially support, partisan views. The language of praise became a currency traded by polemicists to gain influence with the nation, not, as it may appear, to curry favour with the King. 'Praise' had a political edge to it: a compliment paid to the crown usually came with (ideological) strings attached. These tracts were not private declarations of admiration: the printed word was a public channel of communication, and texts, even those which took the form of a direct address to Charles[14] were intended for the nation at large.

Charles II did not however escape from popular pamphlets without criticism. Somewhat counter-intuitively, the fiercest censure of the King often comes from Tory voices – in theory those on the King's own side. This paradox can be explained by the burden that Whig writers carried: the need to engage with Charles in order to demonstrate that their cause was consistent with loyalty to the crown. Thus the Whig critique of Charles's character was

---

[11] For example Robert Ferguson's suggestion, in his *A Letter to a Person of Honour* (1680), that illegitimacy was no bar to the throne, and that it had not been historically.

[12] As we saw in Chapter Seven, pamphleteers who argued for James's exclusion did so in the full knowledge that Charles opposed the measure, yet their arguments were framed as an appeal to Charles's best interest.

[13] Apparent in the Whig appropriation and reinvention of Charles II which was highlighted in Chapter Four.

[14] Such as, *The Country-Mans Complaint, and Advice to the King* (1681)

often restrained and loaded with carefully framed caveats.[15] Tory writers, more secure in their own 'loyal' status, frequently lambasted the King for his failings - even going as far as to blame the crisis on his meekness and inability to follow a consistently tough (i.e. Tory) line of action.[16] In truth these differences between the two factions originate from a commonality of purpose: Whig and Tory writers were seeking to provoke a shift in the nation and were using the King to this end. Both sides therefore wanted the King to reflect and embody their own cause better.

Differences in partisan depictions of the King remind us that we are dealing with two sets of representations. The rival canons of Tory and Whig texts offer us, as they did their contemporary audience, two contending groups of literature, two worldviews, and, crucially, two versions (or constructs) of Charles II. Tory representations, for example, often showed a King who had been overly lenient with dissenting trouble-makers;[17] Whig depictions, by contrast, commonly portrayed a King rendered vulnerable to papist treachery by his trust in Tory counsellors.[18] Not only did popular texts provide alternative visions of England's future, they also tendered divergent versions of her present King. Only by putting these two constructs side by side, and by observing the interaction between them, do we begin to get something approximating a full picture of popular Exclusion debate.

Polemical print thereby provides us with the best approach to the crisis at 'street level' – the best opportunity of accessing or recreating the experience of those years. Recent historiography has recognised the relationship between the early-modern media and popular politics.[19] And there is perhaps no better illustration of this relationship than the case of the Duke of Monmouth, whose popular persona was largely a 'media creation' and whose

---

[15] Good examples of this come in Whig texts dealing with the Popish Plot such as *A Tory Plot, or, The discovery of a design* (1682)
[16] For instance, *The Country-Mans Complaint, and Advice to the King* (1681)
[17] For example, *An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty* (1681)
[18] For instance, *The Charge of a Tory plot maintain'd in a dialogue* (1682)
[19] In particular the work of Harris, Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain; Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II* ; Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*; Greaves, *Secrets of the Kingdom;* and Pincus, 'Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture'.

figure, in a very short period, deeply permeated into public consciousness.[20] Print literature was a powerful tool - it fabricated a 'popular hero' from almost nothing and, in effect, moved mountains on the political landscape. The Ducal persona was really a pattern of rhetoric, carefully designed by Whig polemicists to gain leverage over the King and the Tories by scaring them with this youthful embodiment of patriotic Protestantism.

The primary function of representations of Charles II was to enact an appeal for popular support. What the people of England wanted - their hopes and their desires - were absolutely crucial in shaping depictions of the King.[21] Print literature from these years can be read as an attempt to court the general populace and to steer the formation of their political opinions – above all through reference to the King. During the Exclusion Crisis it was impossible for the government to control printed texts whose content was politically infused and whose affect was politicising. Print literature not only reflected opinions generally held, it perpetuated them, and, in so doing, altered the milieu of popular expectation and reception.[22] Between 1678-83, officially sanctioned representations of Charles II could no longer be the final verdict on the King, they had to compete for attention and for influence against an array of unsanctioned and unfettered rival representations.

(ii) The Image of the King

It is a central assertion of this thesis that understanding the semiotics of royal presentation is vital to understanding Exclusion-era debate. In practice this means observing how representations of Charles II were interwoven with concepts of patriotism, fear, and hope. The persona of Charles II was used to engage the emotional desires of his people; this was

---

[20] A point which was made in greater depth in Chapter Six.

[21] A similar point is made by Sharpe; *Remapping Early Modern England,* p459

[22] The issue of 'popular opinion' raises the controversy over the 'public sphere' – of when/whether it is detectable in England. Certainly there is no single date when we can declare that the 'public sphere' was established, it is not something one simply opens like a bank account. What we may say with confidence is the post-civil war public were possessed of an educated eye when it came to political print and that they were becoming increasingly expectant of printed material being publicly available.

not only a cerebral debate but also one conducted with high passions. The symbol of the King was moulded by skilled propagandists to meet partisan needs. The image (or images) of Charles II acted almost like a character in a piece of fiction; an ideologically motivated construct that was composed of sets of associations tailored to trigger different reactions. Critical is the simplifying personalisation of ideas - the process by which complex constitutional, historical, religious and emotional arguments were channelled through Charles II, fashioning the King into a rhetorical symbol embodying the whole, a monarchic mosaic or tapestry made up of innumerable notions contained in thousands of printed pamphlets. In another sense Charles II was the eye of a needle through which almost all successful arguments had to be threaded.

Tim Harris has suggested that by the end of the Restoration period 'Elizabethan-projection' techniques – royal processions, celebrations of the monarch's birthday etc. - had largely failed and were essentially outmoded.[23] This thesis lends support to Harris's conclusion. However, I would contend that the underlying purpose of these traditional methods of royal projection was redirected and found new expression on the printed page - forging a new type of royal projection. In the Exclusion Crisis we find a rendering of the monarch still loaded with iconographic and ideological meaning, but communicated by means of a royal portrait painted with the ink of the printed word.

Significantly, the process by which Charles II was reinvented to meet the challenges of the crisis involved the laying of new notions upon existing ones – whether derived from the 'Elizabethan style' royal projection of Charles's coronation and coronation procession, or from printed propaganda of the 1660s. The salient point is that certain key 'events' or facts were already firmly established in public imagination: his deliverance at the battle of Worcester, his naturally indulgent disposition, his status as the son of 'the martyr' and so forth.[24] These symbols - redolent of the royal life and character - were too deeply entrenched

---

[23] Harris, *Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain*, p152-153
[24] A theme which was discussed in detail in Chapter Five.

in popular consciousness to be erased and replaced. They could, however, in the changed political climate of 1678-83 be substantively revised and given new meanings. The problem with any symbolic motif (and also the opportunity for polemicists) is that it is susceptible over time to reinterpretation. So it proved with the carefully crafted 'messages' that royal propagandists had worked to promote in the two decades since the Restoration: their iconography simply provided Whig scribes with an emotive language of symbols to appropriate and redirect against Tories. If a new comprehension of the King emerges from Exclusion debate, it does so by the giving of renewed life and meaning to constituent parts that were essentially 'second-hand'. What the Exclusion Crisis did was to transform the meaning of longstanding imagery and symbolism.

Exclusion-era debate demonstrates the personalised nature of political discourse: this was a debate dependent on Charles II, upon the memory of his past and his Kingly persona. The issue of the King's 'character' was extremely important in the Exclusion-era: it became a propaganda battleground which polemicists fought fiercely to gain control of.[25] He who 'owned' the King held the upper-hand. It is true that the crisis challenged and questioned the monarchy as an institution, but the crisis also turned increased scrutiny on Charles II personally, asking fundamental questions of his Kingship. Had the Exclusion Crisis occurred under another King - be it a predecessor or a successor - the resultant debate would look unfamiliar to us: its points of reflexivity and its emotive moments of national memory would have been entirely different.

Ronald Hutton has noted a dichotomy between academic and non-academic treatments of Charles II.[26] The body of scholarly work has cast a largely negative verdict on the King and his policies.[27] 'Pop-historians', by contrast, have tended to promote an attractive portrait of

---

[25] See Chapter Four.
[26] Ronald Hutton, *Debates in Stuart History* (2004), p137-142
[27] Hutton cites John Kenyon, John Miller and his own work as following this trend, *Debates in Stuart History*, p140&144

the King infused with a romantic mythologizing of his life story.[28] Yet, as we have

observed, the 'Restoration myth' of Charles II dates from the early 1660s.[29] We may wonder

therefore whether selective representations of Charles II from Tory sources gave a lead to

these later pop-histories, and, indeed, whether hostile Whig accounts provided the basis for

disapproving Victorian representations of the King.[30]

In particular the 'Restoration myth' was a powerful factor which all but obliged

pamphleteers to take account of the King.[31] The story of Charles II and his triumphant return

from exile acted as a foundation myth for the era. It was, moreover, the exclusive preserve

of the King - Tory efforts to extend and transfer this powerful providential narrative to James

were largely unsuccessful.[32] The King was located in a mythic sense of national or

collective memory: print literature inextricably linked Charles's personal past with the

nation's past, making Charles's story into England's story, and rendering the King

emblematic of her patriotic redemption. In a sense the process of mythologizing Charles II

had begun even before the Restoration, for in *Eikon Basilike* Charles I had appeared to

impart to his son his lifetime's purpose: "And if God will have disloyalty perfected by my

destruction, let my memory ever with my name live in you."[33] The Restoration myth

promoted a notion of a Prince mythologized by the cycle of civil war; a notion designed,

precisely, for an age de-mythologized by the bitter experiences of 1640s. The memory of the

---

[28] Here Hutton discusses a trend best exemplified by Arthur Bryant, Antonia Fraser and Richard Ollard, *Debates in Stuart History*, p142-143

[29] A point explored in Chapter Five

[30] This possibility falls outside the parameters of this thesis - but is one I hope to test in subsequent research

[31] Defined and outlined in Chapter Five. It is perhaps *the* central narrative of representations of Charles II.

[32] As argued in Chapter Seven. Although, paradoxically, it is precisely the personal mythologizing found in propaganda – the installing of Charles and his character to such a prominent role in debates – which made the figures of the Duke of York and the Duke of Monmouth so useful to Exclusion polemicists. The importance of these figures lies in their presence as alternative royal symbols; they were complicating factors which potentially offset the King (and his Restoration Myth). On one level these were rival symbols of royalty that disputed the supremacy of the main one (i.e. the King). But more fundamentally the two Dukes became tools used by polemicists to shape representations of Charles II: to change the meaning of the King's representations by adding or subtracting association with one or other Duke.

[33] *Eikon Basilike. The pourtracture of His sacred Majestie in his solitudes and sufferings, with a perfect copy of prayers used by His Majesty in the time of his sufferings* (1649), p251

Civil War years was therefore integral to the telling of the Restoration myth. These texts offered a compelling personal narrative that resonated with the nation because it embodied a vision of English cultural identity – of the nation's past struggle and of her future destiny. Exclusion debate demonstrates that it is a mistake to try and separate 'Restoration myth' from Restoration politics, for part of what gave Charles II power was his wider symbolic significance.

The process by which an individual comes to not only epitomize a cause but seem to *be* that cause – to be the manifestation of all that it means and represents – is vital to explaining the potency of leadership cults. The construct of a Kingly persona was a symbolically-charged amalgamation of past, present and future creating a notional King: an image designed to resonate emotionally and intellectually with the subject, to demand of them their allegiance not just with reference to royal policy, but to royal majesty, character and providential destiny. In the shaping and manipulation of collective memory, iconographic representations of the King formed the central paradigm.

(iii) A New Reading of the Exclusion Crisis

It is hoped that a new reading of the period 1678-83 is opened up by the present research; adding to our analysis aspects which have hitherto have been absent from historiography or were yet to receive synthetic definition.[34] In explicating the image of the King, we come to understand the power that it held in the battle for hearts and minds, and we may thus gain a sense of Exclusion debate where people's passions and desires are factored back into our reading of the period. Decoding the patterns of Kingly representation furthers our evaluation of what mattered to Englishmen during the crisis, of what these debates were actually about and what determined their outcome.

---

[34] The work which has been done towards understanding the 'Image of Charles II' has made a good start but has neither covered the whole reign nor taken the Exclusion Crisis into consideration. See, Madway, 'The Most Conspicuous Solemnity: The Coronation of Charles II', p141-158; Reedy, 'Mystical Politics: The Imagery of Charles II's Coronation', p19-43.

231

The movement of cultural tectonic plates during the crisis had a lasting effect on the political landscape – not least in the emergence of new political groupings such as Whig and Tory. Older notions and symbols no doubt survived the period, but were forever changed by it, particularly the memory of Charles II himself - it seems likely that remembrance of the King after his death in 1685 could not fail but take account of the Exclusion-era or be influenced by the wealth of representations dating from this period.[35] The verdicts of the King's defenders and detractors ever since may, perhaps, have turned on the legacy of the crisis. Tracing representations of the King - with all their multifarious and contradictory complexities - helps to demonstrate how this flood of Exclusion-era depiction took form and coalesced into plural portraits of the King. It is only by tracking how these representations first evolved and responded to the movement of events that we begin to see how certain aspects came to dominate others and were passed on to posterity.

The reading of the Exclusion-era that I have sought to advance raises questions about the relationship that Restoration subjects bore to authority. The process by which an individual leader came to symbolise a cause is crucial in this regard: it suggests that people responded to, or, at least, that polemicists believed that they responded to, iconographic representations that were loaded with ideological meaning. Partisan contestation of the meaning and applicability of the King testify to the power that these representations held. The processes uncovered in this thesis demonstrate the ways that a leader takes on or attains iconicity – character and symbolic narrative matter as much as policy. These insights are not peculiar to early-modern Kingship but hold great relevance to our own time. We may, for example, note with interest that the New York Times, in writing of the 2004 Republican Party convention (occurring in the wake of the second Gulf War) remarked upon: "the tendency of speakers to praise President Bush's war in Iraq not as a wise effort but as a sign of personal 'inner strength'. They insisted that we were safer after the Iraq invasion – not because of

---

[35] Tracing post-1685 representations of Charles II – and the influence that Exclusion-era representation had upon them - remains an aspect largely unexplored in existing historiography. It is an avenue of research I hope to pursue further.

anything it accomplished, but because it showed we were led by the kind of person who invaded Iraq."[36] Such trends constitute nothing new. In order that a King may transcend the position of mere policy-maker and lead a nation through personal conviction he must become something greater than an individual ruler: he must come to symbolise a collective destiny; to appear to possess a deep and prescient sense of providence to which he alone is privileged. It was precisely this attempt to transform Charles II that is revealed in printed representations of him.

What does all this tell us about power, Kingly or otherwise? Firstly it points the historian toward the need for a widened focus: it is true that the 'power' of the crown depended on institutions - be they a standing army, JPs and local officials, or the Judiciary - but these are not the only places to look for the manifestations of regal authority.[37] Kingly power also depended upon the dissemination of ideas: upon notions which informed public consciousness as to who a ruler was, what that ruler represented, and what their rule meant for the subject. In engaging in a public debate of the type we find in the Exclusion-era, English society was further pushed down a path toward more overt bargaining between authority and subject; a strengthening of an unspoken contract of expectation between ruler and ruled.[38]

Yet we must also ask why the iconization of an individual leader is so powerful a cultural reflex. We can find similar, though lesser, examples of generals and military heroes being elevated to the status of popular icon.[39] But none could achieve the resonance possible to a King. Indeed, this was true of monarchs both living and deceased - the ideological shaping of royal memory continued long after a reign had ended, as the Restoration cults of Elizabeth

---

[36] Christopher Caldwell, 'The Way We Live Now: The Triumph of Gesture Politics', *The New York Times on Sunday* (23/01/05)
[37] A point also argued by Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England*, p3
[38] An idea alluded to in the work of Harris; Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain, p152-3
[39] In the Elizabethan naval heroes of Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Francis Drake or, not long after the reign of Charles II, in the generalship of the Duke of Marlborough.

and of Charles I prove (indeed, it became easier for propagandists to eulogise 'heroes' when the figures in question could not longer scupper their efforts through hapless misadventure).

The figure of the King occupied the pre-eminent position of authority in early-modern society, but this alone does not explain the potency of royal images. There is something else, something more elusive at work than straightforward praise for those at the top of the heap. The projection of a mythic and providential destiny onto an individual leader reveals, perhaps, a 'Messiah impulse' - a tendency in people to look for, and to channel their hopes and desires onto a leader who might act as national saviour.[40] This may explain why high hopes for new leaders - be they seventeenth-century rulers or their latter-day equivalents - give way with such inevitability to disappointment and dejection, as expectations (reasonable or otherwise) are dashed time and again. Propagandists of the Exclusion-era were, therefore, peddling something for which there was a great desire, yet something which could never be fulfilled. Representations of the powerful in the Exclusion Crisis, as today, matter greatly in the exercise of authority.

---

[40] This is not to argue that Messiahs or salvations are to be seen inevitably as mere creations of human desire, as multipled and distored by human imagination – a thesis twentieth-century representationalist 'suspicion' often requires. Rather, we see here more simply and more fundamentally that the 'religious' psyche is always involved in the expression of the world's hopes and desires.

NLS – National Library of Scotland
EEBO – Early English Books Online
NCL – New College Library (Edinburgh University)
NYPL – New York Public Library

An Accompt of the Bloody Massacre in Ireland: Acted by the Instigation of the Jesuits, Priests, and Friars, who were Promoters of those horrible Murthers, Prodigious Cruelties, barbarous Villanies, and inhumane Practices executed by the Irish Papists upon the English Protestants. London, 1678. NLS.

An account of Mr. York's Suite; In a dialogue between Mr. York, and his Post. London, 1681. NLS.

An Account of the Apprehending two Persons supposed to be the D. of Monmouth and Sir Thomas Armstrong. 1683. NLS.

An account of the noble reception of His Grace the D. of Monmouth By the Citizens of the City of Chichester, On the 15 of this instant February. In a letter to a Person of Quality in London. London, 1682. NLS.

An Account of the Several plots, conspiracies, and hellish attempts of the bloody minded Papists against the Princes and Kingdoms of England, Scotland from the reformation to this present year 1678. London, 1678. EEBO.

An Account of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Dutchess of York, their Arrival and Reception in Scotland, the 26. of Octob, 1680. In a Letter from a Gentleman of their Highnesses Retinue to a Friend in London. 1680. NLS.

Advice to His Grace. London, 1682. NLS.

Albion's Congratulatory; or, a Poem, Upon the High and Mighty Prince James Duke of Albany and York, His return unto Scotland. Edinburgh, 1680. NLS.

An Answer to a Scoffing and Lying Lybell, Put forth and privately dispersed under the Title of A Wonderful Account of the Cureing the Kings-Evil, by Madam Fanshaw the Duke of Monmouth's Sister. London, 1681. NLS.

An apostrophe from the Loyal party to the King's most sacred Majesty humbly shewing how the next House of Commons by laws may be purged of its dis-affected members. London, 1681. EEBO.

At Amsterdamnable Coffee-House. On the 5th of November ext, will be Exposed to publick sale these Goods following, in several parcels. London, 1684. NLS.

The Ballad of the Cloak or the Cloaks Knaverie. 1665. NLS.

The Battell of Bodwell-bridge, or, The Kings Cavileers Triumph. To be sung with a *pleasant New Tune.* 1679. NLS.

Blount, Thomas. *Boscobel or, The Compleat history of His Sacred Majesties Most Miraculous preservation after the Battle of Worcester,* London, 1680. EEBO.

Blout, Charles. *An appeal from the country to the City, for the preservation of His Majesties person, Liberty, Property and the Protestant religion.* London, 1679. EEBO.

Bothwell Banks is Bonny: or A Description of the New Mylne of Bothwell. 1680. NLS.

Bothwell Lines. 1679. NLS.

A Brief Account of His Sacred Majestie's Descent in a true Line Male From King Ethodius the First. Written in a Letter to a Friend. Edinburgh, 1681. NLS.

A Brief Account of the Several Plots, Conspiracies, and Hellish Attempts of the Bloody-minded Papists, against the Princes and Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, from the Reformation to this present Year, 1678. As also their cruel Practices in France against the Protestants in the Massacre of Paris, & c. With a more particular Account of their Plots in relation to the late Civil war, and their Contrivances of the Death of King Charles the First, of blessed Memory. London, 1679. NLS.

The Brimigham ballad on Their Royal Highnesses return from Scotland to the tune, of Monk's march. London, 1682. EEBO.

Burnet, Gilbert. *A letter, written upon the Discovery of the late Plot.* London, 1678. NLS.

By the King. A Proclamation, Commanding all Persons being Popish Recusants, or so reputed to deport from the Cities of London and Westminster, and all other Places With in Ten miles of the same. Given at Our Court at Whitehall, the Thirtieth of October, 1678. in the Thirtieth year of Our Reign. God Save the King. Edinburgh, 1678. NLS.

By the King, a Proclamation for the apprehending of James, Duke of Monmouth, Ford, Lord Grey, Sir Thomas Armestrong, Knight, and Robert Ferguson. London, 1683. NLS.

A Canto on the New Miracle by the D. of M curing a young Wench of the Kings Evil. 1681

Captain Thorogood, His Opinion of the Point of Succession, To a Brother of the Blade in Scotland. 1679. NLS.

The Case of Protestants in England under a Popish Prince, If any shall happen to wear the Imperial Crown. London, 1681. NLS.

The Case Put, Concerning the Succession of His Royal Highness the Duke of York. London, 1679. NLS.

Cerdan, Jean-Paul. *Europe a slave, unless England breaks her chains discovering the grand designs of the French-Popish Party in England for several years past.* London, 1681. EEBO.

C.F, *A Letter to His Grace the D. of Monmouth, this 15ᵗʰ of July, 1680. By a true Lover of His Person, and the Peace of the Kingdom.* London, 1680. NLS.

The Character of a through-pac'd Tory, ecclesiastical or Civil. London, 1682. EEBO.

The Charge of a Tory plot maintain'd in a dialogue between the Observator, Heraclitus, and an inferior clergy-man at the Tower-Tavern: wherein the first discourse publish'd under that title is vindicated from the trifling animadversions of the observatory, and the accusation justified. London, 1682. EEBO.

A Choice Collection of wonderful Miracles, Ghosts, and Visions. London, 1681. NLS.

The Coat of arms of N.T J.F & R.L an answer to Thomson's ballad call'd The Loyal feast. Dublin, 1682. EEBO.

A Coffee-House Dialogue: or a discourse between Captain Y_ and a Young Barester of the Middle-Temple; with some Reflections upon the Bill against the D. of Y. London, 1679. NLS.

The Condemnation of Whig and Tory. London, 1681. NLS.

A Congratulatory Poem on His R H's entertainment. For Joanna Brome, 1682. London, 1682. NLS.

A Congratulatory poem on His Royal Highnesses restauaration to the dignity of Lord High Admiral of England. London, 1684. EEBO.

A Congratulatory Poem on the Safe Arrival of His Grace James Duke of Monmouth, At Utretch, on Saturday Sept. 27. 1679. London, 1679. NLS.

A Congratulatory Poem To Her Royal Highness: Upon the Arrival of Their Royal Highness In England, May the 27ᵗʰ 1682. London, 1682. NLS.

A Congratulatory Poem upon the happy arrival of His Royal Highness, James, Duke of York, at London, April 8, 1682 written by a person of quality. London, 1682. EEBO.

The Copy of a letter from Scotland, to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Subscribed by eight archbishops and bishops of that Kingdom, as follows: viz Edinburgh, March 9 1682. London, 1682. EEBO.

The Country-Mans Complaint, and Advice to the King. London, 1681. EEBO.

Cowley, Abraham. *An heroick poem upon the late horrid rebellion, His Majesties Happy Restauration: And the Magnanimity and Valour of his Royal Highness James Duke of York, In the late Dutch War.* London, 1683. EEBO.

Day-Fatality: or, some observation of Days, Lucky and Unlucky, concluding with some remarques upon the Fourteenth of October, the auspicious birth-day of His Royal Highness, James Duke of York. London, 1679. NLS.

de Bremond, Gabriel. *Hattige: or The amours of the King of Tamaran: A Novel.* Amsterdam, 1683. EEBO.

Denton, William. *Jus Caesaris et ecclesiae vere dictae or, A treatise wherein independency, Presbytery, the power of Kings, and of the Church.* London, 1681. EEBO.

A Dialogue Between Monmouth-Shire, and York-shire. About cutting Religion according to Fashion. London, 1681. NLS.

A Dialogue between the D. of C and the D. of P at their meeting in Paris, with the ghost of Jane Share. London, 1682. EEBO.

The D- of M-s Case Stated in Cheshire, Somewhat differing from that Printed in Town. London, 1682. NLS.

The Down-Fall of the Whiggs: or, the Duke of Monmoths Journey into the North. To the Tune of Hey Boys up go we. London, 1682. NLS.

Draghi, Giovanni Battista. *An ode to the King on his return from New-market/set by Mr Baptist, Master of the Queen's Musick.* London, 1684. EEBO.

Dryden, John. *Absalom and Achitophel a poem.* London, 1681. EEBO.

Dryden, John. *Prologue To His Royal Highness, Upon His first appearance at the Duke's Theatre since his Return from Scotland.* London, 1682. NLS.

Dryden, John. *Sol in Opposition to Saturn, or, A Short return to a late tragedy call'd The Duke of Guise.* London, 1683. NLS.

The Duke of Monmouth and Earl of Essex, with the rest of the Noble Peers, Vindicated: In Answer to a Printed Letter to a Noble Peer of the Realm, about his late Speech and Petition to his Majesty. 1680. NLS.

The Duke of Monmouth's Case, With all the very strange Crimes and Misdemeanors alledged against His Grace, in a whole Dozen of Articles. 1682. NLS.

The Duke of Monmouth's Kind Answer to His Mournful Dutchess Complaint, In the time of His Absence: With the great Achnowledgement of His Princely Father's Love, Whose Mercy is beyond Compare. London, 1683. NLS.

Eikon Basilike. The pourtracture of His sacred Majestie in his solitudes and sufferings, with a perfect copy of prayers used by His Majesty in the time of his sufferings. Delivered by Dr. Juxon, Bishop of London, immediately before his death. London, 1649. EEBO.

Englands concern in the case of His R.H. London, 1680. EEBO.

Englands Darling, or Great Brittains Joy and hope on that Noble Prince James Duke of Monmouth. 1681. NLS.

Englands Happiness Restored, or A Congratulation Upon the Return of his Grace James Duke of Monmouth, on Thursday night the 27th of this instant November 1679. London, 1679. NLS.

England's Over-joy at the Duke of Monmouth's return. London, 1679. NLS.

England's Safety: or the Two Unamimous Votes of the Last Good Parliament Concerning the Duke of York being a Papist with their Address to His Majesty. To be revenged on the Papists in case His Majesty came by a Violent Death. Published for the Information of all True Protestants, that they may not be afraid, nor ashamed, openly to Act and Oppose the Duke, and his Adherents from Inheriting the Crown of England, in case His Majestie's Life (which God forbid) be taken from Him. London, 1679. NLS.

The English-man's Happiness under a Protestant-prince and the present condition of the Kingdom considered. London, 1681. EEBO.

The E. of Shaftsbury's Expedient for Setling the Nation. Discoursed with His Majesty in the House of Peers, At Oxford, Mar.24th. 1681. London, 1681. NLS.

The Epilogue. Written by Mr Otway to his Play call'd Venice Preserv'd, or a Plot Discover'd; Spoken upon his Royal Highness the Duke of York's coming to the eater, Friday April 21. 1682. London, 1682. NLS.

The Established Test, In order to the Security of His Majesties Sacred Person, and Government, and the Protestant Religion. Against the Malitious Attempts and Treasonable Machinations of Rome. London, 1679. NLS.

An Exact Relation of the Defeat of the Rebels at Bothwell-Bridge. Published by Authority. London, 1679. NLS.

A faithful compendium, of the birth, education, heroick exploits & victories of His Royal Highness the Illustrious Prince James, Duke of York. As also the full and just account of his kind reception, and high entertainment by the Scottish nobility at Edenburgh, the metropolitan City of Scotland. London, 1679. NLS.

A Farewel to His Royal Highness, James, Duke of York, on his voyage to Scotland, October 20, 1680. 1680. EEBO.

Ferguson, Robert. *A Letter to a Person of Honour, concerning the Black Box.* London, 1680. NLS.

Ferguson, Robert. *No Protestant-Plot: or The Present pretended Conspiracy of Protestants against the King and Government, to be a Conspiracy of the Papists against the King and his Protestant-Subject.* London, 1681. NLS.

Filmer, Robert. *Patriarcha* and *Freeholders' Grand Inquest.* 1680

The Full and true account of all the Proceedings in Scotland. since the Rebellion began. With the Account of Cap. Grahames Ingagement, As also their taking of Glasgow, and their Inhumane Cruelties acted there. With several Particulars very satisfactory. As also the true relation of the last great and bloody Fight between them and His Majesties Forces under the Command of His Grace the Duke of Monmouth. Nere Bothwel Brigg Wherein the Rebels with Routed, and pursued into Hamelton Park, with the Number of their Slain, and many other Remarkable Circumstance. London, 1679. NLS.

A Further and more particular Account of the Total Defeat of the Rebels in Scotland; the Number of the Slain, Two Standards and 1200 Prisoners brought into Edenburgh: And the Confession of divers of the Prisoners, how they were drawn into this horrid Rebellion. Edinburgh, 1679. NLS.

Garbrand, John. *Clarrior e tenebris: or, A Justification of two books, the one printed in 1680, under the Title of The Grand Inquest, the other in April 1682, under the title The Royal Favourite Clear'd: with Several other reasons in Vindication of His Royal Highness, Not so convenient in those Times to be published.* London, 1683. NLS.

Garbrand, John. *The Grand Inquest, or a full and perfect Answer to several Reasons By which it is pretended His Royal Highness the Duke of York May be proved to be a Roman-Catholick.* London, 1681. NCL.

Garbrand, John. *The Royal Favourite Clear'd with an admonition to the Roman Catholics, and an address to his Royal Highness, James, Duke of York, & c. By a barrister of the Inner-Temple.* London, 1682. EEBO.

The Ghost of Tom Ross To His Pupil the D. of Monmouth. London, 1683. NLS.

Gibbon, John. *Prince-protecting providences, or, A Collection of some historical passages relating how several princes and personages (born for great actions) have had miraculous preservations: made publick upon occasion of the late memorable (and miraculous) deliverance of His Royal Highness, James Duke of York*. London, 1682. EEBO.

Gibbon, John. *Unio dissidentium heir apparent and presumptive made one*. London, 1680. EEBO.

The Glory of the English Nation, or an Essay on the Birth-Day of King Charles the Second. London, 1681. NLS.

Gower, Humphrey. *The Speech of Doctor Gower, vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge: to his Sacred Majesty*. Edinburgh, 1681. EEBO.

Great and Weighty Considerations relating to the D. o Y Successor of the Crown. Humbly offer'd to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty, And Both Houses of Parliament, By a True Patriot. London, 1679. NLS.

Great York and Albany: or the Loyal Welcom to His Royal Highness on His Return from Scotland. London, 1682. NLS.

Grimalkin, or, the Rebel-Cat: A Novell. Representing the Unwearied Attempts of the Beasts of his Faction Against Sovereignty and Succession Since the Death of the Lyons in the Tower. London, 1681. NLS.

Hamilton, Robert. *For the Right Noble and Potent Prince James Duke of Buccleugh and Monmouth, General of His Majesties Forces now in Scotland*. 1679. NLS.

The Happy Return, or An Account of his Grace the Duke of Monmouths Surrendring himself. 1683. NLS.

A Help to Discourse, A Dialogue between a Popish Successour, and a Protestant Parliament. London, 1681. EEBO.

Here is a true and perfect account of the proceding at Windsor concerning the Cittizens petition to His Most gracious Majesty by the right honourable the Lord Mayor and the Worshipfull Court of Alderman, likewise the Kings most gracious answer delivered to them by the Lord Keeper. London, 1683. EEBO.

An heroick poem to his Royal Highness the Duke of York on his return from Scotland with some choice songs and medeyes on the times. London, 1682. EEBO.

An Heroick Poem to the King, upon the arrival of the Morocco and Bantam embassadors, to His Majesty of Great Britain. London, 1682. EEBO.

An Heroick Poem Upon His Royal Highness's Arrival. London, 1682. NLS.

A Hew and Cry after Blood & Murther: or, An Elegie on the most barbarous Murther of Thomas Thinn, Esq; With some thankful Ejaculations to Heaven, for the Miraculous Escape of his Grace the Duke of Monmouth from the Hands of the Bloody Ruffians. London, 1681. NLS.

Heynes, Thomas. *The triumphs of Royalty in the person of King Charles II a poem.* London, 1683. EEBO.

His Grace the Duke of Monmouth Honoured in His Progress In the West of England In an Account of a most Extraordinary Cure of the Kings Evil: Given in a Letter from Crookhorn in the County of Somerset from the Minister of the Parish and many others. London, 1680. NLS.

On His Royal Highness's Miraculous Delivery, and Happy Return. Written by Ca. Calle. London, 1682. NLS.

On His Royal Highness's Return. London, 1679. NLS.

His Royal Highness the Duke of York's Welcom to London a Congratulatory poem. London, 1682. EEBO.

To His Royal Highness the Duke of York, upon his return to the care and management of the Navy of England. London, 1684. EEBO.

To His Royal Highness the Duke upon His arrival. London, 1679. NLS.

An Historical Account of the Heroick Life and Magnanimous Actions of the Most Illustrious Protestant Prince, James Duke of Monmouth. Containing an Account of his Birth, Education, Places and Titles: With his Great and Martial Atchievments in Flanders and Scotland. His Disgrace and Departure both from Court and Kingdom; With the most material Circumstances that has occurred since his Return. London, 1683. NLS.

An Historical account of the rise and progress of addressing. London, 1681. EEBO.

An Historical review of the late horrid phanatical plot, in the rise, progress and discovery of the same. London, 1684. NLS.

The History of Joshua applied to the case of King Charles II in a thanksgiving Sermon/preached at St. Peters, Exon on the 29th of May 1684. By Tho Long. London, 1684. EEBO.

The Honour of great York and Albany a loyal song to a pleasant new tune. London, 1683. EEBO.

The Humble Wishes of a Loyal Subject. London, 1681. EEBO.

Hunt, Thomas. *Mr. Hunt's argument for the Bishops Right: With the Postscript. With some additions, Together with Two Discourses about the Succession, and Bill of Exclusion. In answer to two books affirming the unalterable Right of Succession, and the Unlawfulnes the Bill of Exclusion.* London, 1682. NLS.

An Impartial account of the nature and tendency of the late addresses, in a letter to a gentleman in the countrey. London, 1681. EEBO.

The Interest of the Three Kingdoms, with respect to the Business of the Black Box, And all the other Pretensions of His Grace the Duke of Monmouth, Discuss'd and Asserted. In a Letter to a Friend. London, 1680. NLS.

Jemmy Return'd: or The Nations Joy A Pleasant New Ballad. To the Tune of, Let Traytors Plot on. London, 1682. NLS.

J.F, *Englands Lamentation for the Duke of Monmouth's Departure: Reflecting on his Heroick Actions.* London, 1679. NLS.

Jockeys Downfall: A Poem on the late Total Defeat given to the Scotish Covenanters, near Hamilton Park, June 22, 1679. by His Majesties Forces, under the Command of His Highness the Duke of Monmouth, & c. Written by the Author of The Satyr against Hypocrites. London, 1679. NLS.

Johnson, J. *A Congratulatory poem on His royal Highness James Duke of York.* London, 1682. NLS.

Julian the Apostate: Being a Short Account of His Life; The Sense of the Primitive Christians about his Succession; And their Behaviour toward him. Together with A comparison of Popery and Paganism. London, 1682. NLS.

A Just and Modest Vindication of His Royal Highness the Duke of York: In observations upon a late Revived Pamphlet, Intitled, A Word Without Doors. Wherein the Reasons and Arguments of that Author, are considered and Examined. London, 1680. NCL.

A Key (with the Whip) to open the Mystery & Iniquity of the Poem called, Absalom & Achitophel: Shewing its scurrilous Reflections upon both King and Kingdom. London, 1682. EEBO.

The Lady Grey Vindicated: Being an Answer to a Popish Pamphlet, Entituled A True Relation, of a strange Apparition that appeared to the Lady Grey, commanding her to deliver to his Grace the Duke of Monmouth. London, 1681. EEBO.

The last True and New Intelligence from Scotland. Being A True and Perfect Account of the Overthrow of the Rebells, with the Number of the Slain and Taken, on both sides. With a Lift of the Names of the Chief Ring-Leaders, and Ministers, Engaged in their Rebellion. 1679. NLS.

The lawfulness of the Oath of Supremacy, and power of the King in Ecclesiastical Affairs. With Queen Elizabeth's Admonition, declaring the sence and Interpretation of it. London, 1683. NLS.

Lee, Nat. *To the Duke on his return.* London, 1682. EEBO.

L'Estrange, Roger. *An Account of the Growth of Knavery, under the Pretended Fears of Arbitrary Government, and Popery with a parallel betwixt the Reformer of 1677, and those of 1641, in their Methods, and Design.* London, 1678. NLS.

L'Estrange, Roger. *Theosebia, or, The Churches advocate endeavouring the promotion of loyalty to our King, and fidelity to the Episcopal church, by describing the rebellious principles of the enemies thereof, both in their words and actions to our late Soveraign King Charles the First, with the most barbarous Conspiracies and horid machinations against King Charles the Second, and his royal brother James Duke of York, whom God preserve.* London, 1683. EEBO.

A Letter from a person of Quality in Scotland, to a person of honour in London: concerning His Royal Highness James, Duke of York. London, 1681. NLS.

A Letter from his Holiness the Pope, To the most illustrious Protestant Prince, James Duke of Monmouth. London, 1682. NLS.

A Letter from Scotland, giving a true relation. Giving a True Relation of the unhappy Loss of the Gloucester-Frigot, Whereof Sir John Berry was Commander. With a particular Account of the Persons of Quality crowned therein, and the miraculous Escape of His Royal Highness the Duke of York. London, 1682. NLS.

A Letter to a Baron of England, Relating to the Late Bill, Concerning His Royal Highnesse. London, 1679. NLS.

A Letter to a friend, about the late proclamation on the 11th of December, 1679, for further proroguing the Parliament till the 11th of November next ensuing. London, 1679. EEBO.

A Letter to a friend in the Country touching the present fears and jealousies of the nation and how they arise. London, 1680. NLS.

The Lions Elegy, or Verses on the Death of the three Lions in the Tower. London, 1681. NLS.

The Loyal Scot; An Excellent New Song. To an Excellent New Scotch Tune. London, 1682. NLS.

Loyalty rewarded or, A Poem upon the Brace of Bucks bestowed upon the loyal apprentices by His Majesty. Written by an apprentice. London, 1681. EEBO.

Loyalty Triumphant: or A Poem on the Numerous Loyal Addresses To His Majesty. London, 1681. NLS.

The Medal Revers'd. A Satyre against Persecution By the Author of Azaria and Hushal. London, 1682. EEBO.

Memoirs of the Most Remarkable Enterprises and Actions of James Duke of York, Albany and Ulster. London, 1681. NLS.

Mercurius Belgicus: or, a briefe chronology of the battles, sieges, conflicts and other most remarkable passages from the beginning/this rebellion, to the 25th of March, 1646. London, 1685. EEBO.

A Moderate Decision of the Point of Succession: Humbly Proposed to the consideration of Parliament. London, 1681. NLS.

Monmouth and Bucceugh's Welcom From the North: or the Loyal Protestant Joy For His Happy Return. To the Tune of York and Albany's Welcome to England. 1685. NLS.

Monmouth's Return; or The Mistaken Whiggs. Tune of Tell me Jenny, & c. London, 1683. NLS.

A Most Serious Expostulation with Several of my Fellow-Citizens. In reference to their Standing so high for the D. Y's Interest at this juncture of time. London, 1680. NLS.

Mr. Coleman's Two Letters To Monsieur l'Chaise. The French King's Confessor with Monsieur l'Chaise's Answer to Mr. Coleman: which the House of Commons desired might be Printed. Together with the D. of Y's Letter to the said Monsieur l'Chaise; which sheweth, what Mr. Coleman wrote to him, was by his special Command and Appointment. London, 1678. NLS.

The Nations Interest: In Relation to the Pretensions of His Royal Highness the Duke of York. discovers'd at large in a letter to a Friend. London, 1680. NLS.

A New Ballad from Whig-land. To the Tune of Henry Bo. London, 1682. NLS.

A New Ballad to the promise of James D. of Monmouth, To the Tune of Now, now 'tis in vain. London, 1682. NLS.

A new narrative of the Old Plot. To the Tune of, Some say the Papists had a Plot, & c. London, 1683. NLS.

A New Presbiterian ballad to the Old Tune of the Clean Countrary way. London, 1681. NLS.

A New Scotch Ballad: Call'd Bothwel-Bridge: or, Hamilton's Hero. To the Tune of Fortune My Foe. London, 1679. NLS.

News from So-Ho- concerning the D. of Monmouth, L. Grey, and the E. of Shaftsbury: And of the strange manner of finding a Dead Corps of a Man-kind in a Cellar, in the Parish of St. Martins in the Fields. London, 1683. NLS.

News from the North A Poem on the late Most Horrible Conspiracy against his Sacred Majesty, Wherein is given an Account of James, Duke of Monmouth. Who was lately seen in Ireland. By an Embroyan Fancy of Anti-Jack Presbyter. London, 1683. NLS.

News From Windsor: Being the Duke of Monmouth's Welcome: Or, A Congratulatory on His return from Scotland. London, 1679. NLS.

A New Song, Being the Tories Imploration for Protection against the Whiggs. To an Excellent New Scotch Tune. London, 1682. EEBO.

A New Song, Being the Tories Trymph, or, the Point well Weathered: To a New Theatre Tune. London, 1682. NLS.

A new song made by a person of quality, and sung befor His Majesty at Winchester. To the Tune of, Cook Lowvel. London, 1683. NLS.

A New Song. To the tune of Robin Goodfellow. London, 1682. NLS.

A New Song Upon the King of Poland, and the Prince of the Land of Promise. To a Theater Tune: or, Hold fast thy Crown and Scepter, Charles. London, 1682. NLS.

North, Roger. *Examen: or, an Enquiry into the credit and veracity of a pretended complete History; Shewing the perverse and wicked Design of it, and the many falsities and abuses of truth contained in it. Together with some memoirs.* London, 1740. NYPL.

Old Jemmy: An Excellent New Ballad. To an Excellent New Tune, called Young Jemmy. London, 1681. NLS.

On the Arrival of His Royal Highness the Duke into England A Congratulatory Poem. London, 1680. NLS.

Order to be observed while His Majestie, or the two Houses of Parliament continue in Oxford agreed upon by the Vice-Chancellor and delegates to be communicated to the heads of houses, and by them to their respective companies. Oxford, 1681. EEBO.

The Oxford Alderman's Speech to the D. of M. Oxford, 1681. NLS.

A Panegyrick on their Royal Highnesses, And Congratulating His Return From Scotland. Edinburgh, 1682. NLS.

A Panegyrick To His Royal Highness. Upon His Majesties late Declaration. London, 1680. NLS.

Passive Obedience, Stated and asserted. In a Sermon preached at Ampthill in Bedfordshire, upon Sunday, Septemb defeating the late treasonable conspiracy against His Sacred Majesties person and government. By Tho Pomfret, AM rector. London, 1683. EEBO.

A Pastoral Copy presented to His Majesty at Cambridge by a nobleman of that University. London, 1681. EEBO.

Paterson, Ninian. *A Poem on the Test Dedicated to His Royal Highness the Duke of Albanie.* Edinburgh, 1683. NLS.

Paterson, Ninian. *The fanatick indulgence granted anno 1679.* Edinburgh, 1683. NLS.

Philalelos, J.B. *Good and joyful news for England: or, The Prophecy of the renowned Michael Nostradamus that Charles the II of Great Britain, France and Ireland King, Defender of the faith, & c shall have a son of his own body lawfully begotten, that shall succeed him in the imperial throne of Great Britain.* London, 1681. EEBO.

Philo-Carolus consisting of three points viz A canto upon the Plot, A satyr against atheism, and A Panegyrick upon our most gracious Sovereign K. Charles II. London, 1680. EEBO.

A Pindarick ode, upon His Majesties review of his forces, at Putney-Heath. London, 1684. EEBO.

A Pindarique Ode, on their Royal Highnesses happy return from Scotland after his escape at Sea. London, 1682. EEBO.

A Plea to the Duke's answers fiat justitia ruat coelum, Anglice, the Bill in the Honourable the late House of Commons against the D. was their Duty. London, 1680. EEBO.

A Poem of Congratulation on the Happy Return of His Grace James Duke of Monmouth. London, 1679. NLS.

A Poem on the happy return of His Royal Highness from Scotland. London, 1680. EEBO.

A Poem upon the new marable Statue of His present Majesty, erected in the Royal Exchange: By the Society of Merchants Adventurers of England: Together with a copy of the Inscription upon the Pedestall. London, 1683. NLS.

The Poets address to His Most Sacred Majesty. London, 1682. EEBO.
The Presentment of the Grand-Jury for the Town and Borough of Southwark in the County of Surrey. 1685. NLS.

Primerose, David. *Remerciement fait an Roi de al part de l'eglise Francoise et de l'eglise...The Thanks given to the King on behalf of the French and Dutch churches in the City of London for the favours granted by His Majesty to the Protestant Strangers returned into his Kingdom. Published by Royal Command.* London, 1681. EEBO.

A Private Peace-offering, for the discovery and disappointment of the late horrid Conspiracy against the King, & c. in a sermon preached July the 8th, in St. Helen's-Church. By Henry Hesketh. London, 1684. EEBO.

The Protestants Joy, or the Relation of His Grace the Duke of Monmouth, His Reception and Congratulation In The City of London on the 29th of October, 1680. London, 1680. NLS.

Providence bringing good out of evil in a Sermon Preached on the ninth of September, being the day of thanksgiving for the discovery of the late treasonable conspiracy against His Majesties person and government by Richard Pearson, Rector. London, 1684. EEBO.

Reasons humbly offered to His Majesty for his dispensing with the Oath of allegiance as to His Highness the Duke of York, and for his sitting in the Council of Scotland without taking the said oath. London, 1680. NLS.

Reasons for the Inditement of the D. of York presented to the grand jury of Middlesex, Saturday, June 26. 80. London, 1680. EEBO.

Reflections upon the conduct of the King of Great Britain in the late Wars contained in a letter from a Subject of one of the Confederated Princes, to a friend in Holland. London, 1682. EEBO.

A Relation of the Barbarous and Bloody Massacre of about an hundred thousand Protestants, begun at Paris, and carried on over all France by the Papists, in the Year 1572. London, 1678. NLS.

Remarques upon the new project of association: In a Letter to a Friend. 1681. NLS.

The Rose of Delight, or An Excellent new song in the praise of his Grace James D. of Monmouth. London, 1680. EEBO.

Scotland's rejoicing, or a gratulatorie poem upon his Royal Highness arrival into Scotland. Edinburgh, 1679. NLS.

A Seasonable Invitation For Monmouth to Return to Court. A Friend to Monarchs, and a Lover of Loyal Subjects. London, 1681. NLS.

Semper ego auditor tantum, or, A Vindication of His Royal Highness the Duke of York, & c. London, 1682. EEBO.

A Sermon at the Funeral of St Edmund-Bury Godfrey, One of His Majesties Justices of the Peace, Who was Barbarously Murthered. Preached on Thursday the last day of October 1678. In the Parish Church of St. Martin in the Fields. By William Lloyd D.D. Dean of Bangor. London, 1678. NLS.

A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Cambridge on the 9th of September being the day of publick thanksgiving for the deliverance of His Majesty's sacred person, his Royal Brother, and the government, from the late hellish fanatick conspiracy. Miles Barne, D.D. Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty. London, 1683. EEBO.

A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords on the Fifth of November, in the Abby Church at Westminster. By Thomas, Lord Bishop of Exeter. Published by their Lordships special Command. London, 1678. NLS.

A Sermon Preached November 5. 1678. At St. Margarets Westminster, Before the Honourable House of Commons By John Tillotson, D.D. Dean of Canterbury, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty. London, 1678. NLS.

A Sermon Preached on the Fast-day, November 13. 1678. at St Margrets Westminster, before the Honourable House of Commons. By Edward Stillingfleet, D.D.Dean of St.Paul's, and Chaplain in ordinary to His Majesty. London, 1678. NLS.

A Sober and Seasonable discourse by way of a dialogue between a States-man and a Country-gentleman making it manifest that the Sober and truly religious people of this nation, formerly called Puritans and of late Presbyterians, were not the designers and promoters of the last war: and proving by unanswerable reasons that there is no such Country for the quieting the Spirits of all sorts of people. London, 1681. EEBO.

Some Remarques Upon a Late Popular piece of nonsense called Julian the Apostate, & c. Together with a particular vindication of His Royal Highness the Duke of York. By a Lover of Truth, Vertue, and Justice. London, 1682. NLS.

A Speech lately made by a noble peer of the realm. London, 1681. EEBO.

The State and Interest of the Nation, With respect to His Royal Highness the Duke of York. Discours'd at large; in a Letter to a Member of the Honourable House of Commons. London, 1680. NLS.

Strange and Wonderful News from Bristol. Being a True Relation, how several Sheep were found killed near that City; their Bellies being Ript Open, and their Fat only taken out of them; all the rest of the Carcas being left entire, in order (as it is to be Feared) to the Kindling more Dreadful Fires, for carrying on the Horrid and Damnable Popish Plot and Conspiracy for the Destruction of His Majesty, and the Protestant Religion and Government now Establisht by Law. 1678. NLS.

A thankgiving sermon for discovery of the late phanatick plot, September 9, 1683. By John Harrison. London, 1683. EEBO.

Tom Tell-Troth: or, A Dialogue Between the Devil and the Pope, About Carrying on the Plot. London, 1679. NLS.

The Tory ballad on Their Royal Highnesses return from Scotland, to the tune of The Prince of Orange's delight. London, 1682. NLS.

A Tory Plot, or, The discovery of a design Carried on by our late addressers and abhorrers, to alter the constitution of the government and to betray the Protestant religion (Philanax Misopappas). London, 1682. EEBO.

The Tory-poets a Satyr. London, 1682. EEBO.

A True Account of the Great Victory obtained over the Rebels in Scotland, By His Majesties Forces Under the Command of his Grace the Duke of Monmouth, the 22d of this Instant June, 1679. In a Letter to a Person of Quality. London, 1679. NLS.

True Account of the Invitation and Entertainment of the D. of Y. at Merchant-Taylors-Hall, by the Artillery-Men, on Tuesday October 21th 1679. In a Letter, & c. London, 1679. NLS.

A True and Exact Relation of His Royal Highness James, Duke of Albany and York, His Progress from Edinburgh to Linlithgow, from thence to Stirling, and back again the Edinburgh, upon the 3d, 4th, and 5th of February Instant. Published by Authority. London, 1681. NLS.

A true and impartial account of the Duke of Monmouth's being taken into Custody, and his putting in Bail befor Judge Raymond. London, 1682. NLS.

A True and perfect narrative of the later Terrible and Bloody Murther of Sir Edmondberry Godfrey; Who was found Murthered on Thursday the 17th. of this Instant October, in a Field near Primrose-Hill. With a full Accompt of the manner of his being Murthered, and in what manner he was found. Also, the full Proceedings of the Coroner, who sat upon the Inquest, & c. Edinburgh, 1678. NLS.

A True and Wonderful Account of a Cure of the Kings-Evil, by Mrs. Fanshaw, Sister to his Grace the Duke of Monmouth. London, 1681. NLS.

A True Copy of a Second Letter, From a Friend in Utrecht To a Friend in London. Giving an account, not only of some remarkable passages relating to his Grace, James Duke of Monmouth, but likewise to the present concerns at Hamburgh. Utrecht, 1679. NLS.

The true loyalist: or, the Subjects duty to his Soveraign Wherein is contained an antidote against Popery and phanaticism. London, 1683. EEBO.

A True Narrative of the Duke of Monmouth's Late Journey into the West, In a Letter From an Eye-Witness thereof, to his Correspondent in London. London, 1680. NLS.

The Tryal of Edward Coleman, Gent. For Conspiring the Death of the King, and the Subvertion of the Government of England and the Protestant Religion: who upon Full Evidence was found Guilty of High Treason, And received Sentence accordingly, on Thursday November the 28ᵗʰ 1678. London, 1678. NLS.

Two Letters from Scotland. Giving a True Relation of the Unhappy Loss of the Glouster-Frigot, Where of Sir John Berry was Commander. 1682. NLS.

Two Letters Written by the Right Honourable Edward Earl of Clarendon, late Lord High Chancellour of England: One to His Royal Highness the Duke of York: The other to the Dutchess. Occasioned by Her embracing the Roman Catholick Religion. London, 1680. NLS.

Upon the Departure of His Grace, James, Duke of Monmouth To all Protestant Well-wishers. London, 1679. NLS.

Verax, Philamax. *A Letter to His Royal Highness the Duke of York touching his revolt from, or return to, the Protestant religion/by an old cavalier and faithful son of the church of England as establish'd by Law.* London, 1681. EEBO.

The Vindication of His Grace James, Duke of Monmouth, With the rest of the Noble Peers; In an Answer to a Printed Letter to a Noble Peer of the Realm, about his late Speech and Petition to His Majesty. London, 1681. NLS.

Vox Patriae: or The Resentments & Indignation of the Free-born Subjects of England, against Popery, Arbitrary Government, the Duke of York, or any Popish Successor, being a true collection of the Petitions and addresses lately made. London, 1681. NLS.

Vox Populi Vox Dei; or, Englands general lamentation. London, 1681. NLS.

A Welcom to his Royal Highness Into the City, April the Twentieth, 1682. Per J.P Citizen of London. London, 1682. NLS.

The Well-Wishers to the royal family to a new Playhouse tune. London, 1682. EEBO.

Whitehall, Robert. *1679, gratulamini mecum, or, A Congratulatory essay upon His Majesties most happy recovery.* London, 1679. EEBO.

A Word without doors, concerning the bill for Succession. London, 1679. NLS. Wycherley, William. *Epistles to the King and Duke.* London, 1683. NLS.

The Young Bastards Wish, A Song To the Tune of the Old Mans Wish. London, 1685. NLS.

Young Jemmy An Excellent New Ballad, To an Excellent New Tune. London, 1681. NLS.

Secondary Source Bibliography

Adamson, John (ed). *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture Under the Ancien Regime*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1999

Anglo, Sydney. 'The Courtier: The Renaissance and Changing Ideals' in *The Courts of Europe: Politics, Patronage and Royalty 1400-1700*, (ed) A.G. Dickens, Thames and Hudson, 1997

Ashcraft, Richard. *Revolutionary Politics & Locke's Two Treatises of Government*, Princeton University Press, 1986

Ashcraft, Richard. *Locke's Two Treatises of Government*, Allen & Unwin, 1987

Ashcraft, Richard. 'The Radical Dimensions of Locke's Political Thought: a dialogic essay on some problem of interpretation' in *History of Political Thought*, XIV Winter, 1992

Aylmer, Gerald. 'Patronage at the Court of Charles II' in *The Stuart Courts,* (ed) Eveline Cruickshanks, Sutton, 2000

Barnes, Julian. 'French Farce' in *The Guardian*, 03/05/2002

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies* (selected and translated from the French by Annette Lavers), Vintage, 1993

Belcher, Gerald L. 'Spain and the Anglo-Portuguese Alliance of 1661: A Reassessment of Charles II's Foreign Policy at the Restoration' in *The Journal of British Studies*, XV Nov, 1975

Bell, Maureen. and Barnard, John. 'Provisional Count of Wing Titles 1641-1700' in *Publishing History*, 44, 1998

Bernard, John; McKenzie, D.F. and Maurenn Bell. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Volume 4: 1557-1695*, Cambridge University Press, 2002

Bevan, Bryan. *James Duke of Monmouth*, Robert Hale & Co, 1973

Burgress, Glenn. 'The Impact of Political Thought: Rhetorics for Troubled Times' in *The Impact of the English Civil War*, (ed) John Morrill, Collins & Brown, 1991

Burke, Peter. *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*, Yale University Press, 1992

Burns, J.H. (ed) with the assistance of Mark Goldie. *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, Cambridge University Press, 1991

Caldwell, Christopher. 'The Way We Live Now: The Triumph of Gesture Politics' in *The New York Times on Sunday* newspaper 23/01/2005

Callow, John. *The Making of King James II The Formative Years of a Fallen King*, Sutton, 2000

Cavallo, Guglielmo and Chartier, Roger (eds). *A History of Reading in the West* (Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane). University of Massachusetts Press, 1997

Chartier, Roger. 'Reading Matter and 'Popular' Reading: From the Renaissance to the Seventeenth Century' in *A History of Reading in the West* (Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane), (eds) Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, University of Massachusetts Press, 1997

Condren, Conal. *The Language of Politics in Seventeenth-Century England*, St Martin's Press, 1994

Corns, Thomas N. (ed), *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, Cambridge University Press, 1999

Coward, Barry. *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714*, Longman, 1980

Cressy, David. *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England*, University of California Press, 1989

Crist, Timothy. 'Government Control of the Press after the Expiration of the Printing Act in 1679' in *Publishing History*, 5 (1979)

Cruickshanks, Eveline (ed). *The Stuart Courts*, Sutton, 2000

Culler, Jonathan. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981

Cust, Richard. 'News and Politics in Early Seventeenth Century England' in *Past & Present*, No 112, 1986

Dagmar, Freist. *Governed by opinion: politics, religion, and the dynamics of communication in Stuart London, 1637-1645*, St. Martin's Press, 1997

De Krey, Gary S. 'The London Whigs and the Exclusion Reconsidered' in *The First Modern Society*, (eds) A.L. Beier, David Cannadine and James M. Rosenheim, Cambridge University Press, 1989

De Krey, Gary S. 'London Radicals and Revolutionary Politics 1675-83' in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, (eds) Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie, Basil Blackwell, 1990

De Krey, Gary S. 'Party Lines: A Reply' in *Albion*, 25:4, 1993

De Krey, Gary S. 'Reformation in the Restoration Crisis 1679-82' in *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England 1540-1688*, (eds) Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Strier, Cambridge University Press, 1996

De Krey, Gary S. 'Radicals, reformers and republicans: academic language and political discourse in Restoration London' in *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration*, (eds) Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, Cambridge University Press, 2001

Durston, Christopher, and Eales, Jacqueline. *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*, Macmillan, 1996

Edie, Carolyn A. 'The Popular Idea of Monarchy on the Eve of the Stuart Restoration', in *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 39, 1975-6

Edie, Carolyn A. 'Right rejoicing: Sermons on the occasion of the Stuart Restoration 1660', in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 62 Aug, 1979

Edie, Carolyn A. 'News from abroad: Advice to the people of England on the eve of the Stuart Restoration', in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 67 Autumn, 1984

Falkus, Christopher. *Charles II*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1972

Fox, Adam. 'Custom, Memory and the Authority of Writing' in *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England*, (eds) Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle, St. Martin Press, 1996

Francis, F.C. (ed). *Narcissus Luttrell's Popish Plot Catalogues*, Blackwell, 1956

Fraser, Antonia. *King Charles II*, Arrow, 1998

Geertz, Clifford. *The interpretation of cultures; selected essays*, Basic Books, 1973

George, M. Dorothy. *English Political Caricature to 1792: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda* (Volume 1), Oxford University Press, 1959

George, M. Dorothy. *English Political Caricature 1793-1832: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda* (Volume 2), Oxford University Press, 1959

Glassey, Lionel K.J. *The Reigns of Charles II and James VII & II*, Macmillan, 1997

Goldie, Mark. 'Danby, the Bishops and the Whigs' in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, (eds) Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie, Basil Blackwell, 1990

Goldie, Mark. 'Priestcraft and the Birth of Whiggism' in *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, (eds) Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner, Cambridge University Press, 1993

Goldie, Mark. 'Restoration Political Thought' in *The Reigns of Charles II and James VII & II*, (ed) Lionel K.J. Glassey, Macmillan, 1997

Goldie, Mark. 'The Hilton Gang and the Purge of London in the 1680s' in *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain*, (ed) Howard Nenner, University of Rochester Press, 1997

Greaves, Richard L. *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688-89*, Stanford University Press, 1992

Greaves, Richard L. 'Great Scott! The Restoration in turmoil, or, Restoration Crises and the emergence of Party' in *Albion*, 25:4, 1993

Griffith, P., Fox, A. and Hindle, S. (eds). *The Experience of Early Modern England*, St. Martins Press, 1996

Griffiths, Antony. *The Print in Stuart Britain 1603-1689*, British Museum Press, 1998

Habermas, Jurgen. *The structural transformation of the public sphere: an inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*, Polity Press, 1989

Hackett, Helen. 'Dreams or Designs, Cults or Constructions? The Study of Images of Monarchs', in *The Historical Journal*, 44 Sept, 2001

Haigh, Christopher. *Elizabeth I*, Longman, 1988

Haley, K.H.D. *The First Earl of Shaftesbury*, Clarendon Press, 1968

Hammond, Paul. 'The King's Two Bodies: Representations of Charles II', in *Culture, Politics and Society in Britain 1660-1800*, (eds) J. Black and J. Gregory, Manchester University Press, 1991

Harris, Tim. *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis*, Cambridge University Press, 1987

Harris, Tim. 'Was the Tory Reaction Popular?: Attitudes of Londoners towards the persecution of Dissent 1681-86' in *The London Journal*, 13, 1988

Harris, Tim. 'Party Turns? Or, Whigs and Tories get off Scott Free' & 'Sobering Thoughts, but the Party is not yet over: a reply' in *Albion*, 25:4, 1993

Harris, Tim. *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715*, Longman, 1993

Harris, Tim. 'The Parties and the People: the Press, the Crowd and Politics 'out-of-doors' in Restoration England' in *The Reigns of Charles II and James VII & II*, (ed) Lionel K.J. Glassey, Macmillan, 1997

Harris, Tim. 'Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain' in *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration*, (eds) Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, Cambridge University Press, 2001

Harris, Tim. *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685*, Penguin, 2005

Harth, Phillip. *Pen for a Party: Dryden's Tory Propaganda in its Contexts*, Princeton University Press, 1993

Holmes, Geoffrey. *The Making of a Great Power: Late Stuart and early Georgian Britain 1660-1722*, Longman, 1993

Houston, A. and Pincus, Steve (eds). *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration*, Cambridge University Press, 2001

Howarth, David. *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance 1485-1649*, Macmillan, 1997

Hughes, Ann. *The Causes of the English Civil War*, Macmillan, 1991

Hutton, Ronald. *The Restoration: a political and religious history of England and Wales, 1658-1667*, Clarendon Press, 1985

Hutton, Ronald. *Charles II: King of England, Scotland and Ireland*, Clarendon Press, 1989

Hutton, Ronald. The *Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year 1400-1700*, Oxford University Press, 1994

Hutton, Ronald. 'The religion of Charles II' in *The Stuart Court and Europe: essays in politics and political culture*, (ed) R. Malcolm Smuts, Cambridge University Press, 1996

Hutton, Ronald. 'The Triple-crowned Islands', in *The Reigns of Charles II & James VII & II*, (ed) Lionel K.J. Glassey, Macmillan, 1997

Hutton, Ronald. *Debates in Stuart History*, Macmillan, 2004

Jackson, Clare. *Restoration Scotland 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas*, Boydell Press, 2003

Jenner, Mark. 'The Roasting of the Rump: Scatology and the Body Politic in Restoration England' in *Past & Present*, Nov, 2002

Jones, Clyve (ed). *Britain in the First Age of Party 1680-1750*, Hambledon Press, 1987

Jones, J.R. *The First Whigs: the Politics of the Exclusion Crisis 1678-1683*, Oxford University Press, 1961

Jones, J.R. (ed). *The Restored Monarchy 1660-1688*, Macmillan, 1979

Jose, Nicholas. *Ideas of the Restoration in English Literature 1660-71,* Macmillan, 1984

Kantorowicz, Ernst, H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, Princeton University Press, 1957

Kenyon, J.P. *The Popish Plot*, Penguin, 1972

Kiessling, Nicolas K.   *The Library of Anthony Wood*, Oxford Bibliographical Society, 2002

Kishlansky, Mark. *A Monarchy Transformed Britain 1603-1714*, Penguin, 1997

Klein Maguire, Nancy. 'The Duchess of Portsmouth: English royal consort and French politician, 1670-85', in *The Stuart Court and Europe: essays in politics and political culture*, (ed) R. Malcolm Smuts, Cambridge University Press, 1996

Knights, Mark. 'Petitioning and the political theorists: John Locke, Algernon Sidney and London's "Monster" Petition of 1680' in *Past & Present*, Feb, 1993

Knights, Mark. *Politics and Opinion in Crisis 1678-81*, Cambridge University Press, 1994

Knights, Mark. *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture*, Oxford University Press, 2005

Knott, David. 'The Booksellers and The Plot: Luttrell Pamphlets in the University of London Library, in *The Book Collector*, 23, 1974

Koenigsberger, H.G. *Early Modern Europe 1500-1789*, Longman, 1987

Levack, Brian P. *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland and the Union 1603-1700,* Clarendon Press, 1987

Love, Harold. *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*, University of Manchester Press, 1993

Love, Harold. *English Clandestine Satire 1660-1702*, Oxford University Press, 2004

Lunger Knoppers, Laura. *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait and Print 1645-61*, Cambridge University Press, 2000

MacLean, Gerald. (ed), *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: Literature, Drama, History,* Cambridge University Press, 1995

Madway, Lorraine. *Majesty and Mockery: Representations of Royal Power in the Reign of Charles II 1660-1685*, Unpublished PhD Yale, 1999

Madway, Lorraine. 'The Most Conspicuous Solemnity': The Coronation of Charles II', in *The Stuart Courts*, (ed) Eveline Cruickshanks, Sutton, 2000

Marshall, Alan. *Intelligence and Espionage in the Reign of Charles II 1660-1688*, Cambridge University Press, 1994

Marshall, Alan. *The Age of Faction: Court Politics, 1660-1702*, Manchester University Press, 1999

Marwick, Arthur. *The Nature of History: Knowledge, Evidence, Language*, Macmillan, 1970

Mason, Wilmer G. 'The Annual Output of Wing-Listed Titles 1649-1684' in *The Library*, 29, 1974

McKenzie, D.F. 'The London Book Trade in 1644', in *Bibliographia: Lectures 1975-1988 by Recipients of the Marc Fitch Prize for Bibliography*, (ed) John Horden, Leopard's Head Press, 1992

Mengel, Elias F. (ed). *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714. Volume 2: 1678-1681*, Vail-Ballou Press, 1965

Miller, John. *Popery and Politics in England 1660-1688*, Cambridge University Press, 1973

Miller, John. *James II: a Study in Kingship*, Methuen, 1978

Miller, John. 'The Potential for 'Absolutism' in Later Stuart England' in *History* 69, 1984

Miller, John. 'A Moderate in the First Age of Party: the dilemmas of Sir John Holland 1675-85' in *The English Historical Review*, 458 Sept, 1999

Miller, John. *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II*, Pearson, 2000

Munck, Thomas. *Seventeenth-Century Europe 1598-1700*, Macmillan Press, 1990

Nenner, Howard. 'The Later Stuart Age' in *The Varieties of British Political Thought 1500-1800*, (ed) J.G.A. Pocock, Cambridge University Press, 1993

Nenner, Howard. *The Right to be King: the Succession to the Crown of England 1603-1714*, Macmillan, 1995

Nenner, Howard (ed). *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain*, University of Rochester Press, 1997

Nora, Pierre. *Realms of memory: the construction of the French past* (English language edition edited by Lawrence D. Kritzman; translated by Arthur Goldhammer), Columbia University Press, 1997

O'Gorman, Frank. *The Long Eighteenth Century: British Political & Social History 1688-1832*, Arnold, 1997

Ollard, Richard. *The Images of the King: Charles I and Charles II*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1979

Ollard, Richard. *The Escape of Charles II after the Battle of Worcester*, Constable & Co, 1986

Ollard, Richard. 'Clarendon and the Art of Prose Portraiture in the Age of Charles II', in *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts*, (ed) David Howarth, Cambridge University Press, 1993

Osborn, Andrew. 'Kinnock: I'll be Global Crusader' in *The Observer,* 01/06/2003

Osborn, James M. 'Reflections of Narcissus Luttrell (1657-1723)' in *The Book Collector*, 6, 1957

Parks, Stephen. *The Luttrell File: Narcissus Luttrell's Dates on Contemporary Pamphlets 1678-1730*, New Haven 1999

Parry, Graham. *The Seventeenth Century: the Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature 1603-1700*, Longman, 1989

Patterson, Annabel. 'Crouching at home, and cruel when abroad: Restoration constructions of national and international character', in *The Stuart Court and Europe: essays in politics and political culture,* (ed) R. Malcolm Smuts, Cambridge University Press, 1996

Pincus, Steve. '"Coffee Politicians Does Create": Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture' in *The Journal of Modern History*, 67, 1995

Pocock, John (ed). *Politics, language and time: essays on political thought and history*, Methuen, 1972

Pocock, John. *Virtue, Commerce and History*, Cambridge University Press, 1985

Pocock, J.G. *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800*, Cambridge University Press, 1993

Pocock, J.G. 'Wicked and Turbulent Though it was: The Restoration Era in Perspective' in Howard Nenner (ed) *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain*, University of Rochester Press, 1997

Potter, Lois. 'The Royal Martyr in the Restoration: National Grief and National Sin', in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, (ed) Thomas Corns, Cambridge University Press, 1999

Raymond, Joad. *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain*, Frank Class, 1999

Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*, Cambridge University Press, 2003

Reay, Barry. *Popular Cultures in England 1550-1750*, Longman, 1998

Reedy, Gerard. 'Mystical Politics: The Imagery of Charles II's Coronation' in *Studies in Change and Revolution: Aspects of English Intellectual History 1640-1800*, (ed) Paul J. Korshin, Scholar Press, 1972

Ricoeur, Paul. 'Historiography and the representation of the past' in *2000 Years and Beyond: Faith, identity and the 'Common Era'*, (ed) Paul Gifford with David Archard, Trevor A. Hart and Nigel Rappport, Routledge, 2003

Rose, Tesa. *The Coronation Ceremony of the Kings and Queens of England*, HMO Publications, 1992

Rynell, Alarik. *Antedatings and Additions for OED from the Catalogue of Political and Personal Satire in the British Museum*, Almqvist and Wiksell, 1987

Sawday, Jonathan. 'Re-writing a Revolution: History, Symbol, and Text in the Restoration' in *The Seventeenth Century*, 7 Spring, 1992

Schless, Howard H. (ed). *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714. Volume 3: 1682-1685*, Yale University Press, 1968

Schochet, Gordon J. 'Between Lambeth and Leviatham: Samuel Parker on the Church of England and political order' in *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, (eds) Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner, Cambridge University Press, 1993

Scott, Jonathan. 'England's Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot' in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, (eds) Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie, Basil Blackwell, 1990

Scott, Jonathan. *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis 1677-83*, Cambridge University Press, 1991

Scott, Jonathan. 'Restoration Process. Or, if this isn't a Party, we're not having a good time' in *Albion*, 25:4, 1993

Scott, Jonathan. *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-century English political instability in European context*, Cambridge University Press, 2000

Sebeok, Thomas A. and Umiker-Sebeok, Jean. *Recent Developments in Theory and History: The Semiotic Web*, Mouton de Gruyter, 1991

Sharpe, Kevin. 'The Image of Virtue: the Court and household of Charles I 1625-1642' in *The English court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War,* (ed) David Starkey, Longman, 1987

Sharpe, Kevin and Zwicker, Steven N. *Politics of Discourse: the Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, University of California Press, 1987

Sharpe, Kevin and Zwicker, Steven N. *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetics and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution.* University of California Press, 1998

Sharpe, Kevin. *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England.* Yale University Press, 2000

Sharpe, Kevin. *Remapping Early Modern England: the Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics*, Cambridge University Press, 2000

Skinner, Quentin. *Liberty, Before Liberalism*, Cambridge University Press, 1988

Skinner, Quentin. 'Scientia Civilis in classical rhetoric and in early Hobbes' in *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, (eds) Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner, Cambridge University Press, 1993

Smuts, R. Malcolm (ed). *The Stuart Court and Europe: essays in politics and political culture,* Cambridge University Press, 1996

Smuts, R. Malcolm. *Culture and Power in England 1585-1685*, Macmillan Press, 1999

Sommerville, J.P. 'Absolutism and Royalism' in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, (eds) J.H Burns and Mark Goldie, Cambridge University Press, 1991

Sommerville, C. John. *News Revolution in England: Cultural Dynamics of Daily Information*, Oxford University Press, 1996

Speck, W.A. *James II Profiles in Power*, Longman, 2002

Spurr, John. *The Restoration Church of England 1646-89*, Yale University Press, 1991

Spurr, John. *English Puritanism 1603-1689*, Macmillan, 1998

Spurr, John. *England in the 1670s: 'This Masquerading Age'*, Blackwell, 2000

Stanford, Michael. *A Companion to the Study of History*, Blackwell, 1994

Stock, Brian. *Listening for the Text: on the uses of the past*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990

Sutherland, James. *The Restoration Newspaper and its development*, Cambridge University Press, 1986

Thomas, Peter. 'The Impact on Literature' in *The Impact of the English Civil War*, (ed) John Morrill, Collins & Brown, 1991

Thomas, W.K. *The Crafting of Absalom and Achitophel: Dryden's "Pen for a Party"*, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1978

Tully, James. *Context and meaning: Quentin Skinner and his critics*, Princeton University Press, 1988

Underdown, David. *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-Century England*, Clarendon Press, 1996

Watson, J.N.P. *Captain-General and Rebel Chief*, George Allen & Unwin, 1979

Weber, Harold. 'Representations of the King: Charles II and his Escape from Worcester' in *Studies on Philology*, LXXXV, 1988

Weber, Harold. *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II*, University Press of Kentucky, 1996

Webster, Tom. *Godly Clergy in early Stuart England: the Caroline Puritan movement 1620-1643*, Cambridge University Press, 1997

Weil, Rachel. *Political Passion: Gender, the family and political argument in England 1680-1714*, Manchester University Press, 1999

Weil, Rachel. 'The Family in the Exclusion Crisis: Locke versus Filmer revisited' in *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration*, (eds) Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, Cambridge University Press, 2001

Weiser, Brain. 'Access and Petitioning during the reign of Charles II' in *The Stuart Courts*, (ed) Eveline Cruickshanks, Sutton, 2000

Western, J.R. *Monarchy and Revolution: The English State in the 1680s*, Blandford, 1985

Weston, Corinne C. 'England: Ancient Constitution and Common Law' in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, (eds) J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie, Cambridge University Press, 1991

Williams, Abigail. *Poetry and the Creation of a Whig Literary Culture 1681-1714*, Oxford University Press, 2005

Worden, Blair. 'Republicanism and the Restoration 1660-83' in *Republicanism, Liberty and Commercial Society 1649-1776*, (ed) David Wooton, Stanford University, 1994

Worden, Blair. 'The question of secularization' in *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration*, (eds) Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, Cambridge University Press, 2001

Wyndham, Violet. *The Protestant Duke: A Life of Monmouth*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976

Wynne, Sonya. 'The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics' in *The Stuart Courts*, (ed) Eveline Cruickshanks, Sutton, 2000

Yardley, Bruce. 'George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham, and the Politics of Toleration' in *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 55, 1992

Zaret, David. *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England*, Princeton University Press, 2000

Zwicker, Steven N. *Dryden's Political Poetry: The Typology of King and Nation*, Brown University Press, 1972

Zwicker, Steven N. 'Lines of Authority: Politics and Literary Culture in the Restoration' in *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth Century England*, (eds) Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker, University of California Press, 1987

Zwicker, Steven N. *Lines of authority: politics and English literary culture 1649-1689*, Cornell University Press, 1993