

2008

The English Identity Quest of the “Glorious Revolution”

Mark Thomas Duggan

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.lsu.edu/honors_etd



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Duggan, Mark Thomas, "The English Identity Quest of the “Glorious Revolution”" (2008). *Honors Theses*. 411.

https://repository.lsu.edu/honors_etd/411

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Ogden Honors College at LSU Scholarly Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Scholarly Repository. For more information, please contact ir@lsu.edu.

The English Identity Quest of the “Glorious Revolution”

“And let them further give me leave to tell them, That if all the Hedges and Enclosures in England were pulled down and leveled, that it would be England still: ‘Tis True, Property might suffer by such a Communication; but to Heaven and Religion, every one has an equal Title and Property.”

—*An Expedient for Peace: Perswading an Agreement amongst Christians*, anonymous, 1688.

Senior Honors Thesis

Mark T. Duggan

General Introduction: The Glorious Reappraisal

The Revolution of 1688-89 was more than a replacement of the monarch; it was more than a constitutional crisis; it was more than a legal beginning for religious toleration within England. It was an opportunity for a reevaluation of England, its history, its economy, its religion, its government, and the very nature of English identity. While there has been much argument for three centuries over whether the Glorious Revolution was glorious or revolutionary, it stands in history as an English reappraisal of itself and its place in the world.¹ In accepting a new monarch who had developed outside the Isles, the English embraced at least a symbolic shift from the status quo, partially abandoning xenophobia in the process. They tried to cling to the indisputable legitimacy of Queen Mary in continuation of the old Stuart line; but William, while descended from Charles I, was a foreigner who would bring new economic and religious thought to a country that, despite a long national tradition, was suffering from confusion regarding its religious and political systems. 1688 represented the climax—but not the consummation—of decades of strife, with England still haunted by the memory of a king executed, a monarchy reinstated, and peace shakily reestablished. Such a tumultuous half-century left England in desperate need of a steady, honorable head of state who could represent, without oppressive absolutism, the nature of England. Though the king would not say “*L'État, c'est moi*,” he could claim to be the spokesman and cultural representative of his state and nation. However, this prompts some questions: what did it mean to be English on the eve of the Glorious

¹ Such a statement may apply, though in different ways, to a wider British reappraisal, particularly in relation to the 1707 Acts of Union; but that subject deserves much greater treatment than is possible in the present study, and non-English peoples will appear from a primarily English viewpoint. For more comprehensive analysis, see Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); and the various essays in Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, eds., *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-c. 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Revolution? Was it a political identity? A religious one? An economic one? Or a combination of all of these?

The thoroughly bizarre year of 1688 forced the English to address this tension when they had thought that they could procrastinate. Despite enormous concerns regarding the religious affiliation of the king and the “Jesuitical” influences on his reign, the presumed eventual succession of his daughter Mary had led much of the English mainstream to tolerate James II warily. The birth of the Prince of Wales in June catalyzed a full realization of the tensions and complications embodied by a Catholic succession, reviving all the concerns of the exclusion crisis. The Church of England and various Dissenting Protestants each took their own stance on James’s pro-Catholic policies even before the prince’s birth, but questions regarding the king’s promotion of “liberty of conscience” soon became insignificant with the security of the country at stake. How could a country with a Protestant majority have a persistently Catholic monarchy? Those who challenged James Francis Edward’s legitimacy sought to avoid the central problem, to explain it away by saying that the child was a fraud and that his older sisters were the only legal heirs to the throne. They were likely many of the same people who had hoped to secure another illegitimate heir, the Duke of Monmouth, only a few years before. Now their eagerness to avoid an illicit succession would elevate the princess’s husband effectively to the position of sole regnant monarch, despite careful wording to indicate a shared crown. The danger of a transformed national identity was enough to alter the line of succession and give the throne to one who would use it to advance his military and political opposition to Louis XIV, whom the supportive English feared as an aggressive Catholic political force.

The Revolution then was a complex series of events with various influences coming from seemingly countless directions. The English were not monolithic; there were Protestants of

every sort, and dissenters and Catholics loomed far larger in the public mind than their small population percentages would indicate. Xenophobia led some to fear the French, but it still led others to fear the Dutch. Just as most Whigs saw the accession of William of Orange as a protection against disastrous Catholic French influence, there were Protestant Jacobites who feared that William, with his tolerant Dutch background, would create a society that lacked moral conviction and undermined the established church. It is, however, an oversimplification to think of the Revolution as a polarized “Whig v. Jacobite” contest—certainly there were general camps of opinion, but most literature on the revolution asserts that the majority of the population waited to see who won before taking sides. They were concerned for their own situations, taking a practical approach to what could have become as divisive a revolution as the one they had seen forty years before. The radicalized nature of some of the dissenters, combined with the supposed radicalism of Roman Catholics on both sides of the Channel, led the English to accept the settlement with William in the spring of 1689. By then, at least for many, it had become the only practical outcome; but this was not the case in June 1688, when the eventual Jacobites still held power. When James Francis Edward was born, anyone who believed that James II had a firm grip on his monarchy would have accepted the reality that, barring effective opposition, there would be a Catholic monarch to succeed James and continue his political toleration of Catholics. James’s opponents considered such a succession constitutionally dangerous, but it was also legal. The Whigs therefore had to make the 1689 settlement legal, even though it denied the royal succession. They could call it what they liked and spin it as they could, but the actual revolution was a usurpation, and inevitably illegal. For this reason, they argued that the Prince of Wales was illegitimate, or at least ineligible to inherit as a Catholic. Some pitied the king as hopelessly

misguided by Rome and Edward Petre, but others cast him as the lawbreaker, depriving his noble Protestant daughter of her lawful claim to the throne of England.

Perhaps all revolutions inherently involve a consideration of the national situation, but 1688 might just as easily be called the Glorious Reappraisal, the revolutionary opportunity for the English to explore their role within their country and within Europe. Groundbreaking studies, such as Jonathan Clark's *English Society 1688-1832* and Linda Colley's *Britons: Forging the Nation*, cite either the Revolution or its sister events, the 1701 Act of Settlement and 1707 Acts of Union, as a transitory phase in British history. The two works have different approaches, but regardless of whether Britain remained an *ancien régime*, they portray a new understanding by the English of their country after 1688. This partly contradicts the traditional Whiggish view, spread by Edmund Burke and others, that the Revolution was an intrinsically conservative event. While it may have been a classic example of "spin" to depict the "radical" Catholic James as turning England into something that the English did not want their country to become, it was true that those in 1688 saw the time as one of improving liberty. England found a new sense of self, one that continued many of the old concerns about Catholics or dissenting Protestants but that approached those concerns from a different perspective. Through limited toleration would come a limited secularization, and while the English remained an intrinsically religious people, they saw their religion as a practical and logical belief, particularly as compared to the superstitions of French or Irish Catholics. In unifying against the perceived threat of militant, politicized French Catholicism, the English found a new approach to their own government. They tried to approach the military threat with logic, still influenced by the traditional religious concerns but also shaped by increasing economic and political pressures. The people still followed their king, but he had to earn their support—his will alone was not

sufficient to lead the people into a conflict. Even if, as Clark maintains, some *ancien régime* characteristics continued well into the nineteenth century, feudalism was long past. The English were able to confront other countries for what they were, or at least for what they honestly thought they were; and while their fears were often irrational in hindsight, they were contemporarily relevant. Furthermore, they demonstrated that the English were quite aware of and concerned about the rest of the world, appreciating their place in Europe and the importance of world events.² The population's awareness of international events, the impending invasion by William, and the imagined popish conspiracy to enthrone a Catholic Prince of Wales demonstrate that the English did understand to some degree what was happening in 1688.

It can be helpful then to approach the Revolution of 1688-89 as a reappraisal, a means for the English to reassess their situation and identity. They found cause to rejoice in the glories of being English, in part as contrasted with their understandings of other countries, but also because of their own political system and a sense of expanding personal liberty. The Whigs' views may have been incorrect, but it is important to understand why so many people upheld them as the summation of all that was good about England.

Religious Economics: Harmonizing Old and New Scholarship

There have been substantial efforts by some current historians to demonstrate that the Revolution of 1688 was not in fact a religious event, but was driven instead by economic concerns and threats to English national security and liberty. This paper does not seek to rebut such arguments, but it may clarify them in a way that connects recent scholarship with earlier, more traditional understandings of the revolution. The Whiggish understanding of English

² For more on England in Europe see: Jonathon Scott, *England's Troubles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Tony Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); and Steven Pincus, "From butterboxes to wooden shoes: the shift in English popular sentiment from anti-Dutch to anti-French in the 1670s," *The Historical Journal* 38 (1995), pp. 333-361.

history, rightly criticized in the last few decades, is still important insofar as it demonstrates how many Britons thought about their country and its national experience. Just as one ought to study phrenology and other pseudosciences to learn about the people who believed such theories, the historian can use the Whig tradition and its origins to learn how ideas and culture developed in the decades after 1688. Some Whigs defended the Revolution as an intrinsically conservative restoration of English tradition; modern interpretations have acknowledged its revolutionary qualities. Each approach has its own strengths. Those in the Whig camp in 1688 saw William's arrival as a salvific invasion, rescuing the English from, as it were, worse than death. For the most religiously charged Whig thinkers, all the hordes of Catholic Europe had crossed the channel with the infant James Francis Edward at their head. James II's opponents felt genuine fear that June. Their tense acceptance of James after the exclusion crisis was reopened for speedy reevaluation. He had been a tolerable monarch, but with a Catholic male heir the Stuarts threatened to become the epitome of arbitrary government, imposing popery and slavery on an angry but impotent people.

While it is essential that scholars determine the importance of economics and liberty to the revolution, it is also essential that one not dismiss literature on its religious nature. People in 1688 saw the events around them in terms of religion as well as other ideas, and the various causes were interrelated. Warren Johnston has recently demonstrated that many writings from the time related the revolution to the apocalypse as foretold by the *Book of Revelation*; for some the revolution was intrinsically Christian, a result of divine providence.³ Even if that represents an extremity of English society, other examples depict a generally devout population that

³ Warren Johnston, "The Anglican Apocalypse in Restoration England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004), pp. 467-501; and "Revelation and the Revolution of 1688-1689," *The Historical Journal* 48 (2005), pp. 351-389. For a Dutch perspective on this idea, see Ernestine van der Wall, "'Antichrist Stormed': The Glorious Revolution and the Dutch Prophetic Tradition," in Dale Hoak and Mordechai Feingold, eds., *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-89* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), pp. 152-164.

combined religious concerns with others. With thrift often accepted as a Protestant virtue in contrast to Catholic overabundance and flashy wealth, Steven Pincus's description of the revolution in terms of trade and freedom may be reconcilable with religious interpretations.⁴ The various players in the revolution were working towards different ends, but those ends frequently seem to both overlap and contradict one another. For example, James wished to provide "liberty of conscience" to all his subjects to pursue and exercise whatever Trinitarian Christian belief system they wished, including Catholicism. This policy might appear to share ideals with the same freedom of religion that the American colonies would adopt almost a century later, but the result was quite different. Many Whigs condemned the king's efforts as the first step toward an eventual suppression of freedom. He would allow Catholics to practice freely and then, after some time, abolish Protestantism through Bloody Mary-styled persecution. Scholarship on James II makes this seem unlikely, but people thought that it would happen. Was this simply the continuation of traditional English anti-Catholic hysteria, furthered by Mary I, Guy Fawkes, and the supposed Popish Plot? Perhaps; the literature published in 1688 suggests that there was a great hysteria sweeping parts of the population, fed by scathing but dubious documents, including fabricated conversations between heads of state. However, mere "hysteria" does not explain the entire situation. In the mind of the English Protestant majority, Catholics in government were to be avoided because of the political implications of Romanism—and the state had always maintained that treason, not religion, was the inherent threat. They thought that ties to the pope would create an extra-national influence on domestic affairs. Even a nation that was a founding member of liberalism could only be tolerant to a point, because in the view of the English, national security was at stake in the Revolution. The

⁴ Of particular relevance are "'To protect English liberties': the English nationalist revolution of 1688-1689," in *Protestantism and National Identity*, pp. 73-104; and "The Making of a Great Power? Universal Monarchy, Political Economy, and the Transformation of English Political Culture," *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), pp. 531-545.

balance of the country, the balance of Europe, and perhaps the balance of heaven itself were all upset by the birth of James Francis Edward.

The broader implication of the persistent entwinement of church and state is that religion continued to influence English political thought. This does not mean that Steven Pincus's arguments about political economy are incorrect—economic interest was rising in the public mind as a valid concern for the state. John Locke, for example, argued that the “pursuit of property” was a basic human right that the state had to protect. He also argued, however, that England was a Protestant nation.⁵ The seventeenth century understanding of the right to property was not devoid of religious rhetoric. The king himself argued, in defending liberty of conscience, that state-enforced religious conformity hurts the government “by spoiling Trade, depopulating Countreys, and discouraging Strangers.”⁶ Pincus agrees that religion was the driving political force in the sixteenth century,⁷ and this paper will argue that on both the grassroots and intellectual levels, religion would still influence popular thought much later, officially or otherwise. Popular literature published on the eve of the Revolution of 1688 endorsed William and Mary's accession on religious grounds. Recent work has demonstrated that William continued to use religion in justifying his policies throughout his reign, even while he himself was guided by an “anti-popery” that was more political than doctrinal.⁸ This suggests that there was a distinction between thought at the top and thought at the bottom of English society. The ends were sometimes the same, but the motivations could be vastly different. Those with direct power thought of French Catholicism as a threat to national security, while

⁵ John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* (1689) and *A Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689).

⁶ *His Majesties Gracious Declaration to all His Loving Subjects for Liberty of Conscience*, second printing (London, April 1688).

⁷ Pincus, “From Holy Cause to Economic Interest,” in Alan Houston and Steven Pincus, eds., *A nation transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 275.

⁸ See Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

those nearer the bottom thought of it as a threat to their own freedom to be Protestant, a challenge to their natural, native identity.⁹ A papist political system would oppress their rights as free Protestants, indicating the intrinsic relation between Protestantism and liberty in the late seventeenth century English mind. Catholicism, with its foreign authority, implied a loss of liberty and sovereignty, which was why James was such a threat. He would practice “arbitrary government” on a Protestant people, but even worse, he might take orders from the pope, the antichrist himself. In fearing a loss of property and liberty, the people were concerned more broadly about a loss of their own identity as Protestants and as English. Even William III, the perceived champion of Protestantism, had to prove that he would not impose a Dutch religious or political system on the English—he agreed to respect English tradition and scaled back his own plans for religious toleration because the English would not have it.

Religion, politics, and economics were interrelated in their effects on late Stuart English national thought. They influenced the English understanding of international relations, contributing to both rivalry as well as alliance with the Dutch. They would clearly influence the continuing wars with France in the eighteenth century. However, the waxing of economy in politics did not necessarily imply a waning of religion. These were the concern of the state and were not distinct entities. Popular appeals to reason were replacing appeals to religion or divine revelation; but Protestantism itself was “reasonable,” particularly as opposed to irrational, magical Catholicism.¹⁰ A genuine secular state had not arrived, nor would it—and perhaps it still eludes the United Kingdom, with a monarch who heads the Anglican Communion and cannot legally marry a Catholic, and a Prime Minister who, admittedly on others’ recommendations, appoints bishops in the Church of England.

⁹ Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England*, pp. 156-158.

¹⁰ Pincus, “From Holy Cause to Economic Interest,” p. 284.

In this way, Protestantism helped to define English economic principles. Whether it was John Smith in Jamestown telling his company, “He who will not work, shall not eat,” or Victorian evangelicals trying to humanize the Industrial Revolution, Christianity repeatedly helped to shape British culture even when not directly acknowledged. It was and is an inseparable part of the European experience. The degree and complexity of influence in England still demands exploration; but the Revolution of 1688 remains a political event that resulted from religious fears. France was an economic threat and had replaced the Dutch as a rival by the time of the revolution, but this alone was not yet sufficient to rouse the furor of all the English people. Pincus asserts correctly that many in the intellectual class knew better than to assume that Louis XIV wanted a Catholic England for any moral reason, but not everyone knew that.¹¹ The abundance of publications that exploited fears of Catholicism showed that at some basic level, religious fervor moved the English people. The fear of the pope still incurred great passion, enough for many to scramble to the support of William of Orange. According to Claydon, William understood religion’s power. It cannot explain all events at all levels, but there is no foolproof, all-encompassing thesis for an event as complex as the Glorious Revolution.

Prospectus

The long-term national implications of the revolution deserve a much more substantial treatment than is possible in an undergraduate thesis, but a diverse survey of documents from the eve of the revolution might fill a gap in recent scholarship. A quick look at 1688 publications indicates a wide variety of English interests, ranging from prayer books to bawdy songs to accounts of the recent wars with Turkey; but most documents demonstrate the obvious, *i.e.*, that the vast majority of English were practicing Christians. Admittedly, this may have only been true on a surface level; how can one measure the sincerity of one’s outward expression as

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 293.

compared to one's innermost thoughts? Except for the case of the extensive diarists and other "men of letters," it is virtually impossible to garner the internal sentiments of the general population. The purpose of this paper then is to dissect popular publications from the revolutionary year and determine the role of religion in the public sphere, according to the public understanding. The work of Steven Pincus has had a particular influence on this work because of disagreements with some parts of his theses, but his views are reconcilable with those presented here when one reconsiders, as the English of 1688 did, what "religion" means. While economics and secular politics were replacing religion as the primary influence in government, such changes were often presented in religious terms. In 1688 there was more than enough material of a specifically religious nature to demonstrate that it still had enormous bearing on the public mind. It functioned alongside new ideas and created a new collection of influences that would guide England into the Victorian period.

The central instigation of the revolution was the Prince of Wales's birth. It is not the only cause and would have been less of a firebrand if circumstances had not been right; but as the catalyst, it received much attention. Its debate serves as a microcosm of the various concerns of the English political world in the late seventeenth century. There were also many responses to James's plans for "liberty of conscience" in England, which would have legalized Catholicism and Nonconformity. Literature on James, William, and Louis portray a diverse array of concerns with a consistent Christian undertone. In all these topics, one finds publications on the Jesuits, Edward Petre, and militant French Catholicism as contrasted with Protestantism. Through close examination of these works, including various bizarre satires, songs, and fabricated dialogues, this paper will explore how religion, in conjunction with international politics and economics, continued to influence the English public sphere in the late seventeenth century.

Chapter One

“The Sham Prince Expos’d”: Pre-Revolutionary Reactions to the “Warming Pan” Prince

Historians have usually accepted the legitimacy of James II’s son, but those at the time were obviously critical of the new Prince of Wales and the situation of his birth. The tone of their discussions illuminates the thinking of those on the various sides of the Revolution of 1688 and encapsulates a number of the most pressing general controversies that the English would reconsider during the revolution. A plethora of post-tercentennial publications have addressed the thinking of those in 1688 and their relations to specific subjects, including the Warming Pan scandal as it relates to women’s history.¹² Here the birth of the Prince of Wales will be approached from a number of perspectives, including the greater European picture and the gradually declining belief in divine right. When viewed against the backdrop of common English perceptions of Catholics and, particularly, Jesuits in the late Stuart period, the popular acceptance of the warming pan story becomes understandable; in reading some of the arguments against the king, one almost comes to accept their claims as rational. While some of their most extreme accusations become ridiculous, the underlying concerns that contributed to them can shed light on the popular view of the subsequent revolution, its role both in England and throughout Europe, and the role that religion played in it. The replacement of James II would play out on many levels, and while some have attempted to minimize the religious aspect to it, the popular press reveals that despite various means of articulation, religion was present in most arguments surrounding the questioned birth.

On the tenth day of June, 1688, the apparent reality was that the new James Francis Edward Stuart would one day ascend to the thrones of England, Scotland, and Ireland. From the

¹² See Rachel Weil, “The Politics of Legitimacy: Women and the Warming-Pan Scandal,” in Lois G. Schworer, ed., *The Revolution of 1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 65-82.

point of view of much of the English population, this meant that an illegitimate child would inherit absolute power, with popish assistance, over a free Protestant people. It is easy to look back at the Revolution of 1688-89 as if it were inevitable, but the reason that it happened so easily was that those who feared an attack on the Protestant succession did all that they could to protect it. The events of November and December speak more or less for themselves; but the reactions to the birth some months before, from both supporters and detractors, form a prototype for discussions of events that followed. The fears of a false heir extended to include the character of James II, the inherent threat of France, the friendliness of the Dutch Republic, and the persistent threat of popery and arbitrary government. Discussions of the new Prince of Wales would soon become entangled with explicit challenges to the government and the “invitation” of William of Orange; but those challenges could not have arisen without the initial arguments on both sides over the legitimacy of the new prince. A close study of works published in 1688 and 1689 on the new Prince of Wales reveals the complex but united threats of Catholics, the French, absolutism, and arbitrary government. On the other hand, defenses of the new prince also reflected this interrelation, but from the other side; James and his Catholic lineage had to be supported no matter what the cost to protect the traditions of monarchy and divine right. Many of his defenders downplayed the role of Catholicism, trying to avoid the controversy altogether and supporting the natural progression of the royal family. In this case, James Francis Edward’s inheritance of the throne was divinely ordained; it was not the place of the English people to try to understand God’s plans for history.

James’s opponents raised questions about the queen’s pregnancy as soon as they learned of it, but there was also a barrage of adulatory poetry throughout the months leading up to the birth and in the weeks immediately following it. Any royal birth should perhaps be met with

gracious optimism, and despite the growing opposition, some Jacobites greeted young James's existence as revolutionary in itself.¹³ Whether these poems originated in genuine gratitude for a Prince of Wales or in self-promotional flattery at court is debatable, but the rhetoric of the writings demonstrates how James wished his subjects to see his new son. They were infused with millenarian discussions of the birth and the future of England, forming a Catholic counterpart to the Protestant apocalyptic literature published around the Revolution.¹⁴ Within a year William of Orange would promote himself as a sort of Christ or David figure and deliverer from the French.¹⁵ For Jacobites during the summer of 1688, however, it was young James who would redeem their country and save them from an Orange succession and captivity by the Dutch, who, as one pamphleteer put it, "have always labour'd to ruine us, tho we preserve them."¹⁶ Some contemporary documents have an almost entirely secular tone, associating the few religious references directly with the state in relation to the established church; but the poetry acclaiming the birth is generally religious and epic in tone. John Dryden, poet laureate until he lost his job to Thomas Shadwell after the revolution, wrote pleasant, if predictable, verses on the new prince, portraying him as the answer to prayers and the guarantor of future prosperity. The poem begins:

Our vows are heard betimes! and Heaven takes care
To grant, before we can conclude the Pray'r:
Preventing Angels met it half the way,
And sent us back to Praise, who came to Pray.¹⁷

Dryden characterizes the prince as a divine gift. Furthermore, he is an eventual savior who will grant peace and safety to England. Rather than bring more conflict, he would dissolve past

¹³ Of course, as posed by Edmund Burke and others, Whigs saw this as potentially revolutionary, and the "Glorious Revolution" averted that disastrous succession.

¹⁴ Johnston, "Revelation and the Revolution of 1688-1689."

¹⁵ See again Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*.

¹⁶ *The Ballance Adjusted: Or, the Interest of Church and State Weighed and Considered upon this Revolution* (London, 1688/9), p. 6.

¹⁷ John Dryden, *Britannia Rediviva: A Poem on the Birth of the Prince* (London, 1688).

troubles and cease the need for martyrs on all sides. He praises those who have suffered for righteousness, as if in prayer:

But let their dying pangs, their living toyl,
Spread a Rich Harvest through their Native Soil:
A Harvest ripening for another Reign
Of which this Royal Babe may reap the Grain.¹⁸

The entire poem follows this imagery of the Prince as the eliminator of strife, as if his young innocence would bring the country together to support the future. It is a religiously charged optimism, in which God intervenes in English life, implying that the monarchy still exists by the gracious virtue of divine right. It carefully avoids any mention of Catholicism, endorsing the king and the prince as part of the natural, peaceful order. Of course Dryden, as poet laureate, would have towed the party line; but his contemporaries also used religious discussions in praising the Prince of Wales.

Aphra Behn's congratulatory poem for the queen similarly presents a messianic event, with more overt Christological imagery. She describes the birth as divinely calculated through intense planning, a claim that Whigs would soon adopt with a markedly different tone. In this case, her statement, "Long did th' *Almighty* pause, and long debate,/ For *Monarchs* are not fashion'd at a heat," implies an active, benevolent God dictating events of English politics.¹⁹ She proceeds to elevate monarchs to the level of God, "for gods and kings ally'd most nearly are,"²⁰ and then makes a direct comparison of the new prince to Christ:

Like the first sacred *Infant*, this will come
With promise laden from the *Blessed Womb*,
To call the wand'ring, scatter'd Nations home.²¹

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Aphra Behn, *A Congratulatory Poem to Her Most Sacred Majesty, on the Universal Hopes of All for a Prince of Wales* (London, 1688), p. 1.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

²¹ *Ibid.*

The results of this new incarnation are akin to the Parousia, bringing peace to all nations as the Messiah was predicted to do by Isaiah the prophet. In preparation for this coming, Behn urges all to “Raise those dejected Eyes, in Sorrow dress’d,/ And view the *Prospect* of the dawning *East*.”²² She concludes the poem with a final parallel to the birth of Christ:

Behold, with Joy three prostrate *Nations* come:
Albion, Hibernia and old *Caledon*
 Now join their *Int’rests*, and no more dispute,
 With sawcy Murmurs, who is Absolute;
 Since, from the Wonders of your life, ‘tis plain,
 You *will*, you *shall*, and *must* forever reign.²³

Evidently the countries of the Isles should use this birth as a cause for unity across old national lines, but such a hope is obviously quite different from the reality of the ensuing Williamite war in Ireland and other Jacobite risings. Her acknowledgment of “sawcy Murmurs” indicates an awareness of opposition, and parallels Herod’s efforts to kill the infant Jesus. Behn’s two poems for the prince drip with sentimentality and flattery of the royal family, but the logic behind it is telling. It reveals a distinctly religious undertone to early Jacobite literature; if the supporters of the king could cast themselves as honest, God-fearing people, then perhaps the Whigs were less so—the forces of King Herod himself, with an unflattering implication for William of Orange. The Whigs of course would argue the reverse, but because of the inherent oppressions of Catholicism, not the removal of religion from government that some Jacobites feared.

Thomas d’Urfey wrote a more aggressive poem, praising the Prince of Wales for his representation of nonnegotiable traditions, like divine right, and condemning the king’s opponents for their anti-monarchical iconoclasm. Like Dryden and Behn, he characterizes the birth as an answer to prayers, describing the English people as having “doubted an Heir to your

²² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

Immortal Name.”²⁴ The birth itself is a new heavenly creation, similar to Genesis: “Th’ Eternal Dash’d the darkness from the East,/ And said, Let there be Light, and it was so.”²⁵ The prince is the light, like the epithet for Jesus in Christian tradition. Then d’Urfey describes the king as the “parent of us all,” relating James to God, a sentiment consistent with traditional divine right. D’Urfey turns to decry the king’s opponents with biting sarcasm, typical of his style, for attempting to overthrow the government:

The Curr that snarls at Edicts of his King,
Methinks should streight set up a *Monarch* School;
And perfect in his knack of Governing,
Teach his Anointed Sovereign how to Rule.

Desire him to give up his Regal Power,
And veil his Judgment to *Plebeian* Tricks;
Thus let the awful Lyon reign no more,
Because the Ass would vent his Politicks.²⁶

Even while others argued that the king was attempting to overthrow English tradition, d’Urfey complains that James’s detractors would abolish the divine right to rule and break the royal line of succession. He criticizes their motivations as treasonous, indirectly condemning some English Protestants: “Wrong is the Zeal Allegiance does not grace,/ And false the Church that teaches to Rebel.”²⁷ He praises the new prince and God for preserving tradition, overoptimistically claiming that “His very Name has proud Sedition hush’d.”²⁸ He concludes, like the above adulations, with a pleasant but probably unrealistic wish: “Health, Fame and Unity, Your Grandeur raise,/ Kings then Reign best, that govern Subjects Hearts.”²⁹ D’Urfey’s tone is so kind that it almost becomes unbelievable, but d’Urfey was an associate of Charles II and James II, so it seems likely that the poem is sincere.

²⁴ Thomas d’Urfey, *A Poem Congratulatory on the Birth of the Young Prince* (London, 1688); stanza III.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, IV.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, XIV-XV.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, XXXVI.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, XXVII.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, LI.

In general, a birth of any sort can be a joyous occasion in itself, a harbinger of newness and hope. Royal births before 1688 would have been especially welcome because they solidified the succession and, as such, contributed to national security. Insisting that the Prince of Wales would provide unity, where his enemies maintained the opposite, resembles the arguments in 1688 over James's liberty of conscience. In each case, royalists argue that loyalty to James will provide unity, while Whigs maintain the reverse. For the king, a protected hereditary monarchy would ensure the *status quo*; recent monarchical conflicts, such as the execution of Charles I, were generally disdained in memory as harmful disruptions of English life. From a practical royalist perspective, then, one would hope for a continuation of that Stuart line. Even though James's daughters were English, their spouses were not; xenophobia directed towards Dutchmen and Danes could have encouraged many to hope for a legitimate English prince. The central problem, of course, would be the heir's religion, but some Protestants were able to ignore it.

This conservative and seemingly oblivious Jacobite perspective also appeared in the Anglican pulpit, with discussions of the importance of monarchy as a defender of trade. John Turner was an Anglican priest at St. Thomas' Church in Southwark, London, who published a number of sermons during the late Stuart period. He used the Prince of Wales as an opportunity to discuss divine right and the role of monarchy from a religious and economic perspective in the government of England. The page header for one such sermon, responding to the queen's pregnancy, is "Of the Miseries of Anarchy." His defense of the king and queen is mostly concerned with averting anarchy by supporting the crown. Like d'Urfey's defense of the hereditary throne, Turner too considers the maintenance of the hereditary succession, as part of the divine right principle, to be central to his support for the king and the Prince of Wales. He does not entertain questions of illegitimacy but calls for rejoicing throughout England for the

preservation of both state and religious interests. He cites the ancient Israelites as a precedent for the destruction of a nation following the collapse of their hereditary system. For the seventeenth century English, who looked to the Bible for most of their religious instruction, such a warning might lead many to follow the king, assuming that his child is legitimate. Turner advises that when proper law and government break down, the moral rectitude of the entire country soon crumbles, at which point the country collapses from within: “Where Property is destroy’d, as it is in such a State, where there is no King...Necessity makes every thing become just and lawful...so that Rapine puts on an Heroic Shape.”³⁰ His defense of the king is less flattering and more practical than Jacobite poetry; while he offers his sincere congratulations to the royal family, Turner’s concerns lie with the national interest and the collective national morality. Interestingly, he relates the loss of property to depravity and political subversion, a connection between economic wealth and the country’s degree of holiness and monarchical loyalty. His viewpoint would have been greatly criticized by most Whigs, who argued that the national interest could not be served by a Catholic succession. Turner does not address the religion of the king in this sermon but instead concludes by urging all to pray “for the Birth of a Prince, that he may render Empire in an everlasting Succession, Hereditary...and entail Peace, Righteousness Charity and Plenty upon all the Subjects of this Imperial crown.”³¹ The new prince is intrinsically good for the preservation and fruitfulness of England; for Turner, the dissenting arguments are irrelevant.

A second sermon, preached shortly after the birth of the new prince, reiterates some of these arguments, including the notion that a male heir is good for the state on principle. Perhaps acknowledging indirectly the challenges to the prince’s legitimacy, Turner says:

³⁰ John Turner, *A Sermon, Preached upon January the 29th, 1688. Upon Occasion of Her Majesties Happy Conception* (London, 1688), p. 4.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

There is no Form of Government so bad...but it is still infinitely better than no Government at all, and...the Destruction of Government...is usually so fatal to Mankind, by being exposed to the interfering Ambitions and Designs of Men that seek themselves.³²

Interestingly, this was written before the publication of John Locke's *Two Treatises of Government*; so while it almost reads as a rebuttal of his reasons for dissolution of government, it is unlikely that this was Turner's intent. He defends the current order against looming fears that the king would be overthrown. His avoidance of the legitimacy arguments raises some questions regarding his primary concerns; perhaps he thought that the issue was so divisive that it was best ignored for the sake of national unity, a sentiment that would be consistent with these two sermons. He continues with a systematic disapproval of democracy, going so far as to claim that Jesus Christ delayed coming into the world until Rome was restored, at least in theory, to a hereditary monarchy.³³ Presumably, a monarchical system would provide for the most security, after the political tradition of Aristotle's ideal, or Hobbes's *Leviathan*. His arguments for divine right provide an interesting perspective on the Revolution of 1688-89; eventually some Whigs would argue that William and Mary were preserving the hereditary succession because of the supposed illegitimacy of the prince. Turner assumes James Francis Edward to be the lawful son of James and Mary, but much of the material published in 1688 argues the opposing view. For many, the king and his new son should be opposed to protect the national interest; in their view, Turner would be, at best, gullible and naïve. At worst, he would have been a traitor and a representative of the king's corrupting influence on the Church of England.

Just as there were poets—named—who praised the birth of the new prince, there were others—anonymous—who wrote scathing verses to discredit the royal family. While some serious refutations of the birth were published, such as a point by point rebuttal of the

³² Turner, *A Sermon Preached June the 17th 1688. Upon the Birth of the Prince* (London, 1688), p. 3.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

depositions at the royal inquest that autumn, the satirical responses to the birth use much of the same rhetoric but with, of course, a more playful style. On the serious side, the general argument was that the king did not take the proper precautions to demonstrate that his wife's questionable pregnancy was real. Furthermore, the deponents in the inquest were untrustworthy and answered either under duress or to gain favor at court.³⁴ *The Full Answer to the Depositions* also addresses the wider situation in Europe and its relation to the birth, which will be considered later.

A number of letters, poems, and other documents throw direct accusations at the king, Catholics, and Edward Petre, the king's Jesuit confessor and privy councilor. The rhetoric of these publications is scathing and plays on typical early Protestant fears of Catholics. A common complaint, which the king's defenders tried to refute by divine right, was that the king was implementing a Catholic French-style tyranny on his country; they viewed his arguments as exemplary of such tyrannical arrogance and summarily rejected them in both content and delivery.³⁵ His detractors claimed that the only evidence that young James was legitimate was the king's own word, which some would say was divinely more authoritative than their own; but the dissolution of divine right theory is evident in this case. Some even argued that the king was denying the divine right of his daughter by placing an illegitimate prince in her place.³⁶ One of the most convincing general arguments against the king is that while knowing the doubt surrounding his wife's pregnancy, he failed to exercise sufficient precautions to demonstrate its validity to the country. While he did in fact go to great lengths to fill the delivery room with witnesses, his efforts would always be inadequate for his detractors. His witnesses, some Whigs

³⁴ *A Full Answer to the Depositions; And to all other the Pretences and arguments whatsoever, Concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales* (London, 1689).

³⁵ For a new study of James's political Catholicism and its French influences, see Steven Pincus, forthcoming, Chapter 5, "The Ideology of Catholic Modernity."

³⁶ *The Debates in Depositing Kings; And of the Royal Succession of Great Britain* (London, 1688).

claimed, were dubious and possibly spoke under compulsion; and if the depositions are shady, then so might be the birth. If it were otherwise, the king would have taken more care to make the events transparent.³⁷ A king, especially James, was not infallible; a belief in the reverse would appear “popish.” In mockery of the king and the inquest on the prince, one poem reads, “What these Depose unquestionably’s true;/ Our King says so, who dare say other now?”³⁸ Similarly, in a satire that will be discussed later, the king’s rhetoric and avoidance of crucial questions is described as follows: “He ought to have more moderation, and to bring good proofs, because we came thither to know if the Prince of Wales, was legitimate, or Suppositious, and not to dispute his Royal Prerogative.”³⁹ In other words, his inquest involved an inherent conflict of interests because his core argument was his own honest word. The inquest should not consider his prerogative in the first place because, evidently, that has no bearing on the truth.

Not all critiques of the king were so unforgiving—others claimed that, though incorrect, he was merely misguided, not intrinsically evil. The spectrum of dissent was broad, defending James on some counts because of respect for kingship in general. One such work, a dubious account of a conversation between Ferdinando d’Adda and the prince’s nurse, suggests that the king meant well but, under the guidance of Petre and others, had fallen astray. Someone should lead him to the truth, but England should not condemn him eternally for a temporal mistake. Such a viewpoint, reminiscent of some Civil War polemic, is similar in tone to other publications that criticized Catholics but defended their right to err, a disposition that will be discussed in the following chapter. In any case, according to this author, perhaps James

was so fond of the very Notion of having a Son in his Old Age, that in a little time he might have been (good man) deluded into the belief of it; as

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21. It sometimes seems that even witnessing the prince’s conception would have been inadequate.

³⁸ *A Poem on the Deponents Concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales* (London, 1688).

³⁹ *A Melius Inquirendum Into the Birth of the Prince of Wales: Or An Account of several New Depositions and Arguments Pro and Con, and the Final Decision of that Affair by the Grand Inquest of Europe* (London, 1689), p. 2.

some have us'd themselves to tell a Lye so often, that at last they have been perswaded that it was true.⁴⁰

While not necessarily a compelling argument, this particular passage presents a less sinister but disastrously misguided king. Such a kind objection demonstrates the diversity of opinion at the time; many who opposed the king on particular points hoped to maintain the monarchy approximately as it was for the sake of tradition, a hardened form of the arguments of d'Urfey and Turner above. This gentle criticism indicates that some in England wanted not an absolute removal of the king but merely a departure from the absolute monarchy. They welcomed the arrival of William of Orange but hoped that he would merely set order and restore a duly reprimanded James II to his throne. Even in doing so, however, they were participating in the general reappraisal of the English experience, recasting the king in a position that does not forbid criticism. While defending the monarchy as a political concept, they question the king's own honesty and ability. They accuse him of either using smokescreen arguments or becoming the puppet of French and Jesuit influences. If the king himself is incompetent, there might have to be a new structure by which his ineptitudes could be balanced. While the notion of "divine right" was evolving into a new system, however, it was not going extinct. For purposes of tradition and precedent, many still approached the monarchy as divinely instituted but also, by the grace of God, answerable to the people. Such discussions anticipate many of the justifications for the irregular accession of William and Mary in the coming spring. When coupled with a persistent belief in divine providence, the forced transfer of the crown becomes a part of God's plan, giving the English nation increased freedom. If the heir to the throne was dubious, the people should have a right to challenge the monarch and question his motivations, though ideally with a touch of civility.

⁴⁰ *The Sham Prince Expos'd. In a Dialogue between the Pope's Nuncio and Bricklayers Wife, Nurse to the Supposed Prince of Wales* (London, 1688).

Several poems from 1688 challenge the birth specifically because of the influence that religion and politics held over one another. The most common thread warns against Catholics or Jesuits, but others suggest that the Church of England was equally problematic, perhaps because of its association with the state and its tendencies toward popery. Comments about the Jesuit Edward Petre are often quite scurrilous, sometimes because of his perceived corrupting influence on the king, but more often because some thought that he was the father of the new prince:

Some Priest, they say, crept nigh her Honour,
And sprinkled some good Holy Water upon her,
Which made her conceive of what has undone her.⁴¹

This and other documents portray Petre as both politically subversive and morally corrupt, which is how most English viewed Catholics in general. In the conclusion of the poem regarding the inquest, the author relates the fear of the prince to the supposed danger of Catholicism's generally oppressive nature: "Be resolute and stout, and scorn to sell / Your Souls to Rome, but send the Pope to Hell."⁴² The author evidently thought that such a statement was perfectly suitable for concluding a poem that mocked a political hearing; the two concerns went together. These are perhaps typical claims of the papist-fearing late seventeenth century Englishman, but they illustrate the importance of those fears on the grassroots level in 1688.

Another poem allows the possibility that the prince is legitimate, but offers stern warnings if he is not. It concedes that he may be the rightful heir, and it acknowledges that it is not the fault of the child if he is not, resembling the gentle criticism of James discussed above: "Thou Guiltless art, though some for thee may Lie, / Us to Enslave to Roman Tyranny."⁴³ The liar is presumably James and his coerced deponents. In this case, the poem states that England is at war with Rome, but also warns that "Not Rome nor English Church should make us Free, /

⁴¹ *Father Peter's Policy Discovered; Or, the Prince of Wales Pro'd a Popish Perkin* (London, 1689).

⁴² *A Poem on the Deponents*.

⁴³ *An Humble Address, to the Most Illustrious and High Born James Francis Edward, Present Prince of Wales* (London, 1688).

Save this high Arbor, God's Great Orange-Tree." This then appears to be the work of a dissenter, hoping for William to set things right regarding the succession but also to break the Anglican Church's grip on the state. In one short poem, the writer discusses the Prince of Wales, the dangers of centrally organized churches, and the messianic qualities of William of Orange. It encapsulates several of the dominant themes of 1688 in but a few verses, demonstrating that the revolution occurred on many levels.

Still other documents, apparently satirical, claim to be authentic letters on the birth that disprove the king's claims regarding his son. A supposed Catholic hymn in thanksgiving for the birth plays on typical Protestant fears and assumes that Rome had played a sinister role in providing a Catholic Prince of Wales to result in the mass conversion of England. This is one of many falsely attributed "Catholic" letters. One verse of the hymn reads,

Much of this may be done
By way of Dragoon,
As France hath taught us the fashion
Religion to Plant
By true Church Militant,
Far better than Convocation.⁴⁴

The threat here is twofold: France and Catholicism. This is demonstrative of rapidly increasing anti-French animosity in the late seventeenth century and stresses the growing fear of Catholicism as a French tool, not merely a Roman one. Religious concerns combined with economic and political ones as the English solidified their views on their international situation.⁴⁵ The pope is certainly not vindicated, but he is no longer the key enemy—Louis XIV, whom the pope opposed, comes to fill that role in a partly religious, partly nationalistic xenophobia. Therefore the "hymn" fittingly concludes with a reference that would be meaningful for any Londoner in the decades after the great fire: "And let all Men be willing /

⁴⁴ *A Catholick Hymn on the Birth of the Prince of Wales* (London, 1688).

⁴⁵ See especially J. F. Bosher, "The Franco-Catholic Danger, 1660-1715," *History* 79 (1994), pp. 5-30; and Steven Pincus, "From Butterboxes to Wooden Shoes".

That new Pauls which is Building, / Henceforth be call'd Nostre Dame.” French influences threatened the nature of English identity. This document depicts Catholics in England as traitors who would use the new prince to impose upon their country not just another religion but an entirely different cultural system. A number of writers in the summer and fall of 1688 clearly believed in a wide collection of sources for problems at home—international politics, in addition to the Gunpowder Plot and other historic internal violence, informed fears over Catholics. James, with his French support, was almost an alien in his own country.

This broad perspective was even more evident in several other contemporary publications and supports the thesis of some recent work on Europe and England’s mutual influences during the Stuart period.⁴⁶ As mentioned earlier, the rebuttal to the official depositions on the birth addresses the Catholic need for a male heir in terms of international relations. This document goes so far as to suggest that Mary I and Philip more than a century before were a precedent for external Catholic efforts to trick the English people with a false heir, listing all the events surrounding Mary’s supposed conception and parenthetically adding “as now” with each point.⁴⁷ The Spanish had simply been replaced by the French over the course of the previous century. Likewise, in an apparently forged letter from François de la Chaise, confessor Louis XIV, to Edward Petre, the French Jesuit congratulates his English counterpart for the happy birth of *his* child and the apparent success of the Jesuit plot to impose Catholicism on England. Recurrent throughout are references to French rejoicing, which imply that the English ought to be concerned—what is good for French Catholics is inherently bad for English Protestants.⁴⁸ Other documents, which appear to be more sincere (although it is difficult to say without further

⁴⁶ See Scott, *England’s Troubles*, and Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England*.

⁴⁷ *A Full Answer to the Depositions*, p. 3.

⁴⁸ *A Letter from Father La Chaise, Confessor to the French King, to Father Peters, Confessor to the King of England* (Philadelphia, 1688).

corroboration), describe celebrations held in Rome and Regensburg, each of which portray Catholic populations celebrating the possibility of a Catholic succession in a traditionally Protestant country. English domestic events were not entirely domestic if they could excite the populations of people in Bavaria. The depiction of Rome in particular portrays excessive celebration, replete with gluttony and theft by revelers who are eager for any opportunity to eat, drink, and be merry.⁴⁹ One wonders whether the English would have behaved any differently, but according to the traditional English self-concept, debaucheries must have overwhelmed Catholic Rome far more than rational, temperate, Protestant England.

Finally, in what may be the most creative work published after the birth, *A Melius Inquirendum* describes a summit of all the European heads of state, including the pope, and the various deponents at the royal inquest; together they go to the Oracle at Delphi to ask whether the prince is legitimate, and the oracle ultimately rejects the Catholics. All of the arguments in favor of the birth are purely incidental, such as the claim that he must be legitimate because they would not celebrate an illegitimate heir. For example, in a classic case of affirming the consequent, the “Domesticks of Monsieur Albeville” tell the oracle “that they had labored more than 15 days to put things in order [for the celebrations]...adding, that there could not remain any doubt of the Young Princes legitimacy, since the Ambassador had been at so great expence.”⁵⁰ The statements of the king of France also defend the prince and threaten to attack England if the people oppose James, feeding English fears of international intervention:

I maintain, at the peril of my life, that the Young Prince of Wales is Legitimate, and if I ought to transport my Armies by my Bombs, and my Carcasses, I would reduce the World into Ashes, and chastise the Rebellious Nation, that oppose the Design of King James my Cousin.⁵¹

⁴⁹ *An Account of the Rejoycing at the Dyet at Ratisbonne, Performed By Sir George Etherege, Kt.* (Savoy, 1688); *The Relation of the Rejoycings Made in Rome for the Birth of the most Serene Prince of Wales* (London, 1689).

⁵⁰ *A Melius Inquirendum*, p. 7.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

The author intimately ties the defense of the prince to the French aspirations for political domination of Europe; Catholicism and arbitrary government would reign over the continent, and Britain would be subject to that domination as a French ally. Furthermore, Louis acknowledges that James has a “design” that he will uphold, indicating the partnership in crime of the two monarchs. Many of the figures in the satire approach the oracle with their own selfish queries, which provide opportunities for the author to make further attacks on Catholics in general. For example, the oracle advises the Holy Roman Emperor, “Leopold, Leopold; if thou wilt believe me, hearken no more to Loyola, make Peace with the Crescent (Turks), and War against the Sun (France).”⁵² Evidently it would be better to tolerate a Muslim state than a Catholic one, or pernicious Jesuit influences. While the final pages of the satire drift from the question of the Prince of Wales, it is perhaps even more significant that a work on the subject would address so wide an array of European political questions. James II’s supposed plot was part of a much larger problem. *A Melius Inquirendum* concludes with words from the King of Persia, who expresses his concerns about spreading Jesuit influences around the globe; the supposed Jesuitical insurrection in England was perceived as only one part of their massive plot to overrun the world. Publications such as these attest that the English did have at least a partial European perspective in the late seventeenth century, and that this perspective influenced their reactions to the new Prince of Wales and the Revolution of 1688-89.

The birth of James Francis Edward was a pivotal moment in British and European history as the instigator of a revolution and the establishment of a line of claimants to the English throne who would make multiple violent efforts to retake control, beginning with the initial war in Ireland. The literature published on the birth encapsulates much of the rhetoric that would reappear in the arguments surrounding the revolution in the months that followed. It also

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 8. The parentheses are in the original.

suggests that the birth was a crucial provocation of the national reappraisal, an event with aftershocks throughout the following decades. Literature published as late as 1689 shows the centrality of the birth to the revolution as a whole. Printed images of Bonnie Prince Charlie holding a warming pan in 1745 show the persistence of the story decades after it occurred, but the myths surrounding it began even before 10 June 1688.⁵³ The various reactions to the birth provide support for an equally varied collection of theses regarding the influence of religion on the Revolution and the role of England as a part of greater Europe. Documents such as those discussed here display the traditional idea of the English fear of Catholics, while providing an international spin on their concerns, suggesting a nation that saw its world not insularly but through a wide lens. In their reappraisal, the English identified the importance of Europe for their daily lives. With one subject in focus, they sweepingly portray a king in denial, a nation in horror, and a continent in tension, waiting to see how events would affect all of the players involved; but the Oracle at Delphi was no longer available to tell them what would happen. The English would have to decide for themselves how they would handle religion in their country, even as their king had tried in reality to make it a matter of personal choice.

⁵³ One such image is provided in Weil, "The Politics of Legitimacy," p. 73.

Chapter Two

“An Expedient for Peace”: The Liberty of Conscience and English Protestantism in 1688

A key question that James II's reign implicitly raised—and which would be partially answered through the reappraisal of 1688-1689—was whether religion is a public or a private matter. The traditional originator of Protestantism, Martin Luther, sometimes suggests that it should be the latter, calling on the individual to have a personal relationship with God and study the scriptures on his own. He does not, however, advocate an absolute separation of church and state; he merely suggests that a person's spirituality be independent, free of the dictates of an overbearing central religious authority. He does not propose relativism. According to his beliefs, those who are in error should be helped to find the correct path. Even so, the personal study of scripture is a distinct departure from the particularly outward, public expression of early modern Catholicism. Luther's tradition, of course, would apply more to his own church than to Anglicanism; but in oversimplified, black-and-white terms, Protestantism represented liberty while Catholicism represented oppression. For this reason, religious toleration might seem to be an inherently Protestant practice, contributing to modern theories that secularism found its first roots in the Protestant Reformation. In seventeenth-century England, however, delineations were rarely so straightforward. England had upheld an established Protestant church, with some interruptions, for almost 150 years; but all parts of the English religious spectrum were variably vocal in their appeals for or against the penal laws and Test Acts. James II sought their support by favoring liberty of conscience, after he had tried to attract the support of the Church of England in his first years as king. Whatever his motivations, in a country where religious dissent was illegal, James's plan was radical. Even though the idea of toleration would find a different

realization in 1689, James's original policy elicited wide-ranging reactions, with complex defenses and critiques from the various religious camps. The discussions indicate a popular concern with the changing perceptions of established religion and absolute religious truth.

The Protestant Church in Restoration England then was not monolithic, with the old Puritan tradition still influencing some thought and high-church philosophies influencing others. In keeping with this diversity, different sects had different reactions to James II's proposed liberty of conscience, and for a variety of reasons. In general, a few would tolerate all Christian denominations (including Catholicism), some would tolerate most Protestants, and others would permit only one established church. Many in the Church of England opposed the king's proposal because they feared that any legalized disunity would create a weak nation, making England an easy target for invasion. At least one Catholic writer, disagreeing with the Catholic monarch, opposed liberty of conscience because, in his view, it denied the existence of absolute religious truth.⁵⁴ These schools of thought insisted that all Englishmen should belong to the same religious group. Some Protestants with less exclusory views suggested that James's declaration was good in theory, but because of its origins it could only be the first step towards a Catholic state. Others assumed that England would face disunity regardless of the law and argued that it would be better to have "comprehension" within England, granting legal recognition of all non-subversive sects under a wide Anglican umbrella. For some, this unity was intrinsically good; for others, it would merely provide a strong front against Catholicism, postponing troubles among the domestic Protestant factions until the international situation had stabilized. Some went so far as to argue that Protestantism by its nature abhorred centralized authority; the Church of England should not claim to hold such power, lest they follow the model of the papists. In

⁵⁴ *A Letter to a Friend, shewing the Vanity of this Opinion: That every man's Sense and Reason is to guide him in Matters of Faith* (1688).

that case, liberty of conscience was necessary for a Protestant state because to be Protestant in the first place assumed the existence of such an innate freedom. Perhaps Catholics should also be able to practice their religion in a free state—their own free will would have to lead them to the correctness of Protestantism. With these categories, views on toleration and liberty of conscience might fall into a loose continuum, ranging from those within the Church of England (or the Catholic Church) who insisted on conformity to those who favored toleration of virtually everyone, with many degrees between these two extremes. A study of various documents concerning both the legal and religious implications of liberty of conscience, as well as contemporary and modern discussions of the nature of toleration, will help to extrapolate the dominant themes of this complex pre-revolutionary religious situation, a crucial part of the English reappraisal of 1688.

The Church of England, by its position as an established state church, would inherently approach religion as a public matter, following the Christian political tradition of most of Europe. While he encouraged personal spirituality and study of the scriptures, Luther had favored a national church, and England had maintained that. Therefore, as a church with a centralized authority and an official liturgical system, nonconformity placed one outside of both the true faith and the English nation, according to many Anglicans. Some dissenters would criticize this centralization as a continuation of popish practices in the establishment's liturgy and doctrine, but the Church of England insisted that it had removed the Roman errors and therefore proclaimed religious truth. From the mainstream Anglican perspective, because of national unity and, by implication, national security, religion was inevitably a public matter and should remain so. Liberty of conscience would shift that truth into the private sphere, where

disunity could hinder the efficacy of the Church's mission.⁵⁵ As private individuals formed their own conclusions, they would divide repeatedly until there would be such a myriad of churches that all hope for national unity, and possibly national security, would be lost. Perhaps the national identity would dissolve as well, with few Englishmen knowing anymore what it meant to be English or Christian; the only outcome could be complete moral collapse and a nation grounded in atheist depravity.

One writer, who admits only late in his letter that he is a Catholic, worried about the basic implications of liberty of conscience as it pertained to Christian doctrine. Interestingly he does not support the king's policy on principle, demonstrating that at least some Catholics disapproved of their monarch. This may imply a fear that James's actions were politically motivated and not grounded in Catholic teachings, as Gilbert Burnet and others would suggest. From a wider religious viewpoint, if liberty of conscience were a compromise for James to attract political support from the Dissenters, such a policy would challenge the notion of governmental authority over absolute Truth. It might imply that there should be no established church. The risk of anarchy recalls John Turner's sermons on the Prince of Wales. Some radical documents supported liberty of conscience because of that complication, endorsing an early form of separation of church and state. The Catholic author of *A Letter to a Friend*, however, opposes it for the same reason. He argues that one could not answer all religious questions in accordance with individual reason, because such a philosophy would allow any belief system whatsoever and collapse for want of doctrinal foundation. Reason alone was insufficient in a religion that found so much of its origin in divine revelation, although he does admit eventually that he only

⁵⁵ Gordon J. Schochet, "From Persecution to 'Toleration,'" in *Liberty Secured? Britain before and after 1688*, J. R. Jones, ed. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), pp. 123-157.

“intimates the uncertainty of *Reason*,” not its absolute error.⁵⁶ The author maintains that “the root of all *Schism* and *Heresie* is the *Opinion* of our own Sense and Reason; or (which is the same thing) *Scripture* interpreted by every Man’s Reason.”⁵⁷ Each subdivision of Christianity claims that it is right according to reason, but if they all disagree with one another, reason must not be universal among men; and because not all can be correct, someone must be wrong. He continues:

Sir, remember your own Principle, every *Sectarian Preacher* must be allowed his Judgment of Discretion; and every little Shopkeeper the liberty of *Scripture*; but what if that Shopkeepers Judgment, or Interpretation of *Scripture* happens to contradict the Judgment of *Direction* which belongs to the chief Pastors or Bishops of the Church?⁵⁸

Some would have answered that the shopkeeper was correct and the Church was wrong for oppressing him, but such a view would have been too relativistic for a society that did not yet have a concept of relativism even to discuss. Such a belief would allow anyone to create his own new interpretation of *Scripture*, and a new denomination of Christianity would inevitably follow, leading to further schism of an already divided church.

Such a system, if followed absolutely, would extend to allow Catholicism, and “*Roman Catholics* themselves, being demanded why they embrace *this Church* rather than that? their Answer is, because they judge this Church to have good Authority, and that none; which is to draw the matter to their own *Judgment*.”⁵⁹ If religious truth is determinable through reason, then Catholics must find their belief reasonable. The philosophy of Protestantism implies that Catholicism can be correct too because it attracts followers like any other church. The author insists that such a plan is “a good Plea for all *Schism* and *Heresie*...which is more perhaps than

⁵⁶ *A Letter to a Friend*, p. 5.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

you intend by it.”⁶⁰ If one wholeheartedly intends to support a policy of liberty of conscience, then he must embrace all dissent and allow others to err in his sight: he will not be able to lead anyone to a better way because according to his own principle he would expect them to find it for themselves. The radical treatise *An Expedient for Peace*, to be discussed below, does support such complete open-mindedness; but the author of *A Letter to a Friend* maintains that according to the Nicene Creed, which was in the *Book of Common Prayer*, there can be only one church. Anyone outside of it would be incorrect. While Catholic, he criticizes some of his church’s history for being “drowned in idolatry” but also derides Protestantism as a schism, supporting purification of the Church from within. It maintains that Catholicism retains the core ideas of Christianity, and adds that “notwithstanding their *Idolatry*, the Wound is not mortal.”⁶¹ Criticizing the origins of the English Protestant Reformation, he asks why the first English reformers had the right to “damn all the Christian World.”⁶² To stress the Church of England’s Catholic origins, he quotes John Bramhall, Archbishop of Armagh through the Restoration, who defended Anglicanism as having “not left the Catholique Church but only the Roman Church.”⁶³ From this perspective, the Church of England had close ties through history and tradition to the Church of Rome; and the author maintains that while the Catholic Church might have needed reforming, it did not need to be completely abandoned. These defenses of Catholicism are interesting but the crucial point is the defense of single, absolute truth. Even while a Catholic monarch favored liberty of conscience, this author saw such an approach to religion and government as a slippery slope to what modern philosophy would call relativism. He accuses the unnamed addressee of hypocrisy—if he favors absolute liberty of conscience, then he would not

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

tell the author that he is wrong. Such freedom would generate such division that no one would ever know what was right, a situation that would encourage religious and political ruin. If one returns to origins, there is but one solution remaining: the Roman Catholic Church, with all its errors of the past, provides the only path to truth.

Even though he would oppose Catholicism unconditionally, Gilbert Burnet, who would become a key defender of William and Mary's Anglican Church, opposed liberty of conscience for Catholics for similar ideological reasons. Burnet defended the establishment's opposition to liberty of conscience because James II was the crux of another Catholic-Jesuit coalition to overrun England. According to his arguments, the Church of England was merely trying to keep order and follow the will of God against the corruptions of the Roman antichrist. Attempting to dispel accusations that the Anglican community was mimicking Catholic oppressions, he responds that he is only reacting to the genuine Catholic threat:

“We are so much accustomed to their methods, that nothing from them can surprise us. To hear *Papists* declare against *Persecution*, and *Jesuites* cry up *Liberty of Conscience*, are, we confess, unusual things: yet there are some degrees of shame, over which when People are once passed, all things become so familiar to them, that they can no more be put out of countenance.”⁶⁴

In other words, it was well within the Catholic nature to stoop so low as to feign endorsement of liberty of conscience with the sole intent of eventually oppressing Protestants. Burnet goes on to mention Mary I, the infamous persecutor of non-Catholics and fabricator of royal pregnancies, as if to demonstrate to the English people that their situation could be much worse. Even though the Anglican Church had banned other Protestants through the penal laws and Test Acts, at least it was Protestant and not Catholic, seeking the best interests of the entire nation. Burnet also cites the king's 1688 reissue of the Declaration, after first announcing religious liberty a year

⁶⁴ Gilbert Burnet, *An Apology for the Church of England, with relation to the Spirit of Persecution; for which She is Accused* (1688).

before, as evidence of James's duplicity. He questions the king's motivations for reasserting the 1687 proclamation, commenting, "In the ordinary commerce of the world, the repeating of promises over and over again, is rather a ground of Suspicion than of Confidence."⁶⁵ According to Burnet, if James has to remind his people that he seeks freedom of religion in England, he must be hiding his true motivations, which can only be the eventual imposition of Catholicism on a Protestant nation.

The concerns that Burnet used in his apology for Anglican intolerance also surfaced in other Protestant arguments opposing the king, including some that ideally would favor a liberty of conscience. Many supposed that James, as a Catholic himself, would want a Catholic state; his own proclamation mandating the liberty of conscience had said that his idealistic preference was for all people to be Catholic. Many Anglicans and Dissenters thought that liberty of conscience was merely a first step towards complete obliteration of all Protestants; James would allow Catholics to practice and then use them to reshape the government. His placement of Catholics on the faculties of the universities and the presence of Edward Petre in his privy council had already started this process. Because of these concerns, many who favored liberty only did so with careful qualifications, criticizing the king's motivations and challenging the supposition that his plan was actually the best course of action.

The aforementioned Jesuit "conspiracy" to establish a Catholic monarchy has demonstrated that the English were willing to believe virtually anything about Catholics, and the king's liberty of conscience was no exception. He probably did not help his case by stating in the declaration that "we cannot but heartily wish, as it will easily be believed, that all the People

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

of Our Dominions were Members of the Catholick Church.”⁶⁶ As he himself acknowledges, this was to be expected; but even though he goes on to state that the “conscience ought not to be restrained,” many would have latched onto his first statement and used it against him. Burnet, as discussed above, argued that James’s actions were a clever façade. Another criticism of his policy asks a similar series of questions, each of which challenges his own sincerity because of his Catholicism. The author confesses to supporting liberty of conscience on principle, but his questions to the king suggest that someone else would have to promote such liberties for them to be legitimate.⁶⁷ The ten queries suggest that no genuine Catholic could ever support religious freedom because the Church seeks the destruction of all whom it considers heretics. It also brings up recurrent French violence toward the Huguenot population, a trend that was widely discussed in the press throughout the late Stuart period.⁶⁸ According to these challenges, the king’s position as a Catholic negates all the positive implications of liberty of conscience, even to a Protestant who would normally favor such a policy. In short, Catholicism is implicitly insincere. A document that supports toleration of Catholics for general Protestant principles even mentions that the beauty of Protestantism as opposed to Roman Catholicism is its relation to freedom.⁶⁹ While that piece ultimately supports the king, it still expresses some concern in its introduction, perhaps to avoid being too radical in its toleration.

Many Protestants, such as the author of the *Ten Seasonable Queries*, actually favored a liberty of conscience—but in an obvious departure from James, they did so only because it would produce a unified front against Catholicism. From this perspective, a general Protestant unity amidst secondary divisions of doctrine would be an asset to England, acknowledging the

⁶⁶ *His Majesties Gracious Declaration to all His Loving Subjects for Liberty of Conscience*, second printing (London, April 1688).

⁶⁷ *Ten Seasonable Queries, proposed by a Protestant that is for Liberty of Conscience to all Perswasions* (1688)

⁶⁸ See again Boshier, “The Franco-Catholic Danger.”

⁶⁹ *An Expedient for Peace: Perswading An Agreement amongst Christians, &c.* (London, 1688), p. 3.

inevitability of disagreement among the various sects. Even Burnet had wanted unity through conformity, and others simply wanted the same unity through shared interests. Few, if any, would have favored internal discontent and hatred among fellow Englishmen. Legal toleration could help them to stop quibbling with one another, freeing them to attack their common enemies, James II and the Catholic Church. With liberty of conscience, Catholics “will be esteemed by all the common Enemy, and those Dissenters who now joyn with the Papist to *get* Liberty, will most Cordially joyn with the Church of England to *keep* it.”⁷⁰ Such side-changing might make the Dissenters appear fickle, but their support was necessary for whichever side was to prevail in England that year, as James’s efforts to woo them had already indicated. His perceived ulterior motives hurt his cause, but many still attempted to defend liberty of conscience in general as a tool to oppose him and his church. Even if James endorsed it for sinister ends, perhaps his opponents could use it against him to promote Protestant unity, foiling his supposed dreams of a Catholic England. One apologist opened with the biblical warning “that a *Kingdom divided can’t stand*,” urging that “if ever *Unity* (if not in *Worship*, yet in *Love* and *Affections*) will be necessary, it must certainly be *Now*,” because of the looming Catholic threat.⁷¹ The author continues that divisions among Protestants were the result of Catholic intrigue, so continued disunity only contributed to the Catholic ascendancy and Protestant decline. A legal liberty of conscience would provide peace and defense as “the only effectual Means to establish a lasting *Union* among *Protestants*, and to subvert the *Designs* of *Plotting-Men*, who would gladly over-turn our *Religion* and *Laws*.”⁷² This is another example of the

⁷⁰ *Some Reasons to move Protestant Dissenters To be for the taking off PENAL LAWS, yea and TESTS too, On their having the good Security, They shall not be exposed to suffering any more for RELIGION.* (London 1688).

⁷¹ *A Seasonable Discourse shewing the Necessity of Union amongst Protestants in Opposition to Popery, as the only Means (under God) to preserve the Reformed Religion* (1688), p. 1.

⁷² *Ibid.*

popular stereotype of Catholics as opponents of liberty and the English state, a crucial reason for James II's difficulties in keeping his throne in 1688.

One radically tolerant letter insists that Catholicism is wrong but downplays its active threat because, according to the author, Catholics have no sway on the English people. He laughs at fears that the Church of England might lose its "Ancient Splendor," insisting that the Church suffers from paranoia.⁷³ In an optimistic burst of nationalism, the writer, named only as "T. D.," maintains that the English are too smart to fall for the Catholic threat. Their adherence to Protestantism—and, by correlation, their rejection of Catholicism—is based in reason, an inherent trait of the English people. Toleration of Catholicism would ensure its failure, because "the most Ignorant and Stupid amongst us, will be so far from being enamour'd with [it], that the most effectual way to create in them an irreconcilable aversion to it, is to let them but have a view of it."⁷⁴ He goes on to cite the example of Catholicism in France and Spain as proof that the English would never tolerate its imposition in their country. He insists that the example of France is enough to move the English people against Catholicism (which the Revolution would seem to prove), even suggesting that some may claim that France is too foreign to influence the English; this argument buttresses some recent studies of England's role in Europe.⁷⁵ Ultimately, his argument is that the more Catholic talk, the more they hurt their case; in that sense liberty of conscience, even for Catholics, should not cause such controversy. James would have to win over the lowest ranks of society to his side, a task that would seem highly unlikely given the hostility that the English had held towards Catholics throughout the seventeenth century. Some feared that Catholicism had a real chance at winning that year, as evidenced through the warming

⁷³ *Fears and Jealousies Ceas'd: Or, an Impartial Discourse, tending to Demonstrate, from the Folly and ill Success of the Romish Politicks, that there is no Reason to Apprehend any Danger from Popery* (London 1688), p. 1.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁷⁵ Again, see Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England*, and Scott, *England's Troubles*.

pan scandal; but he argues that such fears are irrational, and that the people should stop quibbling. The subtle significance is that the people can oppose their king. The author does not claim that James would not like his people to be Catholic—he instead argues that James lacks the power to force them to be.

Some offered significantly more optimistic support for repealing the Penal Laws and Test Acts and promoting liberty of conscience because they believed that legal restrictions contradicted the nature of both Christianity and Protestantism. Such arguments endorsed the king's policies even while criticizing the king, claiming that if England was to be a genuinely Protestant nation it would support liberty of conscience so that one can make a personal conversion. This follows the more radical brand of Protestantism favored by some Dissenters, by which the individual has his own relationship with God to seek salvation free of any overbearing authority. The state may be associated with religion—few were calling for an outright secular state, instead wanting a less rigid Christian one—but it should not extend its reach so far as to prevent the individual from finding his own understanding. Just as Luther encouraged personal study of the Scriptures to meet God for himself, so English Protestants should study their faith independently and seek the Truth. There should be a free exchange of ideas, almost a religious free market that would foreshadow Adam Smith, which would allow all to seek the common good with each finding his own way. Some argued that persecution of any Christian over matters of religion is in fact unchristian, resembling popish practices of the Inquisition. Defenders of the Church of England on this count maintained that the church itself was not persecutory—the *Seasonable Discourse* is subtitled,

“The Charge of Persecution, lately maintained against the Established Religion...and other *Insignificant* Scribblers, detected; Proving it to be

the Ministers of *State*, and not the *Church*, that Prosecuted the *Penal Laws on Protestant Dissenters*.”⁷⁶

Such an exposé would help the Church of England to appear less “popish” in its practices, even though Gilbert Burnet essentially confessed to some persecutions in his defense of his church. Furthermore, from a constitutional perspective it could be difficult to find distinctions between royal and ecclesiastical actions because James was the supreme head of the Anglican Church. Because of these complications, perhaps the very idea of an established church was unchristian, at least from this perspective. In one letter against the penal laws, which defends the king from a Protestant perspective, the author writes,

The spirit of Persecuting for meer Religion, is a Spirit of Injustice, as not doing unto others as ourselves would be done unto; and a Spirit of Diffidence and Incredulity, refusing to trust God, and his Providence, with the Defence and Justification of what is Professed to be of God.⁷⁷

The Penal Laws and Test Act would contradict the basic idea of Christian love; oppression for the sake of religion was not the mission of Jesus Christ. Such treatment of dissent assumes that the state can know with certainty the will of God, and that assumption leads to performance of atrocities in God’s name. Again, this would be an action resembling Catholic practices.

However, fears of Catholics were less powerful for some defenders of toleration; even while criticizing the Roman church, the author of *An Expedient for Peace* favors an almost unconditional acceptance of Catholics. He limits toleration to the reasonable group, “those that are ready and willing to give the State security for their Good Behaviour, and Peaceable Living.”⁷⁸ With a majority of English subjects likely wanting to live their own quiet lives free of oppression, this is probably a sizeable portion of the population. The author’s reasoning is that

⁷⁶ *A Seasonable Discourse*, etc.

⁷⁷ *A Letter from a Gentleman in the City, to a Gentleman in the Country. About the Odiousness of Persecution, wherein the Rise and End of the Penal Laws for Religion in this Kingdom, are consider’d* (Edinburgh, 1688).

⁷⁸ *An Expedient for Peace*, p. 1.

Christianity was meant to make its followers truly happy, but somehow in current practice it did not do so. He says that religious differences are inevitable because

as long as men have variety of Principles, several Educations,
Constitutions, Tempers, Distempers, Hopes, Fears, Degrees of Light, and
Degrees of Understanding, several Capacities, Offices, and Employments;
'tis impossible, (and therefore not necessary) they should be all of one
Mind.⁷⁹

He goes on to endorse most men's approach to secular concerns as a model for settling religious quarrels, arguing that secular divisions do not cause nearly as much conflict as religious ones. This argument benefits from the previous century of religious violence, both in Britain and on the continent. Such concerns do not belong in the public sphere, in the administration of the state. He asserts "that Punishments ought to be proportioned to their Crimes; that *Spiritual* Faults ought only to have *Spiritual* Punishments."⁸⁰ Religion ought to be a private matter, left to the individual and God, contrary to the approach of both the Roman and English churches. He goes on to compare religious differences to a group of people, all moving towards the same place but from different locations and on different roads. Through this image he compares Christian denominations to the counties of England, each with its own customs but each part of the general body of England, asking: "What would the world think of us? If the *Yorkshire*-men should say the *Kentish*-men are no *English* men."⁸¹ He advocates both Christian and national unity as comparable and necessary for the preservation of England.

He also applies his arguments to the English political situation, expressing worries over the presence of an established Church. He favors not merely toleration or liberty of conscience but also the disestablishment of the Church of England; the support of the law does not necessitate that the church will have any support from God. The arrogance of this position is

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

detrimental to the entire nation, those within and without the establishment. He harshly attacks the current situation:

For First, They suppose God Almighty has appointed a particular Discipline and Regiment for his Church, and then fall out about it; every one maintaining that their own particular Scheme is the same: Then again, they suppose that Discipline and Regiment is absolutely necessary; both which are false...Christ's Kingdom is of another World, and requires none of the Policy of this to manage it; it ought to be kept pure and unmix'd, being clear of another Nature...But these Spiritual Politicians have mix'd Heaven and Earth together, confounded the World with their Policy, and so jumbled things together, that Christianity is almost lost in the Composition.⁸²

This implies a need for separation of church and state, for the sake of the church. This text as a whole supports the idea of a secularized state, predominately composed of people trying to lead a virtuous Christian life to create the best possible English society. Such an argument is revolutionary enough, though it would not find its goals fulfilled that year. The Act of Toleration of 1689 would only end the Church of England's position as a *national* church; it was still the *established* church.⁸³ He goes on to defend the king as wrongfully treated for his efforts to provide for a liberty of conscience, arguing that such a policy would lead to a peaceful kingdom of a sort that the English had not known for decades. Such a policy, however, would have to be accompanied by disestablishment: "As long as one Religion (as they call it) receives an Establishment, and another doth not, that has equal Pretentions to it, *there will never be Peace and Quiet in England.*"⁸⁴ He reasserts the inevitability and worth of disagreement, admitting that human nature is imperfect and no law should try to force humans into an impossible mold.

The author's treatment of Catholics in *An Expedient for Peace* is very different from those discussed above. While he does not favor Catholicism as a religious preference, he does

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁸³ John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), Introduction and p.104.

⁸⁴ *An Expedient for Peace*, p. 9.

not argue that it should be eradicated, instead acknowledging that a Catholic person can be perfectly noble and good despite the errors of his church. His criticisms of Catholicism are similar to his critique of many Protestants—they claim to hold a monopoly on Truth, yet all are sinners and capable of religious error. For example, he writes, “If God Almighty had design’d a *particular Way* or Method of Worship, he would have taken care that none should miss it, and prevented *all differences* about it.”⁸⁵ He goes on to cite the meeting of Jesus and the Samaritan woman in John’s Gospel as precedent for abolishing specific places and methods of worship, allowing all to worship through the universal spirit of Truth. According to the author, the Catholic Church claims to have found an absolute agreement among its members, but through disallowing any discussion of different views, “their *Agreement*, however they may boast, is no *Agreement*...it is rather a Combination.”⁸⁶ In that sense Catholicism is still in error by depriving individuals of the ability to think for themselves, but this is no excuse for pushing other beliefs on the adherent of any religion. Just as the law cannot enforce a religion, so should not the individual: “Since *I* may be mistaken, and out of the way, and *he* in the right way, my method with him ought to be no other than Reason and Discourse; and that in the most moderate and discreet way I can.”⁸⁷ However, rather than condemn all Catholics for adhering to a domineering Church, he argues that all Christians have been sinners because they are human, and neither Catholics nor Protestants can claim to be an exception.

‘Tis well known the *Papists* have had but miserable Treatment in *England*...and ‘tis known as well that the *Dissenters* have had little better...and the Church of *England* too, when under Hatches by the *Dissenters*, were Plotters to bring themselves (though they called it the *King*) in again.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

For this reason all should be allowed under relatively equal footing; whenever one group attempted to gain control over the government in the name of its sect, it resulted in the mistreatment of much of the English population. The identification of the king with the Church of England also indicates this author's disdain for associating the crown and state with any one religion. As stated elsewhere, the royally ordained penal laws and any other religious oppression would be immoral, contrary to the most basic of Christian principles, thereby making the state itself unchristian while feigning to be otherwise.

This document must be among the most radical published in the late Stuart period, going further than John Locke in its embracing of not only liberty of conscience but outright toleration of all who believe in God and try to live as Christians. It goes so far as to say that odd or incorrect views are the concerns of no one but the bearer of those views, asking, "What is it to me, if a Man think a Tree to be a Man, or a Man to be a Beast...?"⁸⁹ The author maintains that the various English religious groups should put aside their differences for genuine unity, not by an empty agreement to put up with one another but through an avowed acceptance of differences as perfectly permissible among individuals. His goal is to

incourage honest and *sincere Differences*, than such forced and *Hypocritical Agreements*...though Company and Universality may seem fine and plausible things to men, yet they cannot be pleasing in the sight of God, if accompanied with Error or Hypocrisie, which are generally the Concomitants of pack'd Agreements.⁹⁰

Such a reappraisal of the meaning of Christianity is central to understanding the arguments over liberty of conscience. For this radically tolerant author, all religious truth becomes doubtful because of the inherent fallibility of humans. That fallibility may even be what drives injustice in the world, because there is a practical advantage in belonging to the establishment according

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

to the law. The repeal of the Penal Laws would be the first step towards a more just society, because the *status quo* fed corruption in the church and the government: “A great many Men would not think it worth their while to contend so about the *invisible* things of *another* World, were there not a great deal to be gotten in *this*.”⁹¹ When some used religion for their personal gain, it removed all legitimacy from their arguments in favor of that religion. Perhaps the summation of the entire discourse is that one should worry about the log in his own eye before picking splinters from the eye of another.

An Expedient for Peace was not the only document from 1688 that sought a reappraisal of Christianity and its role in England. A publication with a similar end sought a basic definition of acceptable religious practices in England, looking to St. Paul’s example for the rubrics of the faith. These treatises seem to foreshadow the eventual idea of C. S. Lewis and *Mere Christianity*, establishing the basic principles of Christianity for the good of all people. A *Certain Rule* was a broadside, meant for posting in public places around England. It is widely tolerant, accepting that there are honest men in all religious categories, “Whether Church-of-England-Men, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Quakers, or Papists.” It also denies regional distinctions for the document’s use, adding that the piece is “Proper to be Set up In all Schools, Shops, Parlours, Chambers, or Closets, both in City and Country, in Court and Camp.”⁹² It goes on to cite various quotes from Paul’s epistles, accepting a very straightforward definition of Christianity. Among the exhortations are “Let him not judge his neighbor,” “Let his moderation be known unto all men,” and that one ought “not to be contentions.” These commandments would pare down English Christianity into a new entity, much more resembling the original Christian church in accordance with the New Testament. In this way it would be the

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁹² *A Certain Rule To Find out How many Honest Men there are in this Nation* (London, July 31, 1688).

full expression of Christianity, going to a time before any divisions had risen among Christians. Of course, this has been the goal of many Protestant sects throughout history, each of which claimed to recapture the essence of Christianity; but according to this broadside, as well as *An Expedient for Peace*, minor divisions were permissible in a genuinely Christian society.

Similarly, another anonymous pamphleteer called for an end to religious violence and adherence to true Christianity, as opposed to the wolf in Christian clothing that had generated religious strife throughout the preceding decades. *Advice to the English Youth* carries a tinge of optimism similar to that surrounding the Jacobite celebrations for the birth of James Francis Edward. The author recognized young men as the future of the country and urges them to come together and end “the sad Effects of later Troubles, or later Calamities on the score of Religion, in your Native Countrey.”⁹³ He goes on to question the general trend of Christianity in England, of which “the Principal Motives...are two, viz. *Rewards* and *Punishments*.”⁹⁴ As above, this is not what Christianity is supposed to be; England had abandoned the Christian ideal for the sake of corruption and self-interest. In the name of religion, individuals had sought personal gain at the expense of everyone else. The author discusses why the English have fallen into such a plight and proposes some ways to redeem the country through proper reactions to current events.

O Unhappy Case of *English-men*! But ‘tis not the Nature of the *English*, the Nature of Religion or Divisions, but ‘tis our Indiscretion, our Ill-*Managery*; ‘tis the Unhappiness of our *Educations*: And I Appeal both to you and your *Instructors*, whether ever either of you felt any *Regret* or *Remorse* in your *Consciencences*, in *Worshipping* God in the way you were *Bred* to, but rather much *Complacency* and *Delight*?⁹⁵

It is the duty and even the nature of English youth to revitalize the country and create a better society. Although their “Fathers have been long in the Wilderness,” it is now the task of the sons, the “Children of Promise, that must enter the Land of *Canaan*,” to recreate England as a

⁹³ *Advice to the English Youth: Relating to the Present Juncture of Affairs* (London, 1688), p. 1.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

great and just nation.⁹⁶ The method for doing this is not particularly radical—in fact, it encourages the people to join behind the king, particularly regarding liberty of conscience, and begin a new era of peace. Though the author never uses the phrase “glorious reappraisal,” that is the tone of this work. In the country’s time of despair, there is a great opportunity for the people to put aside petty divisions and embrace one another as fellow Englishmen.

Publications such as these did not represent the majority, but their presence indicates a part of English society that was ready for a radical departure from the Restoration religious system. For England to embrace diversity was a new interpretation of Christianity and the nation. It sought to reestablish Englishness through disestablishment of the Church of England, foreshadowing the supposedly liberal society that many English would perceive within their country. It was this same liberalism, driven by Locke and others, that would lead the French themselves to look to England as a model during the tumultuous eighteenth century.⁹⁷ *An Expedient for Peace* and *A Certain Rule* represent a reappraisal of Christianity and a Christian nation. They arise from the seventeenth century English experience of religious war and constant conflict, and they implicitly challenge that experience as both unchristian and irrational. In this way the notion of “liberty of conscience” can extend to a general liberty, one that might be consistent with some traditional Whiggish interpretations of English history. The Revolution of 1688 would indeed be “glorious,” moving towards increased liberty for all Englishmen. It would take Lockeian ideals beyond Locke, creating a new, free society that would expand in the eighteenth century. That approach, however, has been rightly criticized; Locke was not the mover of the revolution, his views on toleration were not this extreme, and critiques of the king’s policies indicate that full religious toleration was not part of the majority’s vision of England.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁹⁷ Robert and Isabelle Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy: The French and the British from the Sun King to the Present* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007), pp. 54-62.

The various responses to liberty of conscience also indicate different understandings of what it would be, and what it would imply for the English people. Some opposed it because of its implied disunity, while others supported it because they thought that it would bring unity. For some who favored it, it would be a refusal to persecute those with different but incorrect views, instead seeking to lead them to the truth through gentler, more Christian means. For others it was an absolute acceptance of other viewpoints as part of Christianity, the toleration of various paths towards the same positive end. Some feared that this would lead to a national emptiness where no one knew what was right—the tolerance of various ideas would lead all to form their own paths, none of which might be correct. The basic result was that different people witnessed the same series of events and feared or supported particular actions according to their own perceptions. King James II was, for some, an inherent traitor because of his Catholicism; his preference for liberty of conscience was merely a tool in his long-term plans to impose his religion on his people. They thought that he would allow Catholics to practice freely, and eventually give them preference in the country, depriving the majority of the English of their basic human rights. Others, particularly some Dissenters, saw his liberty of conscience as a good idea in principle but a bad plan because of its author. Anything that James proposed was inevitably poisoned. The liberty of conscience did not find complete fruition—the Act of Toleration of 1689 would be a much better representation of the English mainstream. That conclusion to the liberty of conscience controversies suggests the inherent contradiction of the Whigs' understanding of history. They saw their country as liberal and inclusive, but it still excluded anyone who would not participate in the English experience according to the established rules. They altered those rules, however, in the reappraisal of 1688; being English implied participation in a society that could challenge its king and his policies while pursuing the

common good. They would soon welcome William of Orange, despite his foreign extraction, as a fairer representation of English liberty.

Chapter 3

“The Ballance Adjusted”: Kings, Priests, and Princes

In December 1688, James II left England and found refuge at the court of Louis XIV. For many, this action confirmed fears that he was in league with the French. Had he fled anywhere else, he might have been but a king in exile, as his brother had been after their father's execution. Even as he snuck out of England with William's passive encouragement, there was perhaps a chance that he could regain his throne. Some still saw him as the misguided but rightful king, with William as something of a monarchical auditor, in London to identify the king's errors and guide him to be a more just ruler. In this case the Prince of Orange would not ascend the throne; James would be forced to accept some sort of settlement, perhaps like King John and the Magna Carta.

That of course never happened, but in late 1688, many wrote about James and William and their good and bad qualities, trying to determine what was the best course for England. These publications indicated the vast diversity of sentiments towards James, William, Louis, and the institution of monarchy. As stated above, 1688 represented a shift in English monarchical absolutism, but monarchical representation was still central to the role of kings. Key to William's popularity was the readiness of the English to accept their common goals and shared personal qualities; despite his background, he could embody “Englishness” through his marriage to Mary and his devout Protestantism. Furthermore, as an avowed opponent of Louis XIV, whose regime had replaced the Dutch as the inherent enemy in the English national imagination, he would take England in a direction that the people could wholeheartedly support. A careful study of the varied descriptions in 1688 of these larger-than-life figures indicates, again, the

persistence of religion as a primary concern of the collective nation during the Revolution. This final chapter will loosen the previously strict adherence to pre-invasion documents, but the primary goal of understanding the English identity in 1688 and its various influences will not be abandoned.

James's reputation has already been discussed above in relation to the birth of his son; here he and his contemporary rulers will be examined from several perspectives to determine some general sentiments at the start of the revolution. Divine right theory played a prominent role in discussions of the warming pan scandal, and it would reappear in other discussions of the pending monarchical shuffling. Different pamphleteers and theorists had diverse understandings of how James's Catholicism had affected his reign; some opposed Catholicism but, similar to the author of *Fears and Jealousies Ceas'd*, they thought that their dislike of the Roman church should not have provoked so many conflicts. Even as king, James could not significantly alter the religious demographics of England, so he should not be removed from the throne because of his or his son's religion. Such an argument seems to raise other questions, however: if his divinely granted seat on the throne was unassailable, were his policies absolute as well? If he could not substantially change the thinking of his subjects, should he conform his own to the mainstream? William would do that in the ensuing settlement. Furthermore, Louis XIV might have been the extreme of absolutism, but did James have a realistic opportunity, or even the desire, to make himself a similar monarch in England? Might William do the same? At least a few writers, representing an interesting subcategory of Jacobite literature, held that James was unable to seize such power, which was sufficient reason to defend his position. According to this thinking, James may have been wrong, but William was unnecessary, or even a potentially disastrous affront to England because of his different background. Others at his time, as well as

a number of current historians, have demonstrated that there was a valid threat from French political Catholicism, whether because of external events or internal connections.⁹⁸ The interactions of these various thinkers will help to demonstrate the interrelation of political and religious thought at the time of the Revolution.

The relationship between the French and English courts had grown close during the Restoration. The refuge that Charles and James had found in France during the Civil War had undoubtedly given them a good opinion of their neighbors across the Channel. From a cultural perspective, France was even then the source of many of the stylistic developments of Europe, as it would continue to be during the eighteenth century and beyond.⁹⁹ French influence went beyond fashion design, however; in 1688, a dominant bloc of French sympathizers in the English court favored close political ties to the Gallic monarch. Many understood Louis's political system as an attack on traditional English liberties, and if James were to favor such a system, he would threaten the very nature of the English identity. A number of publications of 1688 played on this fear, propagandizing the relationship as one of outright treason that would dissemble England's fragile structure. One Whig writer begged his fellow subjects, "How long shall we suffer our selves to be blinded with Sanctified Lies and Shames? How long shall the watchful Genius of this Nation be lull'd a Sleep with Forreign Enchantments and Domestick Dreams?"¹⁰⁰ He cites the century of Catholic subversion in England as proof that there was still a pressing internal problem, but then he shifts his focus. The French had not been a great enemy for much of the seventeenth century, but this pamphleteer sees them as the inevitable foe of England.

⁹⁸ See Steven Pincus, forthcoming, chapter 5; also Bosher, "The Franco-Catholic Danger."

⁹⁹ For a broad study of the development of Anglo-French relations since the Restoration period, see again Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*; for more on France's general influence in Europe, see T. C. W. Blanning, *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture: Old Regime Europe 1660-1789* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

¹⁰⁰ *An Alarm to England: or, a Warning-Piece to All True Protestants. Wherein is Discovered the present Design of the French* (London, 1688).

Furthermore, the people are already aware of the danger: “It is the general Discourse, both in Town and Countrey, That there is a league concluded, between His Majesty of Great Brittain, and the French King, to make War with Holland, and to Root out all the Protestants of that Countrey.”¹⁰¹ The pamphlet claims that France, however, bears the greater weight of guilt in the affair; James is apparently misguided but not traitorous. The author’s convoluted logic is less than convincing, but it indicates a persistent trust in the English monarchy as an intrinsically good institution. He refutes various arguments against James that portray him in a bitter feud with William, arguing that it is not “the custom of Monarchs and Princes to use such Menacing Expressions one towards another; it being more suitable to their Grandeur to discover their Resentments at the head of Armies, than in passionate words.”¹⁰² Like many contemporary publications, that claim may be excessively optimistic; but it suggests a tendency not to put too much blame on James himself (and anticipates the method that William and James would eventually choose to settle their differences). The writer briefly examines the recent controversy over the archbishopric of Cologne, after which James apparently gathered troops in response to French and Dutch armaments, exercising his role “at the head of Armes.” The author praises this action, urging his compatriots to “throw away this Effeminacy, and awake to Honour, to Renown and Glory: Let not the name of Englishmen, once a Terror to other Countries, now grow a by-word through our own softness.”¹⁰³ He defends the crown where it preserves the security and strength of the nation and concludes with encouragement for James, who can protect the people from aggressors across the sea.

There were enough publications concerning the French to demonstrate that they were perceived as a threat in themselves, in addition to the various attacks on their Catholicism. An

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

evident forgery, purportedly a letter from Louis XIV to the Earl of Tyrconnel in Ireland, indicated that there was a French plot to arm the Irish in revolt against the English lords. Printed in London, the letter would have roused great fear among any who suspected that the French would help Irish Catholics to overthrow English Protestants throughout the Isles. Louis supposedly writes, “We are stedfastly resolv’d to give the Army in *England* such powerful Diversion, that we doubt not to render them wholly incapable of turning their Arms towards You: In the mean time, we advise you to make all the Levies you can; and by no means admit any *Heretical Villains* into the least Command, *Civil* or *Military*.”¹⁰⁴ In urging against allowing any Protestants in the Irish force, the writer establishes the threat as a foreign one, different from many of the homegrown Catholic threats of the seventeenth century. This demonstrates the new phase of religious fear, by which the French are agents of far more than Guy Fawkes had been—he was at least English, while the new enemy would remove all of their identity. The recurrent theme of raving Irishmen overrunning the Isles was weighty; combined with France, there would be a two-pronged force of elite organization and frenzied barbarity attacking noble England from the west and the south. Both the author of this letter and that of *An Alarm to England* identify that threat, with the implication that the English have to band together and hold off the invasion.

Was there a conspiracy between James II and Louis XIV? Fleeing to Versailles, the embodiment of consolidated royal absolutism, may not have helped James’s case; but non-Catholic Jacobites insisted that there was no plot with the French. The threatened invasion mentioned in the above documents did not come in 1688. The plotters instead had been Whigs, calling a foreign prince to take over their own country. One early (and, as will be seen, bizarrely unconventional) Jacobite pamphleteer questioned the benefits of the Williamite revolution,

¹⁰⁴ *The King of France’s Letter to the Earl of Tyrconnel, Found in a Ship Laden with Arms for Ireland* (London, 1688).

pointing out that William himself had some dubious supporters on the continent. He writes that there were many demonstrations of William's mixed motivations, including

That the P. of *O*'s enterprize was first projected in the Reign of King *Charles* the Second...that it was built and supported upon the Popes Interest and Authority in the Confederacy, who about *May* last, sent a Nuncio to Congratulate the Success, and that the P. of *O*. that Glorious Pillar of the Reformation, and the Mighty Deliverer of our Church and State, did promise the Pope to preserve the Papists in *England*, in the Exercise of their Religion...tho many good well known Protestants were kept in Gaol contrary to our Laws, and the Fundamentals of our Constitution. These things you say well, have raised such a mist in your Eyes, that you cannot as yet perceive any security at all to our Religion, neither as can anybody else, as I believe, except the Old Woman, who for a Husband could see the Egg on top of it, tho she could not see the Barn.¹⁰⁵

It is difficult to believe that William was in league to promote Catholicism while James opposed his own faith, but this rhetoric indicates the political complexities of Catholic Europe. The pope himself was not fond of Louis XIV's practices because they opposed Roman authority, and James had attached himself to Louis XIV against the pope's wishes. With the experience of the Thirty Years' War serving as incentive to end religious warfare, Innocent XI was willing to endorse a Protestant prince against a Catholic monarch who threatened Rome's interests. Jacobite polemicists, in turn, were willing to contort the complicated religious situation to paint William as the true friend of Catholics, even as their own standard bearer expressed his passive wish that all his subjects would become Catholic.

Furthermore, according to this work, William's invasion was intrinsically illegal and compromised the principles and customs of the English law and nation. It argues that William threatened the English identity and would radically change the religious situation, even as Whigs accused James of attempting the same thing. Catholics would have it better under a Dutch system of religious toleration than they would have under James. Additionally, William was not

¹⁰⁵ *The Ballance Adjusted*, p. 2.

the champion of Protestantism that he had claimed to be. He was as much a Machiavellian prince as any, casting aside principles for political gain wherever he saw fit, even if that required him to form alliances with the pope. Although this letter is blatant Jacobite propaganda, it foreshadows some recent scholarship and supports the present argument, that the various monarchs of the late seventeenth century were driven foremost by pragmatism and political economy, not religion, even as they used religious rhetoric to move the people. This is the crux of the possible agreement between the work of Steven Pincus and Tony Claydon. James and William spoke in a religious language because they governed religious peoples, but they were not adherents to a monolithic religious philosophy. They were each devout in their own right—their spiritual sincerity is not in question—but they could use religion as a governing tool to advance their political goals. From this perspective, it was perfectly natural for the Prince of Orange himself to be in league with Catholic prelates and form agreements with the pope. Perhaps it should be remembered that though James favored Catholicism, his relations with the pope were not as rosy as some Whigs would have liked the people to think. For Whig propagandists, a king in lock-step with the Bishop of Rome would have helped the Williamite cause; but James's imprudent endorsement of liberty of conscience and his support of Louis XIV had damaged English relations with the Vatican. If the pope was more willing to support William than James, or at least would not lose sleep over James's defeat, then William must be the one lacking character. The author of *The Ballance Adjusted* cited Louis's refusal to invade during James's reign as proof that there were no French designs, by contrast with the Dutch:

Had the King of *France* been inclined to invade us, as the *Dutch* advised, and some feared, he would never have baulked an opportunity so fit for such an Enterprize, for the *Dutch* made him the offer, when the old Rebels had almost put the Nation into Confusion again.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., pp. 3-4.

Unsurprisingly for Jacobite literature, this casts the Dutch as the intrinsic enemy of England; and in support of Steven Pincus's arguments, one of the stated reasons would be economic. After claiming that the Dutch might help the English in only three ways—the preservation of religion, national security, and trade—the author argues that they would not in fact be of assistance in any of these matters. As Pincus has demonstrated, the French had generally replaced the Dutch as the primary economic rival of the English in the late seventeenth century, but this Jacobite would insist the reverse.¹⁰⁷ Religion, war, and economy are discussed together in *The Ballance Adjusted* as inseparable concerns. The Dutch, as will be seen, had intrinsically different interests from the English in each of these categories and, as a result, were sinister enemies, feigning alliance to achieve their own ends.

Regarding religion, the Dutch do not appreciate its significance and certainly cannot comprehend the role of Christianity in the English sphere because the Dutch maintain a state that is practically atheist. The author insists, “it is improper and absurd to expect protection for our Religion from the Dutch, because the Dutch either have no Religion at all themselves, or pay no regard to it.”¹⁰⁸ In their colonies they fail to be witnesses to the true faith, instead avoiding all references of it to the point that “the Indians themselves take them for heathens.”¹⁰⁹ They shun any outward expression of belief and instead elevate trade and the national interest to the position of deity, making them idolatrous and heretical. According to the author, this is part of their national character; as the product of a primarily Dutch upbringing, William might have such a relativistic nature as to bring about the moral devolution of England. When taken in conjunction with fears from the Interregnum that England was drifting towards religious

¹⁰⁷ Pincus, “From Butterboxes to Wooden Shoes.” In 20/20 hindsight, Pincus is right; those in 1688 were less certain, and propaganda through denial further complicates the contemporary literature.

¹⁰⁸ *The Ballance Adjusted*, p. 4.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

anarchy, as well as the above discussion of liberty of conscience, the liberal religious views of the Dutch posed a threat to English stability and unity.

It is in this section that the work becomes more difficult to understand—after defending the king in the opening paragraphs and maintaining that he did not seek to establish Catholicism, the author goes on to condemn the Dutch for their widespread toleration. For this reason it is perhaps only correct to call him a Jacobite inasmuch as he defends James as the legitimate monarch and condemns William as a vicious usurper. He suggests in his conclusion that he only supports James as being not unbearable; he is much more passionate in attacking the Dutch as essentially subhuman. There is, however, an interesting parallel in his support for James's liberty of conscience but opposition of Dutch-style toleration. First he claims that James

never, as could be learnt, declared that he would bring [Roman Catholicism] in...We must not think a Toleration, or taking off the Penal Laws (tho they are such good Fences and Bulwarks as Church-of-England-men should not part with) to be setting up Popery. All Dissenters desired, and have now got so much for themselves, and the King for his party never desired more; and with this remarkable difference, that he desired Law for what he did, but our New Governours do the same thing without it.¹¹⁰

While the author acknowledges the positive effects of the Penal Laws for Anglicans, he argues that James was not seeking to impose Catholicism by their revocation, and that his actions were legal, as contrasted with those of William. Four pages later, he decries the Dutch for their excessive toleration, which was admittedly more inclusive than James's liberty of conscience—but the present problem is that the Dutch freely allowed Catholics. He complains that they “granted that the Profession and Exercise of the *Popish Religion* should be free and secure. Had the *Dutch* had any regard to the honour of God, or concern for the Propagation and Support of Truth, they could not have been so indifferent.”¹¹¹ The only apparent way for this juxtaposition

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

to make sense is that James's toleration was somehow more principled; he did not deny the existence of absolute truth, but he would allow people to form their own conclusions. He favored genuine liberty of conscience, not outright toleration of anything. For this reason the Dutch system would be sinful for saying in effect that everyone was right, whereas James was not so relativistic.

In terms of national security, the author claims that the Dutch never sided honestly with the English; he cites their onetime collusion with France to invade England as proof of their persistent animosity towards the English, and their alliance with the English Commonwealth in 1653 as evidence of their friendliness with avowed rebels.¹¹² He then provides a long list of incidents in which the Dutch attempted to confine the nascent English empire, establishing the two as inherent trading rivals and even military enemies. However, all the events mentioned occurred decades before, during the period when the Dutch were unquestionably the chief rivals of the English. The seizure of the Royal Charles during the raid on the Medway, for example, was a central event of this rivalry; but that was in 1667. By 1688 the English had new political concerns; early Jacobites, such as the author of *The Ballance Adjusted*, were scraping the barrel when they assumed that the Dutch still loomed as large in English minds. The unlikelihood of substantial effects by such arguments was not enough to stop this writer from calling that there be an "Act of Parliament set upon all *Dutch-mens* heads, as there is upon Wolves and Beasts of Prey."¹¹³ The Dutch vermin could never help England because they would always seek their own ends, and a government-imposed bounty was the only way to stop them.

His final words on economy, however, do strike hard, expressing concern over the apparent use by William of English resources in his war against France. He has already

¹¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

established, in his view, that support of Dutch interests would never help England; so the events of the previous months would at least bring cause for examination of Dutch motivations. He writes,

How far we have given them an advantage to accomplish our Destruction, we not only see, but feel already; for all our Magazines are emptied...a Noble Stock of Timber which King *James* had provided to Build New Ships, and to Repair our Old, all embezzled, or Shipped of, and the Money of the Nation squeezed out of our hands by oppressive Taxes and impositions, when we have no Trade left whereby to get more. And in the last place, for a Consummation of Disgrace an Beggary to the Nation...That the *Mogol* (by Instigation of the *Dutch*) is now fallen upon *Bumbay*, the Chief of the Two Remaining Factories which the *Dutch* had left us in the *East-Indies*: and so all that Rich and Noble Trade is at the point to be absolutely lost, because we are now in no Condition to send thither any Re-inforcement.¹¹⁴

According to the author, England is about to be sucked dry by Dutch parasites, with William as the chief mosquito. Their influence had even put England's Indian interests at risk, inciting the Moghul Empire to attack British factories, or colonial headquarters. The situation is dire—from an economic perspective, the ousting of James is just as bad as the birth of James Francis Edward had been to Whigs. The author attempts to bring together the English to support their national sovereignty and financial interests in the wake of a foreign invasion that for some reason had gone unchallenged. Not only had the Dutch challenged English possessions in India; now they were treating England as their own personal colony, a source of raw materials to bolster the Dutch navy at England's expense. The people had to rally together to stop this exploitation.

Having expressed his economic worries, the author moves into a general diatribe on the domestic situation in the wake of William's arrival. Events in India are now of little concern with England's own independence at stake.

At home our Calamities increase, and Desolation comes Rolling upon us like a mighty Wave; for none can be unsensible Now, that it was but a fond Imagination, to believe giving the Crown to the P. of O. would

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7-8.

endear us to him, or give him a Tenderness over us, like that of a Rightful and Hereditary King: since he spared not one so near of Kin as our King was to him, how can we expect he should have Bowels of Compassion for us?¹¹⁵

The author wants a kind monarch, but he fears that William will be the opposite, based on the tradition of the Dutch as witnessed by the English during the seventeenth century. He does not even know how to respect his familial ties, seizing the throne from his own father-in-law. James, with all his shortcomings, here represents a paternal figure for a country in need of guidance. This is in stark contrast to the seemingly loose, amoral Dutch, who elevate financial interests above God, blood, and honor. Because of their persistent devotion to trade, they threaten English economic independence, which the author addresses alongside religion as part of the collective English identity, now threatened by Dutch imperialists. He concludes this penultimate paragraph with a final appeal to his people to stand against William, whom he fears will not respect them and instead treat them as a vanquished, enslaved nation.

No one ever trusted, or long caressed a Traitor; and since we have been capable of deserting our Rightful King, and shewed our selves as wavering and unsteady as the Sea that surrounds us, I see no Reason to believe he will put any Confidence in us, or trust us with so much power as may preserve our just Liberties and Properties, for fear it should annoy him. Now they have given as much Money as can be, he has dismissed his Parliament, which in difficult Times was wont to be accounted a kind of Pledge, or the best Security betwixt the Prince and People; and he is getting over what Forreigners he can, as unwilling that the English should earn their own Money, or be trusted to defend their own Country.¹¹⁶

Machiavellian that he is, William would know better than to trust a people who had betrayed their previous sovereign, and he will now make sure that the English fear and respect him. Unable to defend their own country because of their own infidelities, the English are helpless unless they unite against this Dutch usurper.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

In his conclusion, the author takes a tone of desperation, hoping that the English would see what has happened to their country. Even as some Whigs were concerned about the excessive influence of the French over James, William represents all foreign nations descending upon England, making it a colony of another sovereign state. These fears are retrospectively a bit overblown, and William went to great lengths in the revolution settlement to demonstrate that he did not seek to destroy English sovereignty. Even so, the author's final words are worth noting; after briefly digressing to praise the abolition of episcopacy in Scotland, he reiterates the dangers that England now faces with William at the helm.

I hope...that all men may see these Dire Effects of our glorious Revolution, and in time become sensible of the sad Presages of the Nations Ruine, unless prevented, by Restoring the Government to its Old Constitution, by bringing back the King, who is sensible of his Mistake...All the World sees, the Grievances of his Reign are not Redressed in this, but many new ones added, so that if we were in the Frying-Pan before, we are now leapt into the Fire. Whereas, were the King at home again, and we true to our Religion, and firm to our Constitution, as good Christians we may, and as good Subjects we ought, we need not fear the Gates of *Rome*, no, nor of Hell itself. But if the Will of God be so, that we must suffer, why not by the Papists as well as by the Fanaticks, who are no less violent, or Blood-thirsty; or by the *French* rather than by the *Dutch*; for the *French* have some Interest in our Preservation, and have some Humanity; but the *Dutch* have neither.¹¹⁷

Perhaps one can weep with him; he may have always remained a Jacobite, it is impossible to tell.

In early 1689, those who felt particular devotion to the institution of monarchy would certainly worry about the arrival of William and its meaning for national sovereignty and individual independence. It was still unclear whether it was the English people or merely the English throne that William had conquered. The difficult implications of his radical move would have to be addressed in the coming months to ensure that his accession to the throne maintained as much legality as possible. Regardless of the author's worries, he likely was forced to accept after a little time that things were not as bad as he had feared—the English did not become slaves of the

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

Dutch, Parliament was reassembled, and the questionable legitimacy of the succession was all that remained for serious questioning.

Indeed, many in England welcomed William as the answer to prayers, using language similar to that of those poems greeting the Prince of Wales by John Dryden and Aphra Behn. They anticipate the typical Whig rhetoric that would characterize Edmund Burke and the Whiggish Victorian historians, describing the revolution as an intrinsically conservative part of the steady English progression towards liberty. At least among his supporters in 1688, William was hailed as a Christ figure, just as James Francis Edward had been but a few months before. James had been an agent of Catholic imperialism, and William was the liberator. Biblical comparisons to Moses, David, Josiah, and Jesus Christ would carry weight for a society still heavily based in scripture.

One anonymous poet of the time, identified only as “a Son of the Church of England,” described the situation as follows:

In Lawless Times, when *Romes* devouring Jaws,
Swallo'd our *Peace, Religion,* and our *Laws*;
When *Subjects Rights* lay crush'd beneath the *Throne*,
And that Debauch'd by th' Whore of Babylon,
When Loyal Wits by *Popish* Knaves were fool'd,
And all the State by *Romes* dark Counsels Rul'd:
When Lyes confirm'd were, and the Truth run down,
And *Beads* became the Jewels of the Crown:
When all the Nation in a deep Despair,
Lay groaning, Crush'd beneath the load of Care:
When Legal Order was by *Priests* confus'd,
The *Laws* corrupted, and the Just abus'd;
The *Crown* and *Cross* in subtle Union joyn'd,
Made Private Leagues, for publick Ills design'd:
Thus *England* lay expecting of its Doom,
Expos'd to all the Greedy Woolves of *Rome*.¹¹⁸

This passage summarizes the interrelation of various concerns under the broad banner of “popery” at the time before the Revolution. The welcoming poem describes a situation in which

¹¹⁸ *A Poem to His Highness, the Prince of Orange, To Welcome Him into the City of London* (London, 1688).

a politicized religion had removed the people's rights and tricked the nation. Indeed it was the Law that was threatened, and "Legal Order" that "was by Priests confus'd"; justice and inalienable rights were about to be taken away by James and his Catholic supporters. It is a sensational and simplistic argument, part of a long tradition of outlandish accusations directed towards Catholics throughout the seventeenth century. Steven Pincus has demonstrated how much of the classic complaints of James's Catholicism had quieted by 1688, but there was plainly a resurgence during the months before the revolution; it was an intrinsic part of the revolutionary literature.¹¹⁹ All English subjects were downtrodden and aimless because of the combination of "Crown and Cross," which presumably refers to concerns over Catholicism but could also read as a condemnation of royal imposition of religion. To the most fearful element of society, James wished to make his people Catholic, a typical accusation, but one that Jacobites would challenge. The poem hyperbolizes that all England was about to be destroyed by oppressive popish hordes, playing on the popular fears of the people to garner support for the divinely-sent Prince of Orange. When taken alongside other pamphlets being published even as William launched his invasion, such as one that listed all of the purported sinister Catholic machines found in "St. Johnes's Chapel," these arguments would seem to hold immediate validity to contemporary readers.¹²⁰ James II's opponents persistently spread propaganda to ensure support of the Dutch prince when he reached London. People could come together and support William in good faith because, evidently, James, or at least his coreligionists, were enemies of the people. Even for those who detested radicalism, the replacement of one monarch with another might not seem to be so radical if it meant the preservation of the intrinsic nature of England. Having identified James with language that would seem quite familiar and, among

¹¹⁹ Pincus, forthcoming, Chapter 4, "English Politics at the Accession of James II."

¹²⁰ *Guido Faux Reviv'd: Or, the Monks Late Hellish Contrivances Expos'd. Being a full Account of the Horrid Bloody Designs of the Papists, at their Mass-House Convent Chappel in St. Johnes's* (London, 16 November 1688).

many, popular in late 1688, the “son of the Church of England” identifies William as a religious savior from an adversary of true religion.

“Heaven,” he writes, had seen James and the Catholic’s “Black Stratagems,” and had chosen William as a “Mighty Saviour” who had “Redeem’d us all from Rome’s vile Slaverie, / And Plac’d us in our Antient Libertie.”¹²¹ Contrary to the fears of the author of *The Ballance Adjusted*, William is no radical; James was the radical and William stopped his destructive changes. This thinking is not foreign to anyone who has studied Whig historiography from the centuries following 1688; the tone of praise for the “Glorious Revolution” had begun even before William took the throne. Ironically similar in language to the Jacobite literature of the summer, such as Aphra Behn’s expectation that young James would lead all to “Raise those dejected Eyes, in Sorrow dress’d, / And view the *Prospect* of the dawning *East*,” it is now William who will bring peace.¹²² In this case, his arrival foretells “the Blest Sun-shine, of a Peaceful Age,” in pleasant contrast to the wars that had ravaged the country some decades before.¹²³ Whereas some Jacobites had hoped that the Prince of Wales would be a source of national unity, now Whigs expected the same from the Prince of Orange. His own sense of justice has driven out the country’s enemies, enabling the people to “Possess those Rights we heretofore enjoy’d” after their religion “By false Authority was Trampled down.” Heaven evidently had not favored the country with the birth of the previous June, because now through the invasion “Happy Albion” can “rightly know / The Blessings Heaven upon Thee doth bestow.” The revolution is the result of divine intervention, another inarguable reason for the religious English to unite behind it and support the new regime. Under William’s leadership and God’s approval, the country will return to its former glory, supposedly unseen since James first came to power. They will witness an

¹²¹ *A Poem to His Highness*, etc.

¹²² Aphra Behn, “A Congratulatory Poem to Her Most Sacred Majesty,” p. 2.

¹²³ *A Poem to His Highness*, etc.

“Age of Joy” in which they can all freely express their “Chearful Gladness” while William, their blessed new ruler, is “With Honour Crown’d, Cloath’d with Felicity; / Pursu’d by Fame, by all Diversion met; / Free from the least Misfortune or Regret.”¹²⁴

The elated optimism of William’s arrival and the diverse concerns that it embodied arose in a number of other publications from late 1688 and also indicated the reappraising qualities of the revolution. Captain Anthony Stampe, “Sometimes Chief Engineer and Adjutant General to an Active Protestant Army against the Rebels in Ireland,” published a collection of prayers on 17 December. His full title reads,

A Protestant Souldier’s Congratulation to the Prince of Orange, in a New Letany, or, Prayers against Popery. Being thought necessary to be added to the *Daily Devotions of Private Families* at all Times, but more especially in this present juncture of Affairs in *England*.¹²⁵

That itself is indicative of the perceived correlation between the arrival of William and the spiritual fulfillment of the English Protestant nation. Stampe offers prayers for a sinful nation that it could return to Christian virtue, particularly in the military; and William’s eventual succession is an opportunity for such an improvement. A national reconversion amidst political upheaval, too, would make sense given the apocalyptic approach toward the revolution taken by some, as has been recently described.¹²⁶ Stampe concludes his collection with an interestingly international concern:

We beseech thee likewise for thy great Gospel sake, that thou would’st be pleas’d to lead this great Captain on further to the Conquest of France, Rome, and other Popish Countrey’s, and that his Highness Head may be adorned with Diadems here, and after this Life in Heaven with a Crown of Glory.¹²⁷

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²⁵ *A Protestant Souldier’s Congratulation to the Prince of Orange, in a New Letany* (London, 1688), frontispiece.

¹²⁶ See again Warren Johnston, “Revelation and the Revolution of 1688-1689.”

¹²⁷ *A Protestant Souldier’s Congratulation*, p. 12.

Here William has at least one supporter who would offer him a blank check to hunt Catholicism across the fields of Europe. If Stampe is any representative of military sentiments, it would help to explain why much of the army supported William rather than James in the subsequent war in Ireland, though there would certainly have been many more reasons besides religious division alone.

Other supporters of William shared this broad militant appreciation of his presumed goals to challenge religious and political enemies throughout Europe. One poet, apparently mindful of the persistent threat of the Ottoman Empire on Christendom, wrote of how “th’ English Arms by Mighty Nassaw led, / [would] Break the long Leagues with Mahomet and Hell; / And the World’s Ravager, Europe’s Monster quell.” He would also take on the other “Turk” in Europe, France: this writer expected him to purify the continent “And wash the Sanguin’d *Fleur-de-Lisses* white.” Even as others made it clear that William’s adventures would not be religious wars, here he would be a hero in an explicitly “Holy War” and “to Great *Britain* her lost Right restore, / Enstall’d proud *Europe*’s Arbiter once more.”¹²⁸ Interestingly this poem concludes with an indirect reference to the Prince of Wales, suggesting that William is the legitimate heir even though he personally ranked after Mary and Anne in the line of succession. Invoking “*British* Mother Church,” who must have borne William somehow despite his origins, the author asks that she “show the Diff’rence, in their Veins there runs, / Betwixt thy True-born, and they *Hagar* Sons.” In addition to his promise to rout the hordes of Catholic Europe, he will establish the proper line of the chosen people, as opposed to the future Ishmaelites of James Francis Edward’s progeny. This poem also utilizes vivid classical imagery, with references to “Roman Julius” and “the *Macedon* Youth” as great princes who would soon be overshadowed by the divinely-ordained glory of William of Orange. He would presumably help Christianity to outdo

¹²⁸ *A Congratulatory Poem To His Highness the Prince of Orange, Upon His Arrival At London* (London, 1688).

the pagan heroes as well. Another piece, entitled *The Fall of Babylon*, compares William to “Good King Josiah” in his efforts to “extirpate Idolatry,” in reference, presumably, to Catholicism. The title page adds that William “may be truly said to parallel that good King in some Things, and to exceed him in Others.”¹²⁹ Here too, he is a gift from heaven to preserve the people and purify the country. With such comparisons, these authors clearly suggest that William is the successor to the divinely instituted kingship of both David the Israelite and James the father-in-law. James and his newborn son lack God’s endorsement, being instead the potential bringer of ruin to God’s blessed Englishmen. William will carry on the glories of English tradition in an intrinsically conservative event. In each of these works, the basic characteristics of Whig literature are already laid out, portraying William as the preserver of the English identity—but in reality that identity was already changing by its willingness to associate itself with a new, non-English monarch in place of one of their own.

An anonymous poet expressed similar sentiments in an acrostic, with the first letters of each line spelling “William Henry Prince of Orange and Nassaw,” hailing William as the “Protector of the Protestant Religion throughout the World.” This poem is a typical expression of praise, but the sentiments and wording indicate again William’s distinction from James on religious grounds. It downplays his lineage, perhaps, by describing him as “Noble in Blood, but Nobler far in Mind”; and with him as such, “Religion groans to be by You refin’d.”¹³⁰ The faith needs his “Safe Protection” as he rescues it “from the Toyls of *Babel’s* Whore.” The poet continues, however, to explain that Catholicism alone is not the problem—once again, it is France that must be stopped. “Nip *France’s* Pride, Pull Hell’s Great *Lewis* down; / Confound his Glory, and Debase his Crown,” he writes. In defending Christianity against “Old Antichrist,”

¹²⁹ *The Fall of Babylon: or, Good King Josiah Revived by the Happy Arrival of His Highness the Prince of Orange: Which Landed in Devonshire the 5th of November, 1688* (London, 24 December 1688).

¹³⁰ *To the most Illustrious and Serene Prince, His Royal Highness* (London, 1688).

who “must to the Christian bow,” he will also stop the newfound political enemy of England, Louis XIV. The two concerns are intrinsically connected, and religious rhetoric is utilized to discuss political themes. The animosity toward France is not developed further in this poem, but its mention indicates that William’s intentions beyond London were well understood and accepted in 1688. First he would purify England from within, forcing out the disease of James and French Catholicism; then he would take the purification to the continent and end Louis’s campaign to draw all of Europe under Versailles’s influence.

A song published around the invasion forms a brilliant little summary of the revolution from a pro-William perspective. According to the lyricist, posing as a fruit-seller, there is a perfect remedy for the recent troubles of England: “Good People, Come buy the fruit that I Cry, that now is in season, tho Winter is nigh, ‘twill do you all good, and sweeten your Blood, I’m sure it will please, when you’re once understood, tis an Orange.”¹³¹ The song proceeds to warn, “Tho some it quite chills, And with fear almost kills; Yet certain each healthy Man benefit feel by an Orange.” Even though fierce William could drive fear into the hearts of the bravest men, he was ultimately in England for the English’s own good. In a clever dig at France, perhaps, this orange will even “make Clarett go down.” While “Att White H— they stink, Because that our Neighbours come over the Sea,” the orange will soon blot out the stench of England’s enemies, both the residents of Whitehall and their pernicious foreign advisors. In response to those within England who would protest the recent events, the poet continues, “Tho the Mobile Bawl, Like the Divil and all For Religeon, Property, Justice, and Laws; Yet in very good sooth, Ile tell you the truth, There nothing is better to stop a mans mouth then an Orange.” It may be impossible to tell whether William appreciated being compared to produce, but the point and the effect are clear. In the form of a tavern song, the recent revolution and the Whig

¹³¹ *A New Song of an Orange* (London, 1688).

rhetoric that accompanied it could spread throughout the population to bring all together in support of William. For those who knew relatively little of the complicated details of the revolution, here at least was a catchy tune to reiterate “the ayls of the Pri— of Wa—.” Such wording would revive the lies of James II and indicate that William was indeed the only hope for the English. In a readily understandable format, the propaganda of the revolution would trickle from person to person and firm the support of the invading prince.

An all-encompassing study of Whig literature supporting William could take up a book itself, as Tony Claydon has already written; but the documents selected here, from the time of the invasion and before it was quite clear that he would become king, demonstrate the popular mood at the time of the revolution. James had his supporters, because of fears of Dutch imperialism and religious anarchy with William at the head. They argued that James, with all his faults, was at least a true English monarch who could protect the people’s rights with a little encouragement. He was not necessarily a curse on England. Others, however, saw his regime as irrevocably entwined with Louis XIV’s Versailles court, with its Jesuit spies and centralized authority. From this perspective, James had to go, and William was the best available agent of removal. The discussion of these three “great men” during the final months of 1688 indicates the diversity of opinions, and the odd nuances of some of the arguments. Many identified James as an admittedly troubled monarch who should nevertheless retain his throne; the persistent divine right theory taught that the people could not remove their king. Even so, there were few who defended him as unchallengeable—if in error, others should guide him to the right conclusion, thereby preserving both the natural succession and the rights of the people. William could serve as a temporary advisor to demonstrate to James how he could better perform his role as king. For the more radical side, which was rapidly becoming the mainstream, William should replace,

not assist, James on the throne. He had gone so far as to become a traitor to his country, and the country then was well within its rights to send him away in shame.

Conclusion: “Now, Now, with One United Voice”

By the time that William and Mary were enthroned in the spring of 1689, the English people had generally come to support the Orange camp and accepted the new direction of the country. They had stopped the immediate threat of an illegitimate heir, removed the Catholics that James had placed in office, and turned their attention from the Netherlands to France as the intrinsic enemy of the English people. They had reappraised both the situation and themselves, gaining a new understanding of what it would mean to be English while asserting that the identity remained what it had been all along. Despite what they said, however, their identity had changed. In writing poetry that insisted that they were the greatest nation in Europe—a claim that surely had been made before—they were no longer being idealistic; they were ushering in a new period of genuine English military and economic dominance. William’s militant reign began the long century of global power and empire, in which England would go on to drive France out of the New World and surpass the waning Dutch Republic in trade. In their growing influence over South Asia, they were planting the seeds of what would become the defining imperial possession of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The English awareness of the world across the channel had been growing throughout the seventeenth century, but the international connections of 1688 forced an even greater knowledge. Stereotypes were often the only means of defining the outside, but that has been a characteristic of local populations throughout history. With the boom of continental touring, the English sought to learn about their European neighbors; as Tony Claydon has recently demonstrated, that observation was often categorized according to religion.¹³² In much the same way, most English saw the various players of 1688 according to their creed, oversimplifying their own complex situation just as the basic Whiggish historical tradition would continue to do through the Victorian period.

¹³² Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England*, chapter 1.

References to other concerns, including property and political freedom, also demonstrated that religion was not their only concern; but at that time they still described liberty and economy in religious terms. One was not simply free to be a Protestant—one was free *because* one was a Protestant. To be a free Englishman, then, one had to be Protestant or else give up personal liberty to an outside authority, be it the pope, the sultan, or the king of France.

Even though there would be a persistent threat to the English crown by Jacobitism throughout the eighteenth century, the mood of 1688-89 was that now the country could finally unify itself after the tumults of the English Civil War and Restoration period. Troubles still awaited England, which pushed it to its unity with Scotland in 1707 and its support of the Hanoverian succession in 1715; but in 1689, the English were ready for a period of tranquility and unity. That desire for national unity was evident in literature on both sides. William would defy partisan associations and include Tories in his cabinet, helping to gather the nation behind him. Unity was something that the English all knew had been lacking, and which would have to be restored if they were to challenge anyone on the battlefield. The Prince of Wales was supposed to bring that unity through the innocence of a newborn child, but James II's opponents had characterized him as tainted, a source of even greater disunity because of his associations with Jesuits and the rejoicing of Catholic Europe. James II's proposal for liberty of conscience was supposed to unify England as well while tolerating various interpretations of religion under the common umbrella of English legalized Christianity—but when that umbrella included the apparently unchristian Catholics, it would divide the English once again. The question came to be, who would be the representative of England and its national identity? Could James continue to speak for the English people with his dangerously close connections to France? Or was William of Orange, a Dutchman but the husband of the unquestionably English Princess Mary,

the only figure who could unify the country? There were evidently many who opposed him, but he of course was the winner of the fight and would go on to reassert his claim to the throne by conquest in the fields of Ireland. As part of William and Mary's demonstration of legitimacy, the new poet laureate Thomas Shadwell and the popular composer Henry Purcell wrote the first of Purcell's six birthday odes for Queen Mary II. She had only been on the throne for a few months when she was hailed already as the successor to Elizabeth I, ushering in a new English golden age. Here too, William's challenge of the "Papal world" would be a central characteristic of his reign as he pushed the Catholic hordes out of the Isles and back all the way to Rome. The new royal couple, described as "restorers," would protect "our dear religion, with our law's defence." In conclusion, Shadwell adds, "Now, now, with one united voice / Let us aloud proclaim our joys"—William needed the country behind him to forward his own goals.¹³³

This was not enough, however, for the English. They needed to unite themselves for their own sake as they came to understand their own nature and identity. Through this glorious reappraisal, they would assume their role as one of the leading countries of Europe, checking French dominance under Louis XIV and, eventually, halting it for a final time at the Battle of Waterloo. Here England would fight not as an outpost of Europe but as a leader of what would be one of the greatest military coalitions in European history. They would have to grow into these large shoes during the Hanoverian years, but 1688 was the start of England's association of itself with international greatness. The political turmoil of the seventeenth century had made England seem intrinsically weak, a house divided against itself. It was a country depressed. With a strong king that they could identify with, they could become happy with themselves and comfortable with their position. At least the monarchy no longer seemed to have a direct line to Versailles. William chose to use England as his base, not Amsterdam; though he moved upriver

¹³³ Thomas Shadwell, text, and Henry Purcell, music, *Now Does the Glorious Day Appear*, 1689.

from Whitehall to Hampton Court, he was not exploiting English resources for the Netherlands. His position as King of England would be his primary role, though with an international focus in his war with France. This was the war that many English had been waiting to fight, for both economic and quasi-religious reasons. Even if religion was but a description and not a core identifier, the Dutch and English were Protestant peoples who shared economic and military interests against the burgeoning Catholic French. In seeing themselves as a practical, Protestant society, England could overcome the French threat and assume its position of destiny as the fatherland of God's chosen people, with the new Josiah at the helm. Through the Revolution of 1688-89, the English reappraised themselves as glorious: that is the crucial factor of the revolution from a nationalistic perspective. Whether it was glorious or not is an inherently biased judgment, and beside the point. That the English—at least on the winning Whig side—saw it as such indicates the start of a driven nation that would soon dominate the world. For them, it was the latest phase of a centuries-long progression towards increased liberty and prosperity that would now force them outside of their borders to draw all under the soon-to-be-unified flag of first Great Britain, and later the *United Kingdom*. It was a reappraisal of glory indeed; but as long as disunity persisted in the highlands of Scotland and bogs of Ireland, the words could be no more than text or speech. Nevertheless, in terms of national identity, what mattered was that the English wanted unity and at times even believed that it was there; in 1688 they looked ahead and saw a future of permanent peace. With God on England's side, it would come to rule the waves and more.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- A Catholick Hymn on the Birth of the Prince of Wales* (1688)
- A Certain Rule To Find out How Many Honest Men there are in this Nation* (1688)
- A Congratulatory Poem To His Highness the Prince of Orange, Upon His Arrival at London* (1688)
- A Full Answer to the Depositions; And to all other the Pretences and arguments whatsoever, Concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales* (1688)
- A Letter from a Gentleman in the City, to a Gentleman in the Country, About the Odiousness of Persecution, wherein the Rise and End of the Penal Laws for Religion in this Kingdom, are consider'd* (1688)
- A Letter from Father La Chaise, Confessor to the French King, to Father Peters, Confessor to the King of England* (1688)
- A Letter to a Friend, shewing the Vanity of this Opinion: That every man's Sense and Reason is to guide him in Matters of Faith* (1688)
- A Melius Inquirendum Into the Birth of the Prince of Wales: Or An Account of several New Depositions and Arguments Pro and Con, and the Final Decision of that Affair by the Grand Inquest of Europe* (1688)
- A New Song of an Orange* (1688)
- A Poem on the Deponents Concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales* (1688)
- A Poem to His Highness, the Prince of Orange, To Welcome Him into the City of London* (1688)
- A Protestant Souldier's Congratulation to the Prince of Orange, in a New Letany* (1688)
- A Seasonable Discourse shewing the Necessity of Union amongst Proestants in Opposition to Popery, as the only Means (under Gor) to preserve the Reformed Religion* (1688)
- Advice to the English Youth: Relating to the Present Juncture of Affairs* (1688)
- An Alarm to England: or, a Warning-Piece to All True Protestants. Wherein is Discovered the present Danger of the French* (1688)
- An Expedient for Peace: Perswading An Agreement amongst Christians ,&c* (1688)
- An Humble Address, to the Most Illustrious and High Born James Francis Edward, Present Prince of Wales* (1688)

- Behn, Aphra, *A Congratulatory Poem to Her Most Sacred Majesty, on the Universal Hopes of All for a Prince of Wales* (1688)
- Burnet, Gilbert, *An Apology for the Church of England, with relation to the Spirit of Persecution, for which She is Accused* (1688)
- d'Urfey, Thomas, *A Poem Congratulatory on the Birth of the Young Prince* (1688)
- Dryden, John, *Britannia Rediviva: A Poem on the Birth of the Prince* (1688)
- Etherege, George, *An Account of the Rejoycing at the Dyet at Ratisbonne, Performed by Sir George Etherege, Kt. Residing there from His Majesty of Great Britain, Upon Occasion of the Birth of the Prince of Wales* (1688)
- Father Peter's Policy Discovered; Or, the Prince of Wales Pro'd a Popish Perkin* (1688)
- Fears and Jealousies Ceas'd: Or, an Impartial Discourse, tending to Demonstrate, from the Folly and ill Success of the Romish Politicks, that there is no Reason to Apprehend any Danger from Popery* (1688)
- Guido Faux Reviv'd: Or, the Monks Late Hellish Contrivances Expos'd. Being a full Account of the Horrid Bloody Designs of the Papists, at their Mass-House Convent Chappel in St. Johnes's* (1688)
- James II, *His Majesties Gracious Declaration to all His Loving Subjects for Liberty of Conscience*, second printing (1688)
- Locke, John, *A Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689)
- *Second Treatise of Government* (1689)
- Shadwell, Thomas, and Henry Purcell, *Now Does the Glorious Day Appear* (1689)
- Some Reasons to move Protestant Dissenters To be for the taking off Penal Laws, yea and Tests too, On their having the good Security, They shall not be exposed to suffering any more for Religion* (1688)
- Ten Seasonable Queries, proposed by a Protestant that is for Liberty of Conscience to all Perswasions* (1688)
- The Ballance Adjusted: Or, the Interest of Church and State Weighed and Considered upon this Revolution* (1688/9)
- The Debates in Deposing Kings; And of the Royal Succession of Great Britain* (1688)
- The Fall of Babylon: or, Good King Josiah Revived by the Happy Arrival of His Highness the Prince of Orange: Which Landed in Devvonshire the 5th of November, 1688* (1688)

The King of France's Letter to the Earl of Tyrconnel, Found in a Ship Laden with Arms for Ireland (1688)

The Relation of the Rejoycings Made in Rome for the Birth of the most Serene Prince of Wales, Only Son of James the Second, King of Great Britain, Defender of the Faith, etc. (1689)

The Sham Prince Expos'd. In a Dialogue between the Pope's Nuncio and the Bricklayer's Wife, Nurse to the Supposed Prince of Wales (1688)

To the most Illustrious and Serene Prince, His Royal Highness (1688)

Turner, John, *A Sermon, Preached upon January the 29th, 1688. Upon Occasion of Her Majesties Happy Conception* (1688)

--- *A Sermon Preached June the 17th 1688. Upon the Birth of the Prince* (1688)

Secondary Sources

Blanning, T. C. W., *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture: Old Regime Europe 1660-1789* (Oxford, 2002)

Bosher, J. F., "The Franco-Catholic Danger, 1660-1715," *History*, 79 (1994), 5-30

Claydon, Tony, and Ian McBride, eds., *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-c. 1850* (Cambridge, 1998)

Claydon, Tony, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge, 2007)

--- *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996)

Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven, 1992)

Hoak, Dale, and Mordechai Feingold, *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-89* (Stanford, 1996)

Houston, Alan, and Steven Pincus, eds., *A nation transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001)

Johnston, Warren, "The Anglican Apocalypse in Restoration England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 55 (2004), 467-501

--- "Revelation and the Revolution of 1688-1689," *The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005), 351-389

Jones, J. R., ed. *Liberty Secured? Britain before and after 1688* (Stanford, 1992)

Pincus, Steven, Book forthcoming; Chapter 4, "English Politics at the Accession of James II," and Chapter 5, "The Ideology of Catholic Modernity"

- “From butterboxes to wooden shoes: the shift in English popular sentiment from anti-Dutch to anti-French in the 1670s,” *The Historical Journal*, 38 (1995), 333-361.
- “From Holy Cause to Economic Interest,” in Houston and Pincus, *A nation transformed*
- “The Making of a Great Power? Universal Monarchy, Political Economy, and the Transformation of English Political Culture,” *The European Legacy*, 5 (2000), 531-545.
- “‘To protect English liberties’: the English nationalist revolution of 1688-1689,” in Claydon and McBride, *Protestantism and National Identity*, pp. 73-104

Schochet, Gordon J., “From Persecution to ‘Toleration,’” in J. R. Jones, *Liberty Secured?*, pp. 123-157

Schwoerer, Lois G., ed., *The Revolution of 1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)

Scott, Jonathon, *England’s Troubles* (Cambridge, 2000)

Spurr, John, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven, 1991)

Tombs, Robert and Isabelle, *That Sweet Enemy: The French and the British from the Sun King to the Present* (New York, 2007)

van der Wall, Ernestine, “‘Antichrist Stormed’: The Glorious Revolution and the Dutch Prophetic Tradition,” in Hoak and Feingold, *The World of William and Mary*, pp. 152-164

Weil, Rachel, “The Politics of Legitimacy: Women and the Warming-Pan Scandal,” in Schwoerer, *The Revolution of 1688*, pp. 65-82