

Roger L'Estrange and the Print Culture of the Restoration

By: Dorothy Turner

Supervisor: Dr. Nicholas von Maltzahn

Thesis presented to the School of Graduate Studies,
University of Ottawa, in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, English Literature

10 May 1996

©Dorothy Turner, Ottawa, Canada, 1996



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-16471-3

Canada



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

ABSTRACT

Roger L'Estrange and the Print Culture of the Restoration

Roger L'Estrange (1616-1704) is usually characterized either as censor or propagandist, as Surveyor of the Press or as factional polemicist, as discourager or participant in the Restoration booktrades. In fact L'Estrange's career manifests a tension between the desire to control the proliferation of printed texts in public life and the urge to partake in the expanding print culture of the Restoration. L'Estrange's engagement with the booktrades ranged from his early work as anti-parliamentary propagandist (1659-1660) through his career as state-sanctioned Surveyor (1663-1679) to his passionate defences of Stuart absolutism during the Popish Plot and his late work as translator after the Revolution of 1688-89.

The seventeenth century witnessed the rising influence of print media in many aspects of political and social life. This dissertation traces L'Estrange's contribution to contemporary political discourse, as well as his engagements with a variety of Restoration booksellers and writers, and his place within a larger rhetorical tradition. In each of these areas, L'Estrange's contributions were shaped by the tensions between his private interests and larger issues of allegiance and duty. Changing subject-sovereign relations, expanding professional opportunities for writers, and increasing public access to printed texts all encouraged and guided L'Estrange's career. As L'Estrange's career was influenced by the cultural forces that surrounded him, so it played an important role in the formation of the complex code of literary-social relations which characterized the turn of the eighteenth century.

Acknowledgements

I would like gratefully to acknowledge the support of the following persons, who have given to me generously of their time and encouragement during the course of this project: Nicholas von Maltzahn, Ruth Arseneault, Ian Cameron, Paula Greenwood, Russell Hunt, Thomas Parkhill, and Victoria Walker. Thank you all.

I would also like to acknowledge the financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

This thesis is respectfully dedicated to Tug McGraw.

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis.
I authorize the University of Ottawa to lend this thesis to
other institutions or individuals for the purpose of
scholarly research.

Dorothy Turner

I further authorize the University of Ottawa to reproduce
this thesis by photocopying or by other means in total or
in part at the request of other institutions or individuals
for the purpose of scholarly research.

Dorothy Turner

Contents

Introduction	1
1 L'Estrange's Early Career as Polemicist	27
2 Deferential Politics in the Public Sphere	66
3 L'Estrange and his Bookseller	101
4 Rhetoric and Interests	141
5 Faction and Periodical Publication	177
Conclusion: <u>The Dissenter's Sayings</u>	197
Appendix: Propaganda, the Playhouse and Published Drama	204
Works Cited	240

Introduction

This dissertation studies the writings of Roger L'Estrange (1614-1704) within the context of seventeenth-century English rhetorical tradition and a wide Restoration network of printed texts. It relies primarily on tracts that were written and published between 1655 and 1685 in London. The analysis is accretive, noting shared themes, images, and tropes in a broad selection of Restoration texts of diverse genres. Four types of texts further this end: L'Estrange's oeuvre, other Restoration texts, histories of the seventeenth century, and theoretical works on print culture or the public sphere.

L'Estrange's work addressed most of the prominent issues in Restoration political life. His oeuvre comprises at least seventy-six works, more than a third of which were republished at least once. It also includes two newsbooks, the Intelligencer (1663-1666), and the Observer (1681-1687). Moreover, a wide selection of tracts by other Restoration writers forms a necessary complement to L'Estrange's work, since he usually wrote in response to other polemicists. These tracts are for the most part 'oppositional,' first of all in the narrow sense that they are opposed in some way to one or another of L'Estrange's works, and often contradicted policies introduced or defended by the House of Stuart. Prominent among oppositional works were Dissenter tracts, among which those by

Presbyterians especially provided L'Estrange with his most enduring targets. He engaged directly with writers as influential as Richard Baxter, and polemicists as obscure as Edward Bagshawe. Since among Dissenters Presbyterians held most political power in the Restoration, and since many Stationers belonged to that congregation, L'Estrange singled out the kirk for special opprobrium until the defeat of the Whigs in 1681, after which the Trimmers held his attention. He did not spare more sectarian writers, of course, the most famous of whom was Milton, but among whom were such famous figures as Stephen College and the duo who discovered the Popish Plot: Titus Oates and William Bedloe. College, Oates, and Bedloe were not simply (or even primarily) sectarian propagandists. Although each was accused of apostasy, and each put his name to published defences, their engagement with L'Estrange had roots in the leadership crises precipitated by the Popish Plot and Exclusion debates in Parliament. L'Estrange engaged these writers when they ventured into the public arena. Even more transparently political were L'Estrange's battles with Andrew Marvell and George Savile, the former of whom wrote against arbitrary government, the latter of whom advocated political moderation, and both of whom championed individual rights.

Restoration writings often resist categorization according to political or religious, literary or philosophic subject matter. This slippage has influenced modern writing about the period, and consequently works of history, political science, philosophy, bibliography and literary criticism can share much theoretical and practical ground. This dissertation, taking its cues from recent works in seventeenth-century literary history, examines the representation of political culture in printed texts. This approach encourages a multiple

emphasis on the text itself, its context and its content.¹ Roger L'Estrange was a polemicist and Tory Surveyor of the Press;² in part, my subject is the rhetoric and vocabulary used by L'Estrange and his fellow writers.³ This kind of analysis is distinguished by its emphasis on the rhetoric of texts that are not usually considered qualitatively to be literary.⁴ But at the same time L'Estrange was equally a polemicist and a prominent member of the Restoration booktrades. The renewed importance of the booktrades in the latter half of the century, and the path of Roger L'Estrange's career itself, invite a marriage of literary-historical analysis

¹This approach is encouraged, in part, by the availability of recent historical descriptions and analyses of the Restoration. See, for example, Richard Ashcraft, Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986); Mark Goldie, "The Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution," The Revolutions of 1688, ed. Robert Beddard (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991) 102-36; Paul Seaward, The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988); and Austin Woolrych, The Complete Prose Works of John Milton, ed. Robert W. Ayers, rev. ed., 8 vols. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1953-1982 [1980]) 7: 1-228.

²The most complete study of L'Estrange's life remains George Kitchin, Sir Roger L'Estrange: A Contribution to the History of the Press in the Seventeenth Century (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1913).

³Writings on language important to this dissertation include Richard Ashcraft, "The Language of Political Conflict in Restoration Literature," Politics as Reflected in Literature, eds. Richard Ashcraft and Alan Roper (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1989); Mark Goldie, "The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument: An Essay and an Annotated Bibliography of Pamphlets on the Allegiance Controversy," Bulletin of Research in the Humanities 83 (1980) 473-564; Quentin Skinner, "Moral Ambiguity and the Renaissance Art of Eloquence," Essays in Criticism 44(1994) 267-292; and Steven Zwicker, "Language as Disguise: Politics and Poetry in the Later Seventeenth Century," Annals of Scholarship 1.3(1980) 47-68.

⁴Three works that apply this literary-historical technique to the seventeenth century are Lois Potter, Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989); N.H. Keeble, The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England (Leicester: Leicester UP, 1987); and Tim Harris, London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987).

and historical bibliography.⁵ If it can be demonstrated that many booktrade members were important players in print culture, and that they were motivated by a range of personal and party interests, then the institutions of licensing (and other forms of censorship) can no longer be regarded as the force of a monolithic or monologic (in the sense of unidirectional) authority. L'Estrange, as both an influential censor and one of the period's most prolific propagandists, is especially qualified to serve as the focus in an analysis of booktrades and the early public sphere.

L'Estrange's official powers were legion. Most revolved around his appointment in 1662 to a position he himself had proposed. In that year he was appointed Surveyor of the Press. The position was elevated into an office the following year, and there he remained until 1678. As part of his remuneration, L'Estrange wrote and published the Newsbook (1663-1666), the official and only major London newsbook until the Gazette of February 1666.⁶ With his appointment as Surveyor, L'Estrange was also granted membership in the Stationers' Company and access to the records of the Company responsible for regulating the booktrades. But his primary duty was to license (usually for a fee) all "books of history and

⁵This combination of historical bibliography and literary-historical analysis is informed by the writings of D.F. McKenzie and others on seventeenth-century booktrade, especially McKenzie's Sandars Lectures of 1976, The London Book Trade in the Later Seventeenth Century (Cambridge: privately printed, 1976).

⁶The Oxford Gazette (originally edited by Henry Muddiman) was printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield (and reprinted in London by Thomas Newcombe) from November 1665 until February 1666. From this latter date, the paper became the London Gazette, printed by Newcombe. See Carolyn Nelson and Matthew Seccombe, British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1641-1700 (New York: MLA, 1987) 314-16.

affairs of state."⁷ His only other official posts were as Justice of the Peace for Middlesex, a post to which he was appointed twice, relatively late in his career--in 1680, then in mid-1683--and his election (on James II's nomination) as Member of Parliament for Winchester in 1685.⁸ He was knighted by James II in the same year, owing to the "particular satisfaction he [James] had in his loyalty."⁹

L'Estrange's career embodies an apparent contradiction. As important as his offices and titles was his interpretation of the duties attendant on these posts. Since L'Estrange himself invented the post of Surveyor, it fell largely to him to decide the day-to-day methods of "Suppressing Licentious and Unlawful Pamphlets, and . . . Regulating the Press."¹⁰ The tension between this career and his oeuvre is that between the censor and the propagandist. The propagandist is responsible primarily to engage an audience in print. The Surveyor of the Press is responsible to restrict public access to debates. Competing interests impel L'Estrange's writing and career: he variously encouraged and curtailed public debate on political issues. His deferential political principles, based in a Filmerian idea of absolute monarchy, led him to discourage public participation in affairs of State. His professional interests as a member of the London booktrades, on the other hand, thrived on expanding

⁷For an overview of the Restoration licensing system, see Frederick Siebert, Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776: The Rise and Decline of Government Control (1952; Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1965) 241-43.

⁸Narcissus Luttrell, A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714 (1877; n.p.: Gregg International, 1969) 1: 39, 265; Kitchin Roger L'Estrange (1913) 313n.

⁹Luttrell Historical Relation (1969) 1: 340; Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange (1913) 362-63.

¹⁰Roger L'Estrange, Considerations and Proposals in Order to the Regulation of the Press (f. H. Brome, 1663) 1.

public access to these affairs. Events that L'Estrange would condemn in his function as Surveyor--the establishment of a newsbook to respond to the Observer, for example--might at the same time, by providing him with a visible enemy, benefit his professional activity as the editor/author of the Observer.

One of L'Estrange's professed political interests--to discourage activity in the emerging public sphere--clashed with one of his professional interests, which was to gain reputation and remuneration from the booktrades. The following chapters trace such points of divergence among L'Estrange's private, professional, and political interests.¹¹ During the seventeenth century, social and political relationships were often represented using the language of interests. The most important conflict of interest lay in L'Estrange as deferential political theorist and L'Estrange as polemicist. On the other hand, often his interests intersected, and these intersections are also explored in the following pages. Personal clashes, for example, could reverberate in the professional arena. The published skirmishes between L'Estrange, Edward Bagshawe and James Howell at the Restoration, like those between L'Estrange and William Bedloe during the Exclusion Crisis, are clearly personal, conforming to the Renaissance tradition of aggressive ad hominem controversy. The subjects of these published exchanges sometimes border on the intimate, however, and appear not to relate to L'Estrange's work in the political sphere. Despite their personal nature, however, these exchanges were not private; they occurred in print, and therefore in public. Apart from satisfying personal resentments personal printed attacks served L'Estrange in several

¹¹J. A. W. Gunn offered the first book-length analysis of conflicting ideas of public and private interest in the later seventeenth century. See his Politics and the Public Interest in the Seventeenth Century (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1969).

ways. He advertised himself professionally as a talented and effective polemicist, and in consequence began to shape for himself his role in Restoration print culture. Further, he recast his own personal history in an advantageous light, publicly strengthening his allegiances to Court figures, especially Charles II and the Earl of Clarendon. Thus L'Estrange's personal, professional, and political interests were closely bound. They were not interchangeable, however; nor even, at times, were these interests complementary.

L'Estrange had as much claim to be a member of the booktrades as a member of the Court. This dissertation discusses governmental presence in the booktrades in a way that reverses the perspective traditionally used to describe censorship. Rather than concentrating on the struggles of writers and printers to pierce the barrier of governmental interference, it analyzes the rhetoric of a censor who belongs as much to the book trades as to the Court. Since L'Estrange needed the press as much as he feared it, his work as a licenser was more complex than traditional models of confrontation allow it to have been. These models simplify the complex relations between public authority and the community, and emphasize the legislative or punitive measures of the former and the civil disobedience of the latter. Theories based on this model maintain, for example, that the development of the press "was watched with unfriendly eyes by kings and Parliament alike."¹² They claim that in order imaginatively to understand the development of news books, "We must think . . . of a few men endeavouring to bring order out of chaos"¹³ pitted against "the chill hand of authority."¹⁴

¹²Harold Herd, The March of Journalism: The Story of the British Press from 1622 to the Present Day (1952; Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1973) 11.

¹³James Sutherland, The Restoration Newspaper and its Development (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986) 185.

Thus the history of the press centres in "the extent to which printers and journalists have succeeded in defeating or evading authoritarian attempts to control the dissemination of information or opinion."¹⁵ Members of the book trades, according to this model, work together to defy the forces of iron-fisted censorship, brutal policing, and institutionalized untruth. This model of interaction between the press and governmental authority is not, however, particularly appropriate to seventeenth-century Britain. Nor does it much allow for the existence of a forum for meaningful public debate. Certainly the Court on occasion tried to limit the production of anti-monarchical propaganda, such as during the Exclusion Crisis.¹⁶ But where was the government when the publisher Joanna Brome was twice indicted for publishing L'Estrange's Tory Observer in the early 1680s? Most press histories ignore the extent to which various government factions were directly involved in the production and distribution of propaganda, nor do they acknowledge that government factions fought an ongoing battle, with few unqualified successes, for control of different aspects of print culture.

The modern polarization between the government and opposition involvement in the booktrades is in part a result, then, of histories of the press that underestimate just how provisional political authority was in late seventeenth-century England. The careers of

¹⁴Herd March of Journalism (1973) 12. See also M.A. Shaaber, Some Forerunners of the Newspaper in England 1476-1622 (1929; New York: Octagon, 1966) 35.

¹⁵Philip Gaunt, Choosing the News: The Profit Factor in News Selection (New York: Greenwood, 1990) 22. Sutherland admires the way early "journalists" "suffered for the freedom of the press" Restoration Newspaper (1986) 232.

¹⁶Harris, London Crowds (1987) 130; Timothy Crist, "Government Control of the Press after the Expiration of the Printing Act in 1679," Publishing History 5 (1979) 49.

L'Estrange and others offer compelling evidence that these poles were neither fixed nor especially stable. Factional printers and booksellers often plied their trades in peace. Moreover, agents loyal to different Court factions were also vulnerable to official harassment. Simply to polarize government and opposition interests does not adequately allow for other sources of conflict or division.

For example, L'Estrange engaged in a three-year power struggle with Robert Stephens, a one-time ally and a messenger of the press. Stephens (according to L'Estrange), first teamed up with the trade publisher Langley Curtis to draw up the charges of libel against L'Estrange which precipitated his flight to Holland in the late months of 1680. In the words of L'Estrange:

Here is . . . the Messenger of the Press, whose Office 'tis, to Suppress Libells, link't in a Confederacy, with the Interest, of the most Seditious, Scandalous Libeller about the Town; And against a Person, that . . . has made himself a Slave, to the Service of the Government.¹⁷

Such shifting personal allegiances and professional jealousies are difficult to factor into a polarized model. Personal relationships among booktrade members might affect the content and circulation of a text as much as the ideological commitments of a tract's author or the licensor's interpretation of that tract. In the case of L'Estrange *versus* Stephens, one agent conspires with the 'opposition' in a (probably professional) contest with another agent. A model of writing and publishing that acknowledges the competing interests that influenced the shape of the booktrades helps make sense of such relationships. And L'Estrange's run-in with Stephens was not an isolated affair. One year after Stephens and Curtis joined forces,

¹⁷Observer 2.170 (20 November 1684).

three of the most strident Court party newsbooks were under investigation. In September 1681 Joanna Brome (publisher of the Observer), Nathaniel Thompson (writer/publisher of the Loyal Protestant Intelligence), and Benjamin Tooke (publisher of Heraclitus Ridens) were presented by London's Grand Jury for "maliciously printing and publishing . . . libels . . . tending to the Advancement and Introduction of Popery, and to the Suppression and Extirpation of the True Protestant Religion."¹⁸ In April 1683, Stephens would again plot to discredit L'Estrange by claiming that the publication of the Observer contravened the royal proclamation of 1680 against periodicals.¹⁹ This second presentment formed part of a larger effort on the part of Stephens to "put down" once and for all the Observer and remove L'Estrange from the public sphere through a campaign of harassment comprised of published and legal challenges.²⁰ These were not the struggles of the Court against a disadvantaged booktrade member. Stephens and L'Estrange were competing for authority within the booktrades and neither could decisively vanquish the other, though each claimed victory. L'Estrange would be silenced at least three more times during his career. The command of 1680 against L'Estrange's polemical activities, and the Surveyor's flight to Holland in 1681 will be discussed in detail later.²¹ In February and March 1687 parliamentary observer

¹⁸Kitchin Roger L'Estrange (1913) 282-83. See also Leona Rostenberg, "Subversion and Repression: Robert Stephens, Messenger of the Press," Literary, Political, Scientific, Religious and Legal Publishing, Printing and Bookselling in England, 1551-1700: Twelve Studies (New York: Franklin, 1965) 361-62.

¹⁹L'Estrange kept his readers well-informed of the developments in this last attack. See Observer 1.323 (20 April, 1683); 1.326-1.328 (25 April- 27 April 1683).

²⁰Calendar of the State Papers Domestic, Charles II, ed M.A.E. Green et al (London: HMSO, 1860-1938) vol. 24, 8 June 1683 (hereafter abbreviated CSPD).

²¹CSPD vol. 21, 10 August 1680.

Narcissus Luttrell noted that "Sir Roger L'[E]strange is commanded to write no more Observators."²² L'Estrange was less vulnerable to legal attacks than, for example, Curtis was. But his high profile and aggressive personality rendered him more vulnerable to violent excoriation than any other "Court" figure. Historians who emphasize L'Estrange's role as "Bloodhound of the Press" seldom mention his ignominious flight to Holland. The uncertain fortunes of the foremost Tory voice of the Restoration cast doubt on common assumptions about the effectiveness and consistency of any system of press censorship.

Along with the Stephens affair and L'Estrange's periodic bouts of Court disfavour, other more general evidence points to the practices of negotiation characteristic of press control during the Restoration. Although the Court did pursue legal and legislative routes against seditious printing, these options were significantly reduced after the lapse of the Printing Act in June 1679.²³ In the 1680s, as in the 1660s, writers such as L'Estrange responded to propaganda where propaganda had power to influence public opinion: in the public arenas, especially in the press. According to the deferential theory advocated by L'Estrange the Surveyor, these public battles for London (and national) opinion should not have been necessary. Circumstances in 1681 after the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament should have offered a matchless opportunity for Tory forces to solidify their power against all manner of political and religious opposition. Events such as the dissolution, the execution of Stephen College (the 'Protestant Joyner') and the trial of Lord Shaftesbury in the same year, and finally the results of the shrieval elections the following July in London all

²²Luttrell Historical Relation (1969) 1: 392, 396.

²³Crist "Control of the Press" (1979) 49-77.

reinforced the Court's position. If indeed government despised and feared the press, what better occasion for the Court to take decisive action against such troublesome publishers as Langley Curtis or Richard Janeway?²⁴ The precedent for treason trials based on written works existed well before Lord Chief Jeffreys' fatal pronouncement of "scribere est agere" against the Rye House plotter Algernon Sidney in 1683.²⁵ The trial for treason and the execution almost twenty years earlier of the printer John Twyn had sharply demonstrated "the Insufferable Liberties of the Presse," and the means available to the government for "bringing it into better Order."²⁶ Although some members of the book-trades were fined and imprisoned for sedition, however, none after Twyn was convicted of treason until after the Glorious Revolution, even though the original statute had been modified to encompass "those who by printing, preaching, or other speaking" endeavour the death or deposition of the king.²⁷ The early 1680s, which witnessed both College's and Sidney's trials premised on

²⁴Curtis and Janeway were two of the trade publishers most active during this period (See Michael Treadwell, "London Trade Publishers 1675-1750," The Library, 6th ser. 4 [1982] 108 and passim). Press issues have been examined in the context of the Interregnum by Blair Worden, "'Wit in a Roundhead': The Dilemma of Marchamont Nedham," Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England, eds. Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995): 301-37; during the Restoration by Crist "Control of the Press" 49-77; and after the Glorious Revolution by Goldie "Revolution of 1689" (1980) 473-564.

²⁵On Sidney's trial see Jonathan Scott, Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677-1683 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991) 320-9.

²⁶An Exact Narrative of the Tryal and Condemnation of John Twyn, ed. Roger L'Estrange (b. Thomas Mabb f. Henry Brome) [A4^v]. L'Estrange likely wrote the introduction to this work. He discovered Twyn's activities, and testified against him. Brome sold the tract. The printer Thomas Mabb witnessed L'Estrange's raid of Twyn's house, testified during the trial, and printed this version of the proceedings.

²⁷A. F. Havinghurst, "The Judiciary and Politics in the Reign of Charles II," The Law Quarterly Review 66(1950): 62.

treasonous writing, also witnessed the rise of the trade publisher who put his imprint on seditious or even treasonous texts for pay, often free from official punitive action.²⁸

Histories of the press have built a polarization between government and the press in part because the seventeenth century is marked by polarizations. It has been suggested, for example, that political moderation itself suffered progressive erosion due to the continuing difficulties and tensions of the period.²⁹ While some of these movements might have been impelled by ideology, this dissertation maintains that they were also encouraged by emerging literary genres. The polarization of political positions was certainly prominent in propaganda, and endemic to newsbooks by the 1680s. Propaganda encourages the essentialization of political relationships. And although factions had access to many media, there was one that was primarily devoted to fulfilling the needs of political parties--the ephemeral press. Broad-sides, newsbooks, and short polemical tracts developed to facilitate the circulation of opinion and commentary. These evolving genres were shaped by the function of polemics in the political sphere. They tended to be short enough to be read in one sitting. They often employed colloquial and dramatic language to engage broad audiences, a generic debt to older and more obviously artistic genres of social commentary such as drama. Finally, ephemeral tracts were often in dialogue with each other. Each

²⁸On this practice see Treadwell "Trade Publishers" (1982).

²⁹Richard Cust, "News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England," Past and Present 112 (1986) 79. On this process of polarization see also Thomas Cogswell, "The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I and the People in the 1620s," Journal of British Studies 29 (1990) 190; Worden "'Wit in a Roundhead'" (1995) 302; Ashcraft Revolutionary Politics (1986) 41; and David Zaret, "Religion, Science, and Printing in the Public Spheres in Seventeenth-Century England," Habermas and the Public Sphere, ed. Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1992) 218 and *passim*.

contributed to the ongoing print conversations which comprised a significant portion of the early public sphere in London. In order to position themselves these tracts made reference to other tracts and polemicists, commenting on specific contemporary events, characters, or political circumstance. Polemical tracts were short, topical, and ephemeral. The functions of polemics dictated their generic characteristics, and polemics, in turn, encouraged the process of political polarization.

Jürgen Habermas has suggested that printing formed the "decisive mark" of the public sphere of critical-rational reflection.³⁰ He maintains that in spite of the inherent restrictions of the press, it (especially the ephemeral press) encouraged political expression. Many Restoration booktrade members were politically active. The press was seldom under the control of any one faction for a long period. Like drama, pamphlets and newsbooks exposed the political structure of state and personal relationships to public scrutiny, but the press--again especially the ephemeral press--was more widely consumed than drama, and was shaped by contributions from a range of classes.

L'Estrange's career as a polemicist forms part of the development of this public domain of critical-rational reflection in London in the latter part of the century. He operated within a second print revolution. If the first was initiated by the spread of printed texts and print technology in the fifteenth century,³¹ the second was fuelled by the infiltration of print

³⁰Jürgen Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society, tr. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge: MIT P, 1991) 16.

³¹This field of study was cleared, especially for scholars of the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries, by the work of Walter Ong, Elizabeth Eisenstein, and Roger Darnton.

into many areas of political life. By the end of the seventeenth century in England writers could subsist on the direct and indirect remuneration from their writing. The professionalization of the writing trades was not complete, however; writers needed to pay close attention to political circumstance as they wrote. L'Estrange would not have thrived had he only sold "the clearness and variety of his Expression, or his stupendious celerity in writing" to the highest bidder for such services.³² No-one operating in the public sphere could admit to being motivated primarily by private interests.³³

L'Estrange's fortunes were tied directly to the party he served. Charles II and his parliaments tried alternately to negotiate and legislate a place for dissenting Protestants (and Catholics) within the political and religious order, under the shadow of the turmoil of the previous generation. L'Estrange came from a Royalist family, some of whom had earlier worked on behalf of the Stuarts.³⁴ Although L'Estrange did not follow Charles Stuart into

³²The Life of Boetius [sic] (p., s.b. W. Davis, 1683) 90. This tract was actually mentioned for sale in the Observer 1.251 (2 December 1682). Marchamont Nedham's work on behalf of several factions (the Army, republicans, the Court) was as close to professional as the seventeenth century offered in this political vein. For an overview of the place of print culture during the century, see Gerald Maclean, "Literature, Culture, and Society in Restoration England," Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration, ed. Gerald Maclean (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995) 10-14.

³³The admission of private motives for writing was reserved for those who had withdrawn, voluntarily or otherwise, from public life. For example, Roger Palmer, Earl of Castlemaine put his name to a long oppositional apology for Catholicism while he was in the Tower (on charges of Jesuitism), and Clarendon's work on toleration was published anonymously after his withdrawal from public life. See The Compendium: . . . As Also An Humble Address (n.p., 1679), and Edward Hyde, first Earl of Clarendon, Second Thoughts; Or, the Case of a Limited Toleration (n.p., n.d.).

³⁴Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange (1913) 4-5.

exile,³⁵ his Cavalier allegiances were clear: he served the House of Stuart and the Church of England. His was a loyalty expressed primarily in political terms. He did not concern himself with religious issues except insofar as they impacted on political life. Neither his secularism nor his pragmatism were strong enough, however, for him to convert to Catholicism with the ascension of the Catholic James to the throne upon the death of Charles in 1685.³⁶ He suffered imprisonment after the Glorious Revolution, then spent the rest of his writing life translating classical political texts, a less obviously contentious profession.

The complex professional and personal relationships among the Royalist booktrade members who were connected with L'Estrange also deserve a second look. Traditional models of censorship flatten these relationships for the sake of a combative model which ranges government press agents--often with L'Estrange at their head--against dissenting writers and brave nonconformist publishers. As booktrade members maintained complex allegiances, so the products they sold were intricately bound up with market trends and other cultural exchanges. L'Estrange worked in the book trades (which comprised writing, printing, financing and bookselling) for the sake of his own benefit and that of the House of Stuart. The distinction is important, because the lines between public and private life were being redrawn in the press from the mid-seventeenth through the eighteenth centuries. Thus

³⁵Some of L'Estrange's enemies would later allege that his Protectorate activities had not been true to the Cavalier cause. See, for example, The Loyal Observer: Or, Historical Memoirs of . . . Roger the Fidler (f. William Hammond, 1683) 7. This text was probably written by Stephens.

³⁶L'Estrange would refute charges against him of Catholicism for most of his career. His daughter's apostasy led to his last public avowal of his Protestant faith in 1703 (Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange [1913] 373).

any attempt to describe L'Estrange's work must not only take account of his stated motives but also place these utterances in the context of changing ideas about the duties and obligations of individuals living in communities.

Ideals of selfless devotion to state or public interests that have their origin in classical and feudal social systems were still present in the rhetoric of political and religious obedience in Stuart England. From mid-century on, however, these older ideals had to share space with the opportunities offered by various new formulations of individual rights and duties. The dissertation begins with an examination of early Restoration conflicts between public and private interests (Chapter One), then places these tensions in a theoretical framework (Chapter Two). After exploring L'Estrange's booktrade interests (Chapter Three) the dissertation focuses on a rhetorical analysis, especially of his later oeuvre. Chapters Four and Five note the innovations which characterize the published work of the later period, both in pamphlets and in newsbooks, and an Appendix measures Restoration polemical debts to the older forms of drama and dialogue.

Chapter One suggests that the political uncertainty which preceded and immediately followed the Restoration in 1660 provided the occasion for L'Estrange to shape political events through the channels for printed propaganda that had developed during the Interregnum. He did not match these efforts as polemicist until the sovereignty crisis of 1678-1681. L'Estrange exerts a formative influence on the press productions of this earlier period: publishing petitions, lobbying, and working in concert with other members of the book trades to circulate hasty ephemeral responses to current events. He exploited existing publishing networks, and where they were as yet undeveloped he helped establish them.

During this earliest period of L'Estrange's career there existed no obvious conflict between his polemical efforts to destabilize the Rump Parliament (and later to advocate the return of the House of Stuart), and his desire for personal reward for these efforts. With the re-emergence of the monarchy in 1660, however, L'Estrange did not immediately achieve either his ideological or professional goals. On the other hand, the propaganda campaign of 1659-60 had solidified the polemicist's business relationship with the bookseller Henry Brome, a partnership that would last until the seller's death in 1681. This early work had also furnished L'Estrange with a wide knowledge of other individuals and factions active in the book trades.

Soon after the Restoration the first open rift appeared between L'Estrange's public and his personal interests. At that time he was writing and publishing profusely in order to recommend himself to Court interests. His fear of renewed civil war, on the other hand, led him to advocate a policy of non-participation in the political sphere. This meant recommending quiescence in the very trades in which he thrived. This struggle appears in his earliest attacks on Presbyterians. Chapter Two traces L'Estrange's attempts to justify his hounding of Presbyterians and other Dissenters in light of his professed deference to external authority. His connections to the Court and his role as "Guide to the inferiour Clergy"³⁷ demanded that he openly advocate passive obedience to the Stuart regime, while he published prose so inflammatory that the Court on several occasions publicly chastised him.

³⁷The label appears in several texts, including A New-Years-Gift for Towzer (f. E. Harrison, 1682) 2, and The Heu and Cry: or, A Relation of the Travels of the Devil and Towzer (f. Roger Catflogger, [1682]) [A1].

Chapters Three through Five describe the activities of Cavaliers who, armed with their Interregnum experiences, competed for personal rewards in the months and years following the Restoration. The evolving print culture encouraged trade in panegyrics, memoirs, and apologies. Although Cavaliers, by definition, were loyal to the government of Charles II, this loyalty to the Stuarts did not dictate other loyalties. Personal attacks, circulated in print among many segments of the population, revealed a tension between the personal interests of individual Cavalier authors defending their personal reputations and the 'public good' each claimed to represent.³⁸ As was the case for most writers, several personal factors motivate L'Estrange's early career as strongly as any ideological attachment to the cause of monarchical absolutism or ecclesiastical intolerance: his personal animus against rival writers (such as Edward Bagshawe and James Howell) and rival book trade members (the 'Confederates,' most of the Court of the Stationers' Company), and his own quest for personal advantage within the booktrade and outer circles of the Court. Once L'Estrange established his place as Surveyor and conservative Court polemicist in the Restoration order, he spent the rest of his life variously defending and building his career, largely by writing and distributing polemical texts, depending on the success of conservative Court factions, and participating in the Restoration booktrades.

Concern with public and private interests was not confined to Royalists, nor did it dissipate upon the re-establishment of the House of Stuart and the Cavalier Parliament. In

³⁸Seaward maintains that "until the advent of war in 1665 it was faction, allied with religion, which brought the government the worst of its parliamentary difficulties" (The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667 [Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988] 217).

fact, by the time the Popish Plot was discovered in 1679, the language of interest had spread widely through printed texts. Chapters Four and Five concentrate on a rhetorical analysis of Restoration tracts and newsbooks, which carried the weight of the new emphasis on public and private interest. The claim that one's enemy wrote for the sake of personal advantage, for "the Crust not the Cause,"³⁹ was an important weapon in the arsenal of the polemicist. "Who knows not" as L'Estrange would ask, "that Interest governs the World?"⁴⁰ This belief was ubiquitous and coloured the interpretation of all claims to selfless devotion. Further, the instability of church and state hierarchies sharpened this distrust of motive, since few writers could convincingly claim, for example, to represent the Church of England on toleration when the Church itself suffered rapidly-changing policy, and polemicists as divergent as Samuel Parker and Edmund Hiceringill claimed to represent its interests. Few authorities could corroborate the truth or meaning of an argument. When Titus Oates claimed that his Popish Plot testimony was authorized by Parliament, he became an object of ridicule, not respect.⁴¹ Writers had difficulty establishing an authority which could stand as a measure of the validity of an assertion, and many claims were subject to intense scrutiny. One response to this scrutiny was to adopt a particular authorial stance, which involved constructing a narrator influenced by the rhetorical ideal of "a good man speaking well." The authority of the text thus came to depend in part on the character of the author/narrator. As sources of

³⁹ [Stephens] Loyal Observator (1683) 11.

⁴⁰Roger L'Estrange, A Further Discovery of the Plot . . . Drawn from . . . Oates (f. Henry Brome, 1680) 5.

⁴¹See L'Estrange's response to Oates's claim (Further Discovery Drawn from . . . Oates [1680] 2).

authority, these authors/narrators suffered barrages of attacks against their reputations and interrogations of their secret motivations.

Renegotiations of the value and meaning of public and private interest took the form of debates about rhetoric itself. That L'Estrange's actions were motivated by a range of interests might seem too obvious to be worthy of mention, except that this is the century famous for equivocation and the scrutiny of motives. Transparent language may have signified truth to the Royal Society, but an ideal of clarity did not preclude elaborate and sophisticated argument, nor did it discourage innuendo and obfuscation. The use of written persuasion to achieve personal ends was both admired and vilified. Scepticism about motive clashed with belief in the power of rhetoric.

Restoration audiences were accustomed to interpreting the "obliqueness and innuendo" of polemical tracts.⁴² There were several ways to controvert a tract written for such sophisticated readers, of which the most common was to impugn a writer's motives by proving that the text was written on behalf of party, impelled by private interests. Writers often advertised their allegiances, either through the subject, arguments or language of tracts, or by means of dedications, advertisements or imprints. It was often easy to determine the factional affiliation of a text, due to the dialogic characteristics of the polemical genres.

As often as they advertised their allegiances, however, tracts circulated anonymously, or did not reflect a one-dimensional political agenda. The most enduring literature of the

⁴²Steven N. Zwicker, "Representing the Revolution: Politics and High Culture in 1689," The Revolution of 1688-89: Changing Perspectives, ed. Lois G. Schwoerer (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992) 166. For a discussion of the "lies, suspicion, deceit, and treachery" that encouraged these habits see Richard Ashcraft, Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986) 9.

Restoration is famous for its complex relationship with Parliament and the House of Stuart. Dramatic and other kinds of literature, both in composition and circulation, were not free from political influence. In the process of responding to complex interrogations written by the period's most talented writers, counter-writers developed a tremendous proficiency at interpreting tracts as political commentary. The Appendix examines the connections between Restoration polemics and other English traditions of political commentary, especially drama. As McKenzie pointed out as early as 1976, periods that witnessed expanded newsbook and pamphlet trade saw also the 'decline' of drama--first with the closing of the theatres in 1642, and later with the problems faced by dramatists and companies as they struggled to reestablish themselves with the Restoration. Never would drama regain quite the direct political potency it had held up to 1642, but dramatic form and traditions influenced the political texts of the Interregnum, and again the writing of the Restoration.⁴³ The playhouse remained a profoundly political space. Restoration drama is populated by characters who scrutinize rhetoric and motive as ruthlessly as their authors do. In the best Restoration drama the interests of protagonist and author are thickly textured and as complex as the interests of any other talented writer engaged in the public sphere. When responding to these artistic texts counter-writers often flattened them, choosing one interpretation among the many possible in order to align the tract's author with one or another faction.

By 1680 the power struggles among factions within the press and the authorities they represented were fifty years old. L'Estrange's career reached its culmination in his six-year

⁴³This is not to argue that drama did not exert a political influence after the closing the of the playhouses. Its changing political functions are the subject of Martin Butler's Theatre and Crisis 1632-1642 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984).

editorship of the Observer, one of the most regular and longest-running of the early periodical publications. Here he discovers the medium most congenial to the social critic and party propagandist: short, dialogic and intertextual exchanges on the most contemporary of political and religious events. With the Observer L'Estrange moves from his multifaceted engagement with Dissent into a more 'regular' activity. The rules for engagement in the press are becoming more stable. This resulted in a certain presumptuousness among the members of the print community, an assumption about their role in the movement of political events.⁴⁴ The newsbook, which depends on regular circulation and a stable readership, could only thrive in an atmosphere of popular, if not official, sanction. The political activism of polemicists such as L'Estrange solidified the place of the press in politics, so that by the age of Walpole the newsbook and other serial publications became a major vehicle for public participation in the political process.

The control of the press then becomes as much a process of practical and professional negotiation as a policing activity. This fact helps to place L'Estrange's polemical work in line with his activities as Surveyor--the two were inextricably linked. L'Estrange's mandate as Surveyor was not simply to suppress tracts. Equally often, he worked to interpret the motives of oppositional writers from evidence in their writings. In order to determine that a tract had to be suppressed the tract in question had to be placed in some sort of political context. Often L'Estrange had to convince even his own faction that the ideas expressed by

⁴⁴L'Estrange attacked this presumption, among other places in his Observer: "Printed by JOHN DARBY . . . (says the Paper) as who should Say, . . . I am the Man; Touch me, if you dare. . . . The Impunity seems to Imply, either that the Author is in the Right, or that the Magistrate stands in Awe of him" (Observer 1.380 [25 July 1683]).

oppositional tracts were heterodox. L'Estrange's animus against any one tract might equally be motivated by his own personal or professional concerns. Since he could not (owing to the contemporary beliefs about the role of the author/narrator and evolving ideas of self interest) admit to being motivated by any impulse but one toward the public good, many of his published attacks form part of ongoing professional and personal negotiations among factions and their writers, as well as acting as published defences of the House of Stuart.

*

It is to polemicists like L'Estrange that critics refer when they argue that "the Tory faction looked back with longing to the good old days of Elizabeth and James, when gentlemen alone knew what was going on."⁴⁵ L'Estrange did claim that participation was dangerous in the political sphere. The press was the medium which could enable this participation. The press had been responsible in a large part for the Civil Wars; it could as easily overwhelm the Restoration order. Whether participation took the form of a printed personal apology, a published remonstrance, or a declaration of political principles, it contained the potential to undermine the political order.

In one sense, L'Estrange's activities as licenser were self-defeating. The system of licensing itself advertised books. In print culture the more contentious a book is reputed to be, the more value can accrue to it. In a published letter to the Surveyor, Edmund

⁴⁵Will Irwin, Propaganda and the News: Or, What Makes You Think So? (New York: McGraw, 1936) 20.

Hickeringill, an inveterate enemy, mused about L'Estrange's inability to control the value of books. Booksellers, he claimed,

perceive the people have got an opinion, (and then there's no beating it out of their heads,) and have taken such a prejudice against Books so mark'd [with an Imprimatur] in the forehead, that construing it to be a Brand of Infamy, they will scarce ask the price of them, or bid a penny:

Taking it for granted, the Author so licens'd, was some dull Phlegmatic fellow, and either wanted the wit or honesty to vouch himself.⁴⁶

Thus readers believe that books disapproved of by the licenser possess a "wit or honesty" lacking in the publications which carry the mark of governmental sanction--specifically, in this case, L'Estrange's mark. Notoriety provided writers with the attention of an audience, if not necessarily their trust. The process of press control involved responding to this notoriety.

Although the press was potentially anarchic, it possessed two invaluable properties. First of all, properly managed it was the only force strong enough to control a public already too familiar with its effects. "'Tis the Press that has made 'um mad, and the Press must set 'um Right again."⁴⁷ As importantly, these same book trades that played a pivotal role in the Civil Wars (and now gave voice to Dissenters) allowed L'Estrange to build a career for himself and to direct the actions and opinions of the London population. In response to the circulation of Shaftesbury's (or Locke's) anti-Stuart Appeal from the City to the Country

⁴⁶Edmund Hickeringill, Gregory, Father-Greybeard, With His Vizard Off . . . In Some Reflexions upon a Late Pamphlet Entitled, The Rehearsal Transpros'd . . . in a Letter to Our Old Friend, R.L. (2nd. ed., b. Robin Hood, s.b. Nathaniel Brooke, 1673) 2. See also Charles Blount, Reasons Humbly Offered for the Liberty of Unlicens'd Printing (n.p., 1693) 7-8.

⁴⁷The Observator 1.1 (13 April 1681).

L'Estrange arranged to 'overlook' the publication of an equally contentious response, a tract with a title likely to attract reprisals (or at least suspicion). He provided similar instructions to the sellers with Royalist sympathies, such as Samuel Mearn:

As the Letter to a Friend in the Country (commonly called my Lord Shaftesburys) crept in to the world last Session of Parliament and got loose by stealth, so I am to advertise you that if you take any notice of a Pamphlet entituled Animadversions to the Men of Shaftesbury, or some such title, you are to give no interruption to it. If the businesse comes to be questioned, leave me to answer for it.⁴⁸

L'Estrange here organizes a press event. He does not block the passage of the text, nor does he excoriate the book's author, or arrange for repressive damage control.⁴⁹ Instead, he encourages book trade activity, assuming that published responses are the most effective way to respond to a highly effective piece of propaganda. Further, he anticipates that these responses will generate yet more activity. Some of L'Estrange's most compelling work was written in response to such texts that had 'got loose by stealth.'⁵⁰ If we recall Hickeringill's jibe about L'Estrange's inability to control the booktrades, this note to Mearn can serve as L'Estrange's response. The 'Imprimatur' does not control the press, nor does the Surveyor. Roger L'Estrange, however, built and maintained his career and represented Court interests by operating in a sophisticated and volatile print culture.

⁴⁸Longleat, Coventry MSS 2. f. 86.

⁴⁹The neutral title of Marchamont Nedham's tract referred to here, A Pacquet of Advices and Animadversions . . . to the Men of Shaftesbury (n.p., 1676), was designed to attract a multipartisan readership.

⁵⁰These would include, for example, An Account of the Growth of Knavery (f. Henry Brome, 1678), written in response to Andrew Marvell's Account of the Growth of Popery (Amsterdam: n.p., 1677), and L'Estrange's Answer to the Appeal (f. Henry Brome, 1679), written in response to Charles Blount's Appeal from the Country to the City (n.p., 1679).

Chapter 1

L'Estrange's Early Career as Polemicist

The present chapter examines L'Estrange's booktrade activities before and immediately after the Restoration, in the context of the political negotiations that surrounded the return of Charles Stuart in May 1660. L'Estrange worked before the Restoration as the very type of oppositional writer he would oppose once he became Surveyor of the Press. The genres and publishing practices he and other polemicists employed were in part inherited from the previous three decades and adapted to the circumstances of 1659. Broad­sides, remonstrances and petitions would remain a component of public participation throughout L'Estrange's tenure as Court apologist. The development of print ephemera during the Interregnum and early Restoration granted the booktrades a prominence in the political process that would never diminish. The trades owed this prominence in part to the suitability of such ephemera to quickly-changing political circumstances. This chapter analyzes the rhetorical practices L'Estrange and other polemicists used to destabilize the Rump Parliament. If the potency of these polemics is suggested by their part in the fall of the Rump, their flexibility is demonstrated by L'Estrange's polemical attempts after the Restoration to defame the very allies he had courted only months before.

Although L'Estrange's reputation in the Restoration stemmed both from his licensing and his writing activities, the propagandist gave birth to the censor. L'Estrange associated with press and booktrade members well before being named Surveyor of the Press. The oppositional polemicist of 1659 became the censor of 1663 and the government apologist of 1679. In the first phase of his career L'Estrange exerts a strong influence on the development of political genres: publishing, lobbying, and working in concert with other members of the book trades to circulate hasty ephemeral responses to current events. In the second phase he used his new-found talents and connections in his efforts against Presbyterians such as William Prynne. If L'Estrange could recommend Prynne as "the Honour of the age" just before the Restoration,¹ within the year, he would place him with Baxter at the head of the Presbyterian menace.

Throughout L'Estrange's writing career, every time he published a political text he increased the exposure of government to public scrutiny, and encouraged debate on political issues. His pamphlets did this for the first time during the months leading to the Restoration, when they exposed the Rump to public ridicule in the press. His polemics offered less positive solutions to constitutional impasses than criticism of the status quo. He called for the violent overthrow of the established order, and proposed alliances among supporters of the Church of England, royalist sectaries, and Presbyterians--in short, he canvassed everybody but the Rump and the radical sectarians (including segments of the Army and republicans) least likely to agree to an alliance with moderate Presbyterians and monarchists. L'Estrange controverted these more extreme factions, which allowed him to avoid

¹Be Merry and Wise (n.p., 13 March 1660) in L'Estrange His Apology 81.

publicizing the ideas of more dangerous enemies, especially Presbyterians who found solutions to political impasses in various models of limited monarchy. After the Restoration L'Estrange assaulted Presbyterian writers with the same violence he had earlier displayed against republicans. He represented Presbyterians as radicals once the temporary alliances among moderates that had been necessary for the Restoration had served their purpose, and Presbyterians began to reap the benefits of support for the 'winning' cause.

The press had been vilified and exploited by factions for decades. Its contributions to recent revolutions were acknowledged by a variety of writers at the Restoration and after. The widespread belief that the press played a seminal role in the late troubles fuelled L'Estrange's search for dissenter writers upon whom to assign responsibility for the death of the king and the economic and political chaos of the Interregnum. L'Estrange concludes that Presbyterian "Libells were not only the Forerunners, but in a high Degree, the Cause of our late Troubles."² During the years of Cromwell's Protectorate it had been "scarce possible to Act without Discovery."³ The political uncertainty following the Protector's death,

²A Memento: Directed to All Those that Truly Reverence the Memory of King Charles the Martyr . . . The First Part qtd. in Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange (1913) 86. I have been unable to find this particular quotation in any tract by L'Estrange, though the sentiment and phrasing surely belongs to the Surveyor.

³L'Estrange His Apology: With A Short View of Some Late and Remarkable Transactions (f. Henry Brome, [6 June] 1660) 39. Where possible, page references to texts which appear in the Apology will correspond to the pagination of this edition. When available dates are taken from the tracts themselves before Thomason's manuscript dates, and some obvious corrections have been made. In March 1656 Hyde wrote that "We are not asleep in [the king's] . . . business; there is as much done in it as the present fears and apprehensions of our friends in England will permit" (qtd. in Bosher Restoration Settlement [1957] 92). See also Godfrey Davies, The Restoration of Charles II, 1658-1660 (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1955) 123-24. On the activities of Royalists during the Interregnum see Ronald Hutton, Charles the Second, King of England, Scotland, and Ireland (Oxford: Clarendon

however, renewed activity in the booktrades, since Cromwell's legislative attempts to control the press were buried with him in August 1658. This legislation was exhumed with him two years later, however, as the newly restored monarchy of Charles II attempted to adopt the best of the Interregnum's infrastructure while effacing its symbols. The Licensing Act of 1662 cited the effects of "the general licentiousness of the late times . . . [which] encouraged [writers] to print and sell heretical, schismatical, blasphemous, seditious and treasonable books, pamphlets and papers."⁴ Cromwell, Common Council, various government factions, and the Stuart Court alike feared the power of hostile polemicists, and especially their influence on London opinion. They also assumed that there existed a link between the press, political opinion, and political events.

Press control, which had been effective under the Protector,⁵ was replaced after his death by sporadic and defensive proclamations such as that by the Committee of Safety dated 1 December 1659, "prohibiting the contrivance or subscription of any petitions or papers for

Press, 1989) 34-132, and Lois Potter, Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989) 1-37. On Anglican activities during the same period see John Spurr, The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689 (New Haven: Yale UP, 1991) 1-28. Booth's 'rebellion' exemplifies both Royalist uncertainties and the response of Parliamentarians and the Army to the consolidation of Royalist forces. See Edward Hyde, first Earl of Clarendon, The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, 8 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1826) 7: 323, 332-35; Thomas Rugg, The Diurnall of Thomas Rugg, 1659-1661, ed. William L. Sachse (London: Royal Historical Society, 1961) 3-6; Davies Restoration (1955) 123-43; Ronald Hutton, The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985) 57-59.

⁴Qtd. in Sutherland Restoration Newspaper (1986) 2.

⁵ Siebert Freedom of the Press (1965) 230-32. Siebert follows standard practice in making a division between press legislation during "the Puritan Revolution" and that of the later Stuarts. He assumes the fissure of 1659-60 marks a profound change, but ignores the period of transition itself.

the promoting of designs dangerous to the peace of the Commonwealth."⁶ The proclamations published "by Authority" after the death of Cromwell demonstrated the power of the press in political affairs, as when the Committee of Safety attempted to maintain control of the population by assuming control of the press. The announcement was made in the most politically efficacious medium available: the very press the government wanted to control. The Committee of Safety, like the Stuart Court after it, understood that the press needed to be at once harnessed and exploited. There are many examples of official documents which respond to potentially dangerous print activities. When, for example, L'Estrange published a pamphlet in response to the "two Printed Papers" that announced the election and commanded "the City to acquiesce in expectation of [a new] . . . Parliament,"⁷ London's Common Council replied with a proclamation vindicating the Lord Mayor and others from "certain scandalous aspersions, contained in a pamphlet entitled, The Final Protest and Sense of the City."⁸ On 28 March 1660, the Council of State required Livewell Chapman, who, "having, from a wicked design to engage the nation in blood, caused several seditious and treasonable books to be published, doth now obscure and hide himself," to appear before Council.⁹ After the Restoration, too, Charles Stuart depended on the enforcement of proclamations to control the press and the spread of sedition generally, at least until the

⁶England, Committee of Safety, Proclamation (b. Henry Hills and John Field, [10 December, 1659]).

⁷The Final Protest, and Sense of the Citie [and] The Engagement (n.p., 19 December 1659) in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 44.

⁸London, Common Council, [Defence of Mayor] (n.p., [20 December, 1659]).

⁹England, Council of State, Proclamation (b. Abel Roper and Thomas Collins, [28 March, 1660]).

Printing Act of 10 June 1662 came in force. On 16 June 1660, for example, Commons requested that the king issue a proclamation calling in Milton's Defensio and his Eikonoklastes.¹⁰ This was the first of a series of proclamations issued by the restored Court for the purpose of controlling the press. Perhaps never in the seventeenth century was the connection stronger between politics and the press, and never before had the press been so active.¹¹

The role of published propaganda (as much as its content) in the months before the Restoration deserves emphasis. Communication between various official bodies in London (and abroad) and various groups of citizens depended extensively on the press.¹² Henry Hills and John Field (for the Committee of Safety), John Streater and John Macock (for Parliament), and Abel Roper and Thomas Collins (for the Council of State) printed furiously on behalf of their respective authorities.¹³ While the fog of political uncertainty shrouded

¹⁰The Complete Prose Works of John Milton, gen. ed. Don M. Wolfe, 8 vols. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1953-82) 7: 221.

¹¹Mason notes over 2,000 Wing-listed titles for 1660. 1658 saw less than 1,000, 1663 saw approximately 700. With the Popish Plot and the expiry of the Printing Act in 1679, the total jumps again in 1680, to approximately 1,800 (W.G. Mason, "The Annual Output of Wing-Listed Titles, 1649-1684," The Library 5th ser. 29 [1974] 220).

¹²The circulation of hand-written news sheets also played an important role in informing subscribers outside London, J.G. Muddiman, The King's Journalist: Studies in the Reign of Charles II (London: John Lane, 1923); Harold Love, Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993).

¹³For example, Streater and Macock together on behalf of Parliament printed at least 23 pieces between 2 January and 16 March 1660 (average 2 per week); Streater's name appears on the imprint of at least nine other tracts between 15 December 1659 and 31 January 1660 (average one tract every five days), Macock's name appears on at least 21 other tracts between 15 December 1659 and 29 May 1660 (average one every seven days). Finally, Roper and Collins published at least 10 tracts on behalf of the Council of State between 17 March and 21 April 1660 (average one every third day).

Whitehall, these printers remained surprisingly unharried for their activities. The documents they produced, which were as ephemeral as the authorities they represented, acted as the primary link between governing bodies and the Londoners upon whom these same bodies often depended for the maintenance of their position. The texts also served as official responses to political challenges made during the same period.

The press encouraged more opportunities for dialogue between social strata than any other media. If it operated to pass information down from above, it could also served to pass information and opinion upward. In April 1660 the Scottish divine Robert Baillie instructed the agent of his church in London to take advantage of the press to "draw the heart of the King" away from an alliance with "the present leaders of the Episcopal party":

If shortly and plainly their present tenets . . . were put in the text, and the proofs in the margin in their own words, . . . it might . . . allay and cool all honest Protestants towards their designs. I think . . . Dr. Reynolds, or Mr. Prynne, or sundry others might get it ready for the press.¹⁴

The same media that revealed the opinions of the political elite were acknowledged (with the pulpit) to be effective in the management of both local and national political change. Baillie wishes to direct the actions of the Court party specifically, as well as to disable "that high, proud, malicious, and now very active and dangerous party": dogmatic religious conservatives, represented at this point by the writings of Henry Hammond.¹⁵

L'Estrange began his career as Court polemicist during this period of literary frenzy. Although his earliest documents had been written with the destruction of the status quo in

¹⁴Qtd. in Bosher Restoration Settlement (1957) 122.

¹⁵For a brief overview of Hammond's career, see Spurr, Restoration Church of England (1991) 10-12.

mind, within months he would work to shore up the restored monarchy. In December and January, while the Committee of Safety struggled to hold London and Lambert faced Monck in the North, L'Estrange both addressed the City and claimed to represent its interests. He incited Londoners to armed confrontation with the vulnerable Committee and its representatives, and with the Rump at the end of the year. By April 1660 he was controverting Milton and Nedham on behalf of Royalists. But the Restoration in May did not lessen his commercial or ideological imperative to write and publish texts. The uncomfortable position enunciated by the newly-empowered Cavalier interests--that loyalty was not necessarily its own reward and that the triumph of the royalist party did not predicate the defeat of its enemies--provided the context, within weeks of the return of Charles Stuart, for L'Estrange and his bookseller to produce the relatively lengthy L'Estrange His Apology (June 1660). The text marks a transition between earlier blunt calls for revolution and the longer expositions L'Estrange produced during the first few years of the Restoration. Especially in the early days of the Cavalier Parliament, the new monarchy demanded written defences built on less essential oppositions than the ideological ones of upper class-lower class, Royalist-Puritan, Anglican-Presbyterian.¹⁶ The year after the Restoration saw L'Estrange well established, ideologically if not professionally. For polemicists who claimed that the licentious press caused the civil wars and provoked anarchy

¹⁶This was not so clearly the case when the Royalists were in opposition. Sharon Achinstein suggests that, during the Interregnum, 'Royalist' could be equated with "conservative", and this equation could be opposed to "oppositional" writers ("The Politics of Babel in the English Revolution," Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution, ed. James Holstun [London: Frank Cass, 1992] 18, 38). Upper- and lower-class distinctions are implied by Holstun in his introduction (1-2), and by Lennard Davis in Factual Fictions: The Origins of the English Novel (New York: Columbia UP, 1983) 77.

in their wake.¹⁷ a religious settlement which avoided the snares of the past could only be achieved if the press were properly managed. This management was two-pronged. It meant censorship, but as importantly, control of the press demanded a strong and well-organized writing and distribution network for Royalist propaganda. Published debates in the early Restoration seldom read simply as clear statements of political principles. Examined in context, however, they do demonstrate the emerging role of the book trades in the political sphere. L'Estrange adapted his view of Interregnum press history to Restoration circumstances, and orchestrated the distribution of these opinions with all the skills he developed as an oppositional writer.

L'Estrange would later present himself as having been a passionate defender of the beleaguered House of Stuart, and he was certainly an ardent Royalist. But an examination of the tracts he actually wrote during the later part of the Interregnum shows that he did not, at that time, make the claim consistently. Although he recommends monarchy as the original form of government as early as the end of January 1660,¹⁸ he closely associates Presbyterianism and monarchy as late as the end of March,¹⁹ when he also explicitly recommends the security of a "social Compact" against potential political exorbitancies in a

¹⁷L'Estrange's later work would continue to implicate the "presses and Pulpits" in the Civil Wars. See, for example, A Seasonable Memorial (f. Henry Brome, 1680) 17; L'Estrange His Appeal (f. Henry Brome, 1681) 24.

¹⁸"A Plain Case" [24 January 1660] in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 55-56. This text appears neither in Thomason nor in Wing. The dating is from L'Estrange His Apology. An internal reference to the Assessment Act of 26 January 1660 (LT E1074[27]) suggests that L'Estrange predated his tract by at least two days.

¹⁹The Fanatique Powder Plot (n.p., 24 March 1660) in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 98-99.

debate between the merits of absolute and limited monarchy.²⁰ On the other hand, his writing did not support the centralist and even less the republican experiments of the previous two years. His earliest texts of this period neither strongly anticipate the Cavalier position he would enunciate within six months nor exhibit the extreme deference to absolute monarchy that would form the theoretical base of his later conservative arguments during the Exclusion Crisis. It is revealingly difficult to extract any coherent political theory from these tracts. They are hurried productions, most of which respond within a few days to contemporary events or other texts. What can be clearly seen, especially in the various productions of March and April, is a sustained effort to accelerate, or at least to maintain, the state of political urgency precipitated by the failure of the Rump and the potential created by its dissolution on 16 March. The texts produced by Royalists in these months attempt, by contrasting Presbyterians with other factions, to reduce the likelihood of an alliance between moderate and more radical groups. The most insistent Royalist writers (in this L'Estrange is typical) suggest a dichotomy: eloquent or influential republican writers (Milton, Harrington, Nedham) are represented as radical extremists, and Royalists (William Prynne, for example, or L'Estrange himself) are represented as moderate. Thus L'Estrange accuses Milton of "Tampering to delude the People, and to withdraw them from a Peaceable, and Rational expectancy of good, into a mutinous, and hopeless attempt of mischief."²¹ Presbyterians are

²⁰D.N. [L'Estrange], Sir Politique Uncased. Or. A Sober Answer to a Juggling Pamphlet Entituled A Letter Intercepted (n.p., 27 March 1660) in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 104.

²¹No Blinde Guides (f. Henry Brome, 20 April 1660) 3.

then offered the choice of supporting "a mutinous, and hopeless attempt" or "a Peaceable, and Rational expectancy."

L'Estrange's engagement with ephemera stems from their prominence in political affairs. While not all genres are political tools, the ascendance of certain genres and publishing practices suggests that the press is being used for specifically political ends. For example, in the late Interregnum two public political genres were widely produced and distributed: proclamations and petitions. Government governed, in part, on the strength of proclamations. Published by the House of Commons and by other political bodies, proclamations attempted to enforce the wide acquiescence necessary to maintain control of a volatile City. Petitions, on the other hand, are the instrument of the governed. Municipal, county, and other groups tried to influence the government directly by means of texts, especially of circulated and published petitions. In mid-November 1659 a group of London youths petitioned for a free Parliament in what was to become one of the signal events in the study of this period. On 1 December the Committee of Safety responded with a proclamation, forbidding the presentation of the apprentices' petition to Common Council.²² Within two weeks four calls for a new parliament were issued: two by a group of City youths and apprentices (5 and 13 December) and one each by the "citizens of London" (6 December) and by the irrepressible Prynne on behalf of the "sea-men and Water-men about London" (12 December). When this textual skirmish precipitated a riot in which several were killed, partisans from both sides immediately responded with published bids for popular

²²Thomason dates the apprentices' petition 15 November 1659. On the events of early December and their aftermath see Clarendon *History* (1826) 7: 388-89; Davies *Restoration* (1955) 181-82; Hutton *Restoration* (1985) 78-80; Harris *London Crowds* (1987) 42-43.

support in the press. L'Estrange's first contribution in the aftermath of the riot was The Engagement and Remonstrance of the City of London. Published, he admits, "After 5 or 6 Dayes expectation what this Affront would produce," it did not lead to the dissolution of the Committee of Safety or plans for a free election.²³ The effectiveness of petitions and remonstrances lay in their potency as both text and act. As published documents, both petitions and remonstrances have a specific and unmistakable purpose which is laid out in the text itself. Petitions possess added weight: they represent "a deliberate attempt to use the weight of popular opinion to influence national politics."²⁴ The authority of the printed component (the engagement or remonstrance itself) complements the active political engagement symbolized by the act of signing the petition. In 1680, once L'Estrange had come to oppose petitions for a new parliament, he was to admit that few documents were so dangerous or so potent:

The very Stile of them is Menacing; and certainly nothing can be more Evident then their evil Intention. There's Malice in the Publication of them too; beside that by the Number of Subscriptions, they take an Estimate of the strength of their Party; which is their safest way of Muster.²⁵

The words on the petition itself reveal its intention. Further, the actual publication of petitions exacerbates their "Malice" by encouraging the public to subscribe. Petitions encourage and influence the expression of public opinion. In the first two months of 1660,

²³L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 42.

²⁴Mark Knights, Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994) 227.

²⁵A Seasonable Memorial (1680) 21. See also Observer 1.1 (13 April 1681).

while Monck was "too wise, to walk too Open,"²⁶ London and the counties saw published over 30 petitions, remonstrances, addresses, and open letters, all purporting to represent collective interests, most of which called for an elected parliament, which course Monck and the readmitted members of the Rump eventually chose in March.

Along with proclamations, remonstrances and engagements, other short, often single-sheet productions that were political in focus achieved prominence at this time. These tracts were written to respond within a very short number of days to a variety of changing events. Since political events enjoyed only brief currency, writers who wished to exploit them for party and personal ends needed be aware of issues, to divine what could be represented as decisive, to respond immediately and with bombast, and to ensure that their opinions were circulated widely and efficiently. The apprentice riot and siege of December, the debate over Monck's allegiance (which spanned several months), as well as the March and April controversy over the printed version of an inflammatory Royalist sermon preached and published by Matthew Griffith, were all events whose significance was influenced by the immediate and furious debate they engendered. L'Estrange himself claims to have responded immediately both to Lambert's withdrawal from London (6 August 1659) and (in two texts) to the Somerset mutiny of 2 February 1660.²⁷ The Engagement and The Final Protest and Sense of the Citie (19 December) both respond to the December attack on the City apprentices by the Army.

²⁶L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 72.

²⁷Since none of these texts appear in L'Estrange His Apology nor in Thomason or Wing, we can only take L'Estrange at his word.

This genre, early newswriting, demands that writers appear to respond speedily to events. In fact, in the race to influence readers' interpretations texts were sometimes predated. L'Estrange probably predated at least two of the tracts when he reprinted them in his Apology. "A Plain Case" was predated at least two days, in order to suggest that he was quick to appreciate the impact of Monck's letter to the speaker of the House of Commons (23 January 1660).²⁸ The Resolve of the Citie, according to L'Estrange, responds both to the news of Portsmouth and to the Agrement of the General Council of Officers [sic], although only the latter event is mentioned specifically in the text. It is likely that had L'Estrange heard of the unsuccessful siege he would have mentioned it in this piece.²⁹ L'Estrange is republishing these tracts to recommend himself as propagandist. It is thus in his interest to demonstrate a strong sense for the direction of political winds. Monck's progress toward London and the events at Portsmouth were already being hailed as signal events leading up to the Restoration, and L'Estrange, too, now claims to have been aware of their impact from an early date.

L'Estrange's new interpretation of his pre-Restoration writings occurs in part because he is recontextualizing them. Different circumstances demanded different genres. With his eye on the opportunities for advancement that came with the Restoration, L'Estrange

²⁸This tract appears to have originally been written in response to the Act passed 26 January 1660, "for an Assessment of one hundred thousand Pounds by the moneth upon England, Scotland and Ireland." L'Estrange mentions the tax (56) then wonders what would happen if "the City should refuse the Tax" (57). In L'Estrange His Apology the tract is dated 24 January, two days before the Act was dated.

²⁹News of the unsuccessful siege had reached London by 20 December (Hutton Restoration [1985] 81). Events are described in N.L., A Letter Sent from Portsmouth (n.p., 20 December 1659).

collected most of his early propaganda in L'Estrange His Apology: With a Short View of Some Late and Remarkable Transactions. These seventeen short pieces, almost all of which were published between December 1659 and mid-April 1660, represent an impressive range of informed, passionate, and literate responses to the activities of the Rump of 1659. In the month preceding the actual return of Charles Stuart, L'Estrange added to his growing oeuvre three longer works, Sir Politique Uncased, Treason Arraigned, and No Blinde Guides.

By May 1660, then, L'Estrange displayed an easy confidence writing within political genres. This confidence stemmed in part from the ubiquity of political ephemera. Whether published by republican or Royalist propagandists, political tracts shared rhetoric and vocabulary. In December 1659 writers as ideologically opposed as the republican Henry Neville and the Presbyterian William Prynne could share a common vocabulary in describing the current impasse. Many Presbyterians joined Church of England Royalists to advocate the active and violent overthrow of the established order. This "Libertarian and populist" rhetoric had several functions. It clearly articulates the desire for constitutional and ecclesiastical settlements, and it engaged the widest possible range of opinion by appealing to private interests.³⁰ Some beg the attention of London's Common Council, invoked as the only legitimate authority remaining in London. It is addressed by the City apprentices (15 November), who vowed to "assert with our Lives and Fortunes the Laws of this Land and the Liberty of the Subject," and warned Common Council of their intent with scattered upper-case type throughout the text: "LAWS," "FORCE," "LIBERTY" and "SUBJECT."

³⁰Harris London Crowds (1987) 45. On Neville and Prynne see Nicholas von Maltzahn, "Henry Neville and the Art of the Possible: a Republican Letter Sent to General Monck," Seventeenth Century 7(1992) 46.

Prynne's petition on behalf of water-men, resplendent with the rhetoric of liberty and the ancient constitution, forms part of a litany he repeated, it seems on demand, on behalf of any group supporting the readmission of the secluded members:

notorious subversions of our Fundamental Laws, Liberties, Properties, Government, and Parliaments, by the treachery [and] armed violence of ambitious, treacherous Mercenaries [which leads to] dominion over our Lives, Persons, Estates, and Privileges.³¹

"C.D" informs the Council it can either force a new Parliament or "face the fury of the People." Such language emphasized the tactical advantage of the pamphlet in circulation rather than the context of current events in the political process of the past 40 years. After the Restoration many writers, including L'Estrange in his Apology and other texts, promptly reshaped their roles and reinterpret their writing as they attempted to align themselves with a system where proposals for settlement were predicated on a hierarchical system of government. But for the short while that the Committee of Safety clung tenuously to power, L'Estrange recognized its weakness and exploited the "Exigency of Affairs" to counsel rebellion on behalf of "Established Laws" he never explicitly formulated. L'Estrange's combination of inflammatory rhetoric with the vocabulary of the ancient constitution proves to be a liability after the Restoration, when he quickly abandons the republican "citizen." The language of the ancient constitution and fundamental or natural law was more enduring.

³¹See also, for example, his Six Important Quaeres, Propounded to the Re-sitting Rump of the Long Parliament (n.p., [30 December 1659]). Prynne, in fact, was in the midst of a "furious literary campaign" for the readmission of the secluded members of Parliament, of which he was one (Hutton The Restoration [1985] 88). On Prynne's activities at the close of the Interregnum see C.C. Weston and Jarelle Renfrow Greenberg, Subjects and Sovereigns: The Grand Controversy Over Legal Sovereignty in Stuart England (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981) 124-48, and William Lamont, Marginal Prynne, 1600-1669 (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1963) 191-96.

In his later career, he came to graft this language onto an absolutist model of government. In the turmoil of transition, however, he calls in a Machiavellian way for "Citizen[s]" to arm themselves in defence of their rights: Londoners have "onely this Choice left us, whether we will Adventure to destroy You to Day, or be sure to be destroyed our Selves to Morrow."³² Government according to the "Law . . . of the Sword" must be answered by open refusal to be co-opted, coupled with a threat of physical violence: "We do therefore declare to the World, that we will by Violence oppose all Violence whatsoever, which is not warranted by the Letter of the Established Law."³³ The law he proposes is defined almost exclusively in opposition to contemporary proclamations from Whitehall: no equivocation, few positive solutions, and a sustained attempt to destabilize the Army's precarious position with republican rhetoric. L'Estrange claims the "Priviledge of a Citizen" to object on behalf of Londoners as "Englishmen, and as Citizens" to the rule of the Committee of Safety. The Committee believes, he claims, that "A Citizens Skull is but a thing to try the Temper of a Souldiers Sword upon."³⁴

The negative rhetorical strategy L'Estrange employs is one that would retain its efficacy against all enemies but the trimmers or moderates of the 1680s. Few positive

³²"The Declaration of the City, to the Men at Westminster" (May 1660) in L'Estrange His Apology 40-41. This text appears neither in Wing nor in Thomason. The dating is from L'Estrange His Apology. On the citizen as soldier see J.G.A. Pocock, The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition, (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975) 124, 199-201.

³³"The Declaration" in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 40; Final Protest in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 46.

³⁴"The Declaration" in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 41; Final Protest in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 44; The Resolve of the Citie (n.p., 23 December 1659) in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 48.

solutions to the political impasse are posited; instead, texts attempt to influence events by means of transparent threats and inflammatory rhetoric. L'Estrange catalogued the shortcomings of the opposition without recommending any but the most general alternatives, thus protecting himself against similar negative attacks. The uncertainty of the Court's position, moreover, both in the months preceding and in those immediately following the Restoration, also accounts for contemporary reluctance openly to recommend an immediate re-establishment of monarchy. Considering the relatively recent collapse of the monarchical system and its demystification in historical explanations of revolution such as Harrington's,³⁵ Court apologists certainly could not argue their constitutional position using only the language of absolute monarchy. While mounting political tension encouraged more audacious and open proposals for settlement, it also discouraged polemicists from too closely or personally associating themselves with any platform. "A Plain Case" is typical of the responses to political events which were written in that month of anticipation. L'Estrange limits his justification of monarchy to one brief (though graphic) appeal to patriarchal theory.³⁶ Although his allegiance to monarchy is announced in the tract's opening

³⁵Harringtonians suggested that behind the uncertainty over the restored monarchy's ability to achieve and maintain stability lay "a fundamental shift in the balance of land ownership away from the nobility, and towards a new gentry of independent freeholders." No longer "could the monarchy be supported by the might of its natural allies" (Seaward [Cavalier Parliament [1988] 40). See also J. G. A. Pocock, The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987) Chapter VI; Ashcraft Revolutionary Politics (1986) 222-23.

³⁶Although L'Estrange later draws on Filmer, the extent of his early engagement with him is unclear. He appears not to mention Filmer by name. On Filmer and Royalist monarchical theory see J.W. Daly, Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1979) Chapter 6 and Appendix A. Ashcraft maintains that Daly understates Filmer's influence on Royalist theory (Revolutionary Politics [1987] 187n.),

movement--"the Almighty Wisdom placed ONE RULER over the World"--the anonymity of the piece admits simultaneously to the uncertainty of any one constitutional agreement being chosen over others.³⁷ Yet L'Estrange confidently assumes the broad appeal both of patriarchal precedent and of a time when government was unadulterated by the "Force, Craft, or Agreement afterward produced," adding that he need not contribute further polemic to a "Presse [which] groans under the Subject."³⁸ Uncertain circumstances encouraged nostalgia, but discouraged polemicists from defining too narrowly their preferred form of government.

Negative rhetoric emphasizes simple oppositions. In L'Estrange's early usage, the antithesis is between 'radicals' (including the Rump) and 'moderates'. Within two years, L'Estrange billed Presbyterians as the 'radicals'. Later in his career, he essentialized the divergences among Whig and Tory platforms, and (less successfully) between Tories and Trimmers--especially in ephemeral dialogues, which encouraged such antitheses. In 1659, however, L'Estrange built his oppositions with the help of a category and vocabulary that was guaranteed to be widely popular: the ancient constitution. Most readers in late-seventeenth-century London would not deny the importance of fundamental laws any more

while Sommerville suggests that establishing the direct influence of Patriarcha is "of relatively minor historical interest, since the political doctrines expressed in it were mostly unoriginal" ("Absolutism and Royalism," The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700, eds. J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie [Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991] 358).

³⁷A large majority of Royalist and anti-Rump texts were published anonymously during this period, but from January 1660 on, booksellers and others working in the book trade--individuals such as Thomas Bassett and Edward Thomas--grew less shy of acknowledging their work.

³⁸"A Plain Case" in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 55.

than those writing in the months before the Restoration could offer a widely acceptable account of the laws' origins and substance. To encourage a broad alliance, L'Estrange invokes variously the "Law of the Land," the "benefit of Law," the "known Laws of the Place, and Nation," the "Letter of the Established Law," and the "Reason of the Antient Laws" but seldom offers to delimit or define their substance.³⁹ The political resonance of the words themselves, "the Sound of the Words, not . . . the Meaning of them," supplies their rhetorical efficacy.⁴⁰ Just as he knew to appeal to nostalgia for patriarchal precedent and lost order, L'Estrange correctly gauges the broad appeal of an extended invocation of "establish'd Laws." He invokes these laws, not to offer an explanation of them, but to make a claim against the Rump. He argues (in an argument most often used by Prynne) that the illegality of the Rump stems precisely from its lack of precedent in English legal history.⁴¹

Polemicists writing on behalf of these groups share only their enmity for the Rump and an understanding that the basis of a constitutional settlement could be expressed in terms of the ancient constitution: an assumption exploited by Royalists and parliamentarians alike.

L'Estrange, then, uses this negative rhetorical strategy to hedge his constitutional bets. He acknowledges political uncertainty by keeping well clear of royalist apologetics. After all, if constitutional negotiations were to yield a monarch who was strongly bound by

³⁹"The Declaration" in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 40; The Engagement and Remonstrance of the City of London (n.p., 12 December 1659) in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 43, 44; Final Protest in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 46; Resolve in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 49.

⁴⁰Citt and Bumpkin . . . The Second Part (f. Henry Brome, 1680) 2.

⁴¹Prynne called for a free parliament as early as November 1658 (Lamont Marginal Prynne [1963] 191). On Prynne's attack on the Rump see Lamont 190-96.

Presbyterian ecclesiastical restraints, L'Estrange's early career would have been ill spent arguing a Filmerian basis for monarchy. Negative rhetoric did more than help him avoid having to argue on behalf of any one cause, however. By targeting the illegality or immorality of the Rump, L'Estrange's texts allowed ideologically opposed groups to band together for the present in order to achieve a specific end.

L'Estrange located the desire to "restore the fundamental law"⁴² in the social and financial interests of the groups whose support he solicited.⁴³ He defined the public good as a convergence of private interests, employing a trope that would later become the refrain of the anti-monarchist: "Tradesmen are ready to Perish for want of Businesse; and their Families for want of Bread."⁴⁴ Private interests became 'common' or 'public' when they could be defined as "legitimate and social, rather than private or purely selfish."⁴⁵ L'Estrange coupled the existence of the Rump with widespread fears of a standing army, suggesting that the latter benefited the former. The Rump appropriated revenue left from lands still in private hands. Not content with ravaging the gentry, they "Turn[ed] those Troops to Free-quarter, whose Pay . . . [was] already in their own Pockets," thus

⁴²Pocock Ancient Constitution (1987) 49.

⁴³Harris contends that to "win popular support, royalist and anglican propaganda made a deliberate appeal to economic grievances" (London Crowds [1987] 57).

⁴⁴"The Declaration" in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 40-41. This appeal to economic forces was unusual for L'Estrange. There existed "a strong tendency" in Royalist writings "to emphasize the negative features of commerce" (Ashcraft Revolutionary Politics [1987] 231). See also the Engagement and Remonstrance in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 43; Final Protest in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 46. He abandons trade issues after the Restoration as part of his movement away from admitting the importance of private interests.

⁴⁵The distinction between social and selfish private interest is suggested by Gunn in his discussion of appeals to property rights (Politics and the Public Interest [1969] 33).

impoverishing both the soldier and the citizen responsible for supporting him.⁴⁶ He compared the Rump to the wolf: both hunt in packs but have no personal loyalty, and "live by Blood and Rapine." Since both thrive by preying on those already weakened through sickness, adversity, or want, since both attack the group by culling the individual, and since every individual is potentially vulnerable to attack, "'tis the Publique Interest to Hunt them."⁴⁷ The Rump offered a target for the citizen who distrusted the army, the one who railed against the uncertainty of 1659 and wished for a return to simpler times, and the merchant who felt economically disadvantaged by government waste and greed.

Loose coalitions that focussed on the illegality of the Rump permitted many writers, politicians, and moderate army officers to strive for new elections. Monck found that "the people did generally wish for the king But then there must be strict conditions to which he must be bound, which it should not be in his majesty's power to break."⁴⁸ Only the most extreme Commonwealthsmen still believed in the "complete sovereignty of the

⁴⁶"A Plain Case" in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 57. I have not found this particular complaint against the Army and the Rump in other documents. For similar arguments, however, see Lois Schwoerer, "No Standing Armies!" The Antiarmy Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1974) 55-64.

⁴⁷"A Plain Case" in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 56.

⁴⁸Clarendon History [1826] 7: 439. Clarendon suggests that "the heads and governours of the moderate presbyterian party" argued for the restoration both of king and church. "[T]he question seemed only to be, upon what terms they should admit him: some proposing more-moderate, others more severe conditions" (7: 440). On proposals for limited monarchy see von Maltzahn "Republication in the Restoration: Some Trimming Pleas for Limited Monarchy, 1660/1680," The Huntington Library Quarterly 56(1993) 283-84 and passim. Harris contends that support for the king "was conditional upon his ability to solve specific economic, constitutional and religious grievances" (London Crowds [1987] 61).

Commons."⁴⁹ If moderates all agreed on the basic issue, recommendations still ranged from a completely free House of Commons to one bound by restrictions against Catholics and the families of Royalists, and which retained the seats of existing members. Monarchists and Commonwealthsmen alike might propose a broad religious toleration, and were abetted by the relative inactivity of many of the radicals themselves during the early months of 1660.⁵⁰ On behalf of the army, Monck demanded similar religious toleration, along with indemnity and arrears, but for polemicists such as L'Estrange the army recalled the most arbitrary case of sectarian rule. The possibility of a standing army raised the spectre of a parliament controlled by, not controlling, the movement and composition of a decisive, dangerous and expensive political weapon, now under the control of Monck.⁵¹ The monarchists, in fact, including Charles Stuart himself, promised to disband the army, to abolish most forms of taxation, and to convene a free parliament and its successors according to the terms of the Triennial Act of 1641.⁵² The "Presbyterian Knot" called for monarchy strictly bounded both by Parliament and by advisers.⁵³

L'Estrange later denigrated the formation of temporary alliances which he found so important in the early period of the Restoration. Factions, he would argue, unite only for a

⁴⁹Hutton Restoration (1985) 104.

⁵⁰Hutton Restoration (1985) 89.

⁵¹Parliament feared that "an army that had marched so far barely upon his [i.e. Monck's] word, would be as ready to march to any place, and for any purpose, he would conduct them" (Clarendon History [1826] 7: 395).

⁵²Hutton Restoration (1985) 107-108.

⁵³Hutton Restoration (1985) 105.

short period of time and in order to achieve a particular end. They maintain "Unity in Opposition, and in nothing Else."⁵⁴ As demonstrated once again in the "Late Times," the "Divided Reformers" subordinated their "Private Profession to a Publick" cause, "so long as the Common Enemy was upon his Legs"; once that common "Interest" was "subdu'd," each reformer then consulted his "Particular," and "every man did Concienciously labour for the Establishment of his own way."⁵⁵ But in the early months of 1660, his efforts aimed to achieve a moderate constitutional settlement which would at the same time pave his way to a career at Court. L'Estrange wrote, therefore, to build at once the broadest and most ephemeral alliances. He knew petitions and the function of the press. He trained for his role as Surveyor of the Press by helping develop the very medium he would later work to suppress.

Along with appeals to the ancient constitution, a common strategy used to establish broad support involved exaggerating radical sectarian positions, and building 'moderate' proposals in opposition to them. No matter what their politics, writers could promise religious stability and renewed economic prosperity as a natural result of political equilibrium: "Do not all good people desire peace and settlement in this turmoiled Church, and shipwrackt State?" asked the author of Englands Faiths Defender Vindicated.⁵⁶ In March, Hyde's representative, Dr. George Morley, arrived in England "to steer [moderate

⁵⁴Citt and Bumpkin (f. Henry Brome, 10 February, 1680) 29.

⁵⁵Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 13.

⁵⁶Englands Faiths Defender Vindicated (f. Charles King, 15 March 1660) 7.

Presbyterians] toward acceptance of the Church of England."⁵⁷ On the other hand, Royalist polemicists, in attempts to represent their own proposals as the most firmly based in "sobriety and moderation," mined both extreme republican and less radical tracts. They exploited issues such as lingering resentment over the regicide, the disestablishment of the church, and sequestration. Once the most intimidating or incongruous of Milton's or Nedham's proposals were represented as the only alternative, polemicists could convincingly build a model of the ideal, moderate political system based in monarchy. On the eve of the Restoration polemicists linked the Rump parliamentarians to "republicans" like Milton and Nedham in a genealogy extending back to the most violent sectaries of the 1640s. In opposition, Charles Stuart could easily be represented as the most pious and conciliatory of monarchs. As a cordial to the "pretence" of self-seeking "Independents, Anabaptists, Phanatiques, & c." the author of The Loyal Subjects Teares recommends Charles Stuart, "so patient, so gracious, so merciful, so just, so pious a Prince."⁵⁸ The Rump is "the hinder part of the many-headed Beast," the metaphorical and literal result of decades of confusion, "Tyranny and Rebellion ending in a Stink."⁵⁹ L'Estrange anatomizes it as "an Ambitious, and Schismaticall Faction" controlled by "the Insipid Vote of a Legislative Conventicle."⁶⁰ A dichotomy between moderation and fanaticism encouraged moderates to associate with

⁵⁷Spurr Restoration Church of England (1991) 31.

⁵⁸The Loyal Subjects Teares, for the Sufferings and Absence of Their Sovereign, Charles II (f. Charles King, 21 March 1660) 5-6.

⁵⁹The Character of the Rump (n.p., 17 March 1660) 1.

⁶⁰Be Merry and Wise in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 80; A Word in Season, to General Monk, to the City, and to the Nation (n.p., 18 February 1660) in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 74.

monarchists, lest the schism represented as the alternative plunge the country back into confusion. When Milton recommended a perpetual senate in February, the glee with which his critics attacked him is only partially attributable to the obvious contradiction between this proposal and his earlier republican work. The more extreme the republicans seemed, the more their isolation recommended a moderate alternative. To this end, L'Estrange marginalized radical writers: "Say, ___MILTON; NEDHAM; either, or both, of you (or whosoever else) ___ Say where this Worthy Person [i.e. Monck], ever mixt with you?"⁶¹ The confidence with which conservative arguments are advanced by the date of No Blinde Guides (20 April) shows how the imminent return of monarchy gave confidence to Royalists of various stripes, and provided a comprehensible vocabulary of concepts to reading audiences.

L'Estrange culls quotations from Milton's text to simplify and to emphasize the most familiar opposition between republican and Royalist theories of government. The basic contention of the republicans, that "all power derived originally from the people and could be resumed by the people"⁶² provides the fulcrum for appeals to fundamental law and traditional authority. The authority of the Rump dissolves in view of its arbitrary origins, and its refusal of "Tryal by the Establish'd Law of the Land."⁶³ Participatory experiments provoke

⁶¹Plain English to . . . Monck (n.p., 4 April 1660) in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 118.

⁶²Blair Worden, "Classical Republicanism and the Puritan Revolution," History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper eds. Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl, and Blair Worden (London: Duckworth, 1981) 193. On republicanism in this period see also Worden's "English Republicanism," The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700, eds. J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991).

⁶³No Blinde Guides (1660) 10.

political instability; the "People" feel "free at any time . . . to Assemble, and Tumult, under the colour of a new Choyce."⁶⁴ Milton's political association with the newly-fallen Rump only sharpens the reaction to his call for a perpetual council: "I could only wish," mocks L'Estrange, that Monck "had been a little civiller to Mr. Milton; for, just as he had finished his Modell of a Common-Wealth . . . In come the Secluded Members, and spoyle his Project."⁶⁵

By reading tracts such as Milton's out of their original contexts--and by choosing tracts that were the most provocative--L'Estrange could emphasize the shared concerns of moderate sectaries and Royalists, and range them against more extreme sectarian positions. Although the Restoration of Charles Stuart was not assured even as late as April 1660, panegyrics to the Stuarts anticipated the benefits available from a restored Court. The power of the careful Monck and his army had forced the dissolution of the Rump. There "remained . . . within the king's own breast some faint hope (and God knows it was very faint) that Mon[c]k's march into England might yet provide some alteration," and Royalists recognized at least the real possibility of the rightful monarch's return.⁶⁶ It was unsurprising, then, that texts of this period are marked by a focus on the personal, individual benefits of the mercy and tolerance promised in a restored Court. Supporters of the restoration of Charles Stuart also admit the need for a parliamentary body of some sort in any constitutional settlement; later events would prove this consideration hypothetical for some Royalists. From being

⁶⁴No Blinde Guides (1660) 11.

⁶⁵Be Merry and Wise in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 86.

⁶⁶Clarendon History (1826) 7: 395, 393.

active advocates of political change, then, Royalists turn to assume the defence of the present political order, concentrating on the benefits of a monarch ensconced firmly at the head of whichever parliament achieved prominence. In contrast, Republicans and hard-core parliamentarians found themselves increasingly isolated from the centres of influence.

Milton's reputation and inflexibility induced L'Estrange to single him out for special regard before the Restoration. The poet's brand of republicanism is represented as the only alternative to the order of a renewed monarchism. The timing of L'Estrange's attack on Milton's anti-monarchism is significant. If political alternatives had been many in the winter, by the spring of 1660 "most Londoners did want the return of Charles II."⁶⁷ In this atmosphere, already prey to Royalist attacks for his untimely suggestion for a "Grand or General Council,"⁶⁸ Milton published his Brief Notes Upon a Late Sermon. The sermon in question (based on Proverbs 24:21--"My son, fear God and the King, and meddle not with them that be seditious, or desirous of change") was preached by Matthew Griffith on 25 March and later published.⁶⁹ Milton's Brief Notes on this sermon provided L'Estrange with an opportunity to court moderate Presbyterians under the cover of a personal denunciation of

⁶⁷Harris London Crowds (1987) 37. The range of speculation on the mood in London during the period is represented by Worden "Beginnings" (n.d.) 165-66 and Austin Woolrych, "Dating Milton's History of Britain," The Historical Journal 36(1993) 937.

⁶⁸The Readie and Easie Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth, 1st ed., The Complete Prose Works of John Milton, ed. Robert W. Ayers (New Haven: Yale UP, 1953-1982 [1980]) 7: 369.

⁶⁹The open Royalism of the tract, coupled with its audacious dedication to Monck in the printed version, landed its author in Newgate and provided the immediate context for Milton's Brief Notes. On the debate between Griffith and Milton see Woolrych Works of John Milton (1980) 201-4 and Robert W. Ayer's annotation of Brief Notes in Works (1980) 464-86.

Milton's several recent republican contributions to constitutional debates. The vulnerability of Milton's politics in the months preceding the Restoration has been well documented. Scholars assume that the "contradictions" between the two editions of The Readie and Easie Way were caused by Milton's awareness of "the maelstrom of contemporary politics" and his overriding desire "to preserve certain religious and civil liberties from every danger."⁷⁰ Since he maintained an ideal of religious and civil liberties above all practical necessity, his work belongs to a different genre than that of Nedham or L'Estrange, whose journalistic proficiency demanded more ideological flexibility.

The rigorous authenticity that renders Milton's work of enduring interest was devalued by contemporary polemicists such as L'Estrange. In fact, No Blinde Guides permitted L'Estrange to move from his earlier general attacks on the Rump as the epitome of private interest and his mollification of moderate Presbyterians, to engage a potent and inflexible enemy.⁷¹ He ridicules Milton's political theory, claiming that it suffers from theoretical contradictions and that it has proven unsustainable in practice. L'Estrange's attack on No Blinde Guides focusses on Milton's rhetoric.⁷² It singles out Eikonoklastes, Milton's response to Charles I's supposed memoirs. Not only does Eikonoklastes position

⁷⁰Barbara K. Lewalski, "Milton: Political Beliefs and Polemical Methods, 1659-60," PMLA 74[1959] 192; Woolrych's contribution to Volume 7 of the Complete Prose Works, especially Chapter 10, provides the immediate context for the production of Brief Notes Upon a Late Sermon. See also Stanley Stewart, "Milton Revises The Readie and Easie Way," Milton Studies 20(1984) 205-224.

⁷¹This skirmish is a source of such embarrassment to Kitchin that he pleads "It is some amends that L'Estrange's name appears in the list of subscribers to the 1680 [sic] edition of Paradise Lost" (Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange [1913] 63).

⁷²Milton's rhetoric was also vilified in The Censure of the Rota (b. Paul Giddy, [30 March] 1660) 8, 13.

Milton squarely amidst the most radical of the republicans, but also the very eloquence of the text renders it suspect. If "a conform Irreverence of Language" matches the "Bold Design" of Eikonoklastes, suggests L'Estrange, can Brief Notes be less seditious?⁷³ The answer is provided by the ignominy Milton suffers in L'Estrange's latest barrage: Milton lost his sight "with staring too long, and too sawcily upon the Portraiture of [God's] . . . Viceregent, to breake the Image."⁷⁴ Brief Notes is handicapped by its idealism, and the most eloquent spokesperson for republican virtue now lives in philosophical and political isolation.

L'Estrange begins his attack by recalling the substance of Eikonoklastes, Milton's most personal incursion on the House of Stuart. Milton invaded

the Prerogative of God himself: (Omniscience) and by Deductions most Unchristian, and Illogical, aspers[ed] . . . his Last Pieties (the almost certain Inspirations of the Holy Spirit) with Juggles, and Prevarication.⁷⁵

Why discredit Milton when he was unlikely to propose a viable present political alternative? This reminder of political duplicity is intended not only for Milton, but for more moderate or flexible dissenters. Presbyterians feared reprisals for their earlier revolutionary activities at the hands of the restored son of Charles I. These fears were exploited by all manner of polemicists. Anti-monarchists of the stamp of Milton and Nedham dared Presbyterians to imagine the thoughts of a man whose father was murdered and whose property and power were ruthlessly torn from him. "[C]anst fancy," asks Nedham, "that our Master can forget he had a Father, how he liv'd and died, how he lost both Crown and life, and who the cause

⁷³No Blinde Guides (1660) 2.

⁷⁴No Blinde Guides (1660) 8.

⁷⁵No Blinde Guides (1660) 2.

thereof?"⁷⁶ Royalists at once strove to reassure and to remind these same groups that the wronged son of Charles I is meek but not forgetful. Active support of the monarchy in the new parliament, along with a promise of loyalty and moderation on the part of Presbyterians, argue moderate Royalists, will go far in ensuring the prosperity of the once-rebellious faction at the hands of the restored monarch and his Cavalier ministers. So "moderate he pleads for his cruelest Adversaries," claims the writer of Policy, No Policy, and "so tender a Father to his unnatural Subjects, he pities (not inveighs against) their miscarriages." The treachery of Presbyterians only magnifies the clemency of Charles Stuart, but his choice between two equally justifiable alternatives--mercy or justice--will be predicated on the performance of the Presbyterians in this latest test.⁷⁷

Both L'Estrange and Nedham manipulate the anxieties of Presbyterians. Nedham's Newes from Brussels, a brilliantly intimidating text, is styled a letter from a "Neer Attendant" of Charles Stuart's. Nedham outlines the origin of the Civil Wars (which "first bubbled up in Presbyterian Pulpits")⁷⁸ and discloses the Cavaliers' elaborate plans to obtain private revenge as soon as the opportunity presents itself: "we resolve, the Rogues that left the Rump, shall feel the scourge that Loyal hearts lash Rebels with, as well as others; a

⁷⁶[Marchamont Nedham], Newes from Brussels (n.p., 10 March 1660) 5.

⁷⁷B.T., Policy, No Policy (16 March 1660). The veiled threats throughout this text would be enough to make any perceptive Presbyterian squirm: "so Merciful and Kind in his very Severities, and so severe in his kindnesses, that his greatest Enemies, become his greatest Friends, and his friends can never be otherwise" (2).

⁷⁸Nedham Newes from Brussels (1660) 4.

Roundhead is a Roundhead."⁷⁹ L'Estrange carefully handles Nedham's attack as one too blatant to demand a serious reply, even from a professional propagandist, dismissing it as a weak attempt to "hinder our Expected, and Approaching Settlement."⁸⁰ The author of True and Good News from Brussels expands upon this analysis, admitting that the danger lay not so much in the possibility that anyone might actually believe that Newes from Brussels came from the hand of someone close to the king. Rather, the real danger was to be found in the "feares of those, whom it would seeme to concerne, for the wounds of guilt are hardly to be cured." Republicans wish to force the Presbyterians "to feare the snare of moderation" which is offered by Royalists as much as they should fear "the Gibbet of severity." He ends by offering the standard Royalist refrain that clemency will be "given freely to those that ask."⁸¹

Royalists were more apprehensive of an alliance between radical and moderate dissenters than most cared to admit. The implications of tracts such as The Fanatick Powder-Plot, True and Good News from Brussels, and No Blinde Guides--anxiety over the possibility of a new alliance between centralist Presbyterians and more radical anti-monarchists--lurk under more superficially significant arguments. L'Estrange's attack on Milton exploits factional support and takes advantage of the tenuous or inconsistent claims in Milton's eloquent pleas for republican virtue. Early in his career L'Estrange understood the

⁷⁹Nedham Newes from Brussels (1660) 7. Milton, too, insinuated the likelihood of reprisals against Presbyterians (The Readie and Easie Way 2nd ed., Complete Prose Works 7: 449).

⁸⁰The Fanatique Powder Plot in L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 98.

⁸¹W.S., True and Good News from Brussels (n.p., 1660) 4-5.

benefits of demonizing a personal enemy while building his own case from the writing he attacks.

If L'Estrange's work of the months prior to the Restoration focused on destabilizing the status quo by negative rhetoric and temporary alliances, the realities which he faced in the new Restoration order demanded that similar strategies engage new enemies.

L'Estrange's texts of the early Restoration separate into those obviously motivated by private animus or the will to personal advantage, and those which engage the issues of religious and political duty with more abstraction or complexity. The rhetorical sophistication of the former texts will be addressed in Chapter Five. In the second group of texts (which are longer and, for the most part, published later than the first), L'Estrange impugned Presbyterian writings in a vein reminiscent of his earlier tactics against sectaries.

L'Estrange knew minutely about forming temporary alliances, and about using the press to demonize enemies. It is not surprising that L'Estrange excoriated these strategies when they were the instruments of other polemicists. Early in his 1662 Memento L'Estrange accused Presbyterians of using the very strategy he himself had used against the Rump before April 1660, and which he was in the process of modifying to meet current monarchist needs:

The fear of Popery, was the Leading Jealousie, which Fear was much promoted, by Pamphlets, Lectures, and [sic] Conventicles. Still coupling Popery, and Prelacy; Ceremonies, and the Abominations of the Whore: by these resemblances of the Church of England, to That of Rome, tacitly instilling, and bespeaking, the same Disaffection to the one, which the people had to the other.⁸²

Here L'Estrange accused Presbyterians of emphasizing Anglican and Roman Catholic "resemblances," just as before the Restoration he himself had drawn resemblances between

⁸²A Memento . . . The First Part (f. Henry Brome, 11 April 1662) 17.

the Rump and the most radical Interregnum sectarians. In 1662 he claimed that Presbyterians wanted threats of Popish infiltration to raise suspicions against Anglicans by association, just as in 1659 he had hoped the fear of Interregnum radicals would raise popular suspicions against the Rump. Because L'Estrange wanted to marginalize Presbyterians, he chose once again to engage with neither their most representative nor their most moderate texts, but to build an antithesis between 'moderate' and 'Presbyterian'. He recontextualized dissenting tracts to integrate the moderate positions of a writer like Richard Baxter with those of extremists such as Edmund Calamy into a coherent platform of systematic political dissent. L'Estrange could then associate Dissenters with the most extreme Dissenting positions, and finally emphasize the most historically damaging consequences of religious nonconformity.

Despite the similarity in L'Estrange's pre- and post-Restoration rhetorical practice, there remain two essential differences between his polemical activities in these two periods. Originally L'Estrange advocated action, sometimes violent action, as he endeavoured to influence political contingency by means of mass, concerted effort. After the Restoration, with Court and Parliament suffering internecine conflict, he championed passive obedience to king and parliament with the same single-mindedness. Also characteristic of the post-Restoration polemic is its religious focus, which for L'Estrange was a matter of necessity rather than of inclination. The purely political forays of the winter of 1659-60 served to destabilize, not to reinforce, the Rump and the Committee of Safety. Faced with what he represents as a new adversary, and contending for position within the restored Court, L'Estrange was forced to engage Presbyterians on a religious front. For the most part

moderates, Presbyterians continued to exert significant influence, especially in Parliament, until the dissolution of the Convention Parliament at the end of December, 1661.⁸³ The goals of moderate Presbyterians--political constraints on monarchy and ecclesiastical hopes for the Savoy Conference of 1661--vexed L'Estrange personally and ideologically. Although the "pivotal concern of the Anglican establishment was to preserve its political monopoly by preventing religious toleration,"⁸⁴ the church hierarchy could not claim dominion in this area. Since L'Estrange's mandate was political, and the Presbyterians enunciated their claims and demands largely within the parameters of the debates over toleration and comprehension using the language of liberty of conscience, his polemical strategy involved equating religious Dissent, no matter how 'indifferent' its object, with historical and current political schism.

L'Estrange early equated Presbyterianism with Dissent, and concurrently built an equation between the written defence of Dissent, polemical duplicity, political and religious extremism, and historical treachery. His first extended attack against the "Faction . . . under the note of Presbyterian" unfolded in the late spring or early summer of 1661. His Interest Mistaken. Or, The Holy Cheat, dedicated to the newly-elected 'Cavalier' Parliament which opened 8 May, singles out John Corbet's The Interest of England in the Matter of Religion. He builds a case against political Presbyterians by weaving direct accusations of political machinations into the religious polemic of divines who wrote to influence negotiations

⁸³On parliamentary negotiations and the influence of Presbyterians in the Convention Parliament see Seaward Cavalier Parliament (1988) 162-95 and *passim*.

⁸⁴Mark Goldie, "John Locke and Anglican Royalism," (1983) 75.

currently underway in the Savoy on behalf of the Presbyterians.⁸⁵ "Their Writings and Opinions," complains L'Estrange, early establishing his special concern with the written representation of Dissent, "are with great Freedome, Craft and Diligence, dispers'd throughout the Nation; to the great Scandal of the true Church." Religious incursions on the authority of the Church of England constitute treason on their own. However, the singular menace represented by Presbyterian polemic lay in its function as a shield for the political will to power. In fact, religious schism "is yet the least part of the Mischief, or an effect of their Design." Far from desiring any authentic religious settlement, despite the posturing of the Savoy Conference, the Presbyterians "Ayme" only "to Tumultuate the People, and make a Partie against the Civil Power." They express the political will to power in the vocabulary of religious Dissent: "their Pamphlets wear the Face of Church-disputes, and Modells; but he that reads them through, shall find the King's Authority the Question."⁸⁶ The second edition of Interest Mistaken is even more baldly accusatory: "the Factious and Schismatical Clergy are but (with reverence) Bawds to a State-faction. A Tumult for Religion, is within one step of Rebellion."⁸⁷ If published to coincide with the reconvention of parliament in November, this edition joins L'Estrange's next volley, The Relaps'd Apostate, to deliver even sterner warnings against the dangers of negotiating with factions.

⁸⁵On 25 March 1661 Charles issued his warrant for Anglican and Presbyterian representatives to meet in the Savoy to undertake a revision of the Book of Common Prayer. On the Savoy Conference see E.C. Ratcliffe, "The Savoy Conference and the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer," From Uniformity to Unity, ed. Geoffrey F. Nuttall and Owen Chadwick (London: S.P.C.K., 1962) 89-148.

⁸⁶Interest Mistaken (f. Henry Brome, 1661) [A2^v].

⁸⁷Interest Mistaken (2nd. ed; f. Henry Brome, 1661) [A7^v].

On 13 September 1661 Secretary of State Nicholas complained to Clarendon that the Presbyterians "are as bold and as insolent here in this city as ever they were since the Independents mastered them"⁸⁸--this in spite of their spring defeats in elections to the Cavalier Parliament.⁸⁹ L'Estrange published both The Relaps'd Apostate and its "supplement," State-Divinity, to coincide with the reassembly of Parliament on 20 November.⁹⁰ Here he first summarized the positions he was to maintain unchanged throughout his career. He varied only his vocabulary to accommodate the various factions against which he directed his attacks: "Their Charge" he announced, "shall be Plain and Short."

They Invade the Kings Authority: --- The settled Law: --- And the Power of Parliaments. They affront the Parliament Now Sitting: --- Threaten the Publique Peace: Justifie the Rebellion of 1641. and Provoke Another.⁹¹

In L'Estrange's accusations, "the Rebellion of Haeresie, is less unpardonable, than That of Schism."⁹² The language of "invasion," "law" and "rebellion" moves contention away from either religious or personal grounds, and plants it firmly in the least controvertible and most comprehensively distrusted realm: that of political treachery. Not only does this rhetoric allow L'Estrange to vilify Dissent in political terms; as importantly, his full-frontal assaults

⁸⁸Qtd. in Bosher Restoration Settlement (1957) 238.

⁸⁹Spurr Restoration Church of England (1991) 39.

⁹⁰The Relaps'd Apostate: Or Notes Upon a Presbyterian Pamphlet (f. Henry Brome) is dated 14 November 1661, State-Divinity; Or a Supplement to The Relaps'd Apostate (f. Henry Brome) is dated 4 December 1661.

⁹¹State-Divinity (1661) 2.

⁹²A Memento . . . The First Part (1662) 121.

on religious Presbyterians divert attention from his more personal engagement with James Howell and various other Cavaliers, in which his personal animus overcomes his identification with the 'party.' Thus the excessive rhetoric of The Relaps'd Apostate and State-Divinity must be viewed in light of his efforts to differentiate his own voice from those of other monarchical supporters seeking reward for loyalty.

Government anxiety and his polemical and investigative efforts on the part of intolerant episcopacy helped L'Estrange secure the nominal position of Surveyor of the Press in February 1662.⁹³ Within two months of his appointment and less than one month before the Act for Uniformity marginalized all but the most conformable of clergy, he produced A Memento: Directed to All Those That Truly Reverence the Memory of King Charles the Martyr. In its naked malice against Presbyterians ("The late King was betray'd by Presbyterians in his Counsel") and its political focus ("Divisions in the Church have no further Interest in This place, then as they Lead to Seditions in the State") it resembles his other productions of the early Restoration.⁹⁴ However, this least polemical and most theoretically ambitious of his works also adapts several of Bacon's essays, most extensively "Of Seditions and Troubles" and "Of Unity in Religion." In so doing, L'Estrange attempts to provide an abstract justification of and prescription for monarchical absolutism and religious intolerance. The text did not succeed. It circulated only in one edition; the promised second part, "which shall follow sooner, or Later, according to the Enteriteynment

⁹³This position would yield no remuneration until 15 August 1663, more than a year later, when the Surveyorship of the Press was finally erected into an office (Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange [1913] 134).

⁹⁴A Memento . . . The First Part (1662) 18, 159.

which the World affords to This," was apparently abandoned as L'Estrange grew to understand his profession as lying in a polemical, not philosophical, defence of Stuart absolutism.⁹⁵ The palpable enthusiasm with which he plundered tracts for sedition and haunted their writers and sellers for evidence of treason belied his claims of objectivity and revealed the rhetorical perspicuity which would inspire the hatred of Dissenters and the annoyance of Anglican and monarchist advocates of moderation. He soon abandoned the hagiographic reconstruction of the works of Bacon in favour of a pragmatic prescription for the persecution of Dissent: at least partially on the strength of his Considerations and Proposals in Order to the Regulation of the Press, L'Estrange's post of Surveyor was elevated into an office. The remuneration for which he had long fought was finally secured.

⁹⁵A Memento . . . The First Part (1662) [a4^v].

Chapter 2

Deferential Politics in the Public Sphere

From the time L'Estrange hit the public stage his career was an active one. Despite his modern reputation as a Royalist apologist, however, his career was not entirely devoted to the selfless defence of the House of Stuart. If the tracts he produced are considered in terms of their length and number, genres and themes, L'Estrange devoted as much time attacking personal enemies, and defending his own reputation, as he did writing party polemics. His writing career before 1688 can be divided into three distinct phases. Chapter One examined the first phase, when he engaged in the debates surrounding the Restoration itself. From the early months of 1660 until the Glorious Revolution and beyond, his personal and professional fates would be bound to those of the Stuart Court. His private interests are more immediately and dangerously wrapped up in the larger complex of political events during this early period than during any other. His calls for Londoners to arm themselves is an open acknowledgement that to be engaged in political life is actively to be engaged. The second period of press involvement, also outlined in Chapter One, saw L'Estrange engaged against Presbyterians on a religious front, examining in four tracts the

theoretical issues around indulgence and toleration.¹ Between April 1660 and 1663, when he published Considerations and Proposals, he also maintained lengthy and vituperative personal and professional debates with Edward Bagshawe and James Howell, debates inspired by personal animus and professional jealousy.² Further, in the first three years of the Restoration L'Estrange published three curricula vitae: A Short View (1660), along with A Memento ... The First Part (1662) and Considerations and Proposals (1663). The first, his reconstructed "diary" of his Cavalier activities during the later Interregnum, is an open bid for reward or preference. His Baconian defence of absolutism (the Memento), introduces L'Estrange the monarchical theorist, a position he soon abrogated in favour of the more active role he imagined for himself in Considerations and Proposals. If he was not awarded the wide powers he recommended for himself in this text, it remains a revealing manifesto; here the coercion that lies at the centre of L'Estrange's model is rendered clear.

The other prolific period for L'Estrange before the Glorious Revolution was the years of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis, culminating with his six-year editorship of the semi-weekly Tory newsheet, the Observer. He produced more than ten new pamphlets of the mid-length polemical genre which included An Account of the Growth of Knavery, The Free-Born Subject, and Tyranny and Popery, between 1678 and 1682. These built or reviewed the basic arguments of concern in this chapter: obligation, sovereignty, law and the threat of civil war, with specific reference to Dissent and the problem of the succession.

¹They are Interest Mistaken (1661), The Relaps'd Apostate (1661), State-Divinity (1661), and Toleration Discuss'd (1663).

²He devotes six tracts in 1661 and 1662 to debates with Bagshawe and Howell.

These tracts, along with his dramatic engagement with Titus Oates, established L'Estrange's reputation as the most dogmatic and least tolerant of anti-tolerationists. But once again, L'Estrange was as he was busy defending himself as he called for passive obedience in his fellow subjects. Against accusations of Catholicism he was forced to publish six tracts, and his Popish Plot contributions were as much about establishing and maintaining his own authority as a political commentator against rival booktrade writers engaged in creating and distributing news as they were about maintaining peace in the kingdom in the face of inflammatory Whig rhetoric. L'Estrange imagines his place among an older line of political counsellors, claiming to subordinate all private needs to those of the State. Both his detractors and his own activities, however, often contradict this self-representation. The difference between L'Estrange's theory and his practice demonstrates the emerging power of the written word in allowing voices to factions. Once factions, no matter how small, discover a voice in politics, they influence events in the face of L'Estrange's model of deference, and he can only respond in the same medium. The press allows this to happen: again, "'Tis the Press that has made 'urr mad, and the Press must set 'um Right again." L'Estrange participates in this process, responding to small, disparate factions and their interests, to booksellers, or individuals such as Bagshawe, Care or Andrew Marvell, acknowledging that individuals and ideas such as economics have influence on the articulation of fundamental beliefs.

After, probably well after, his tenure as Chancellor ended in 1667, Edward Hyde, first Earl of Clarendon, articulated anonymously in print a premise that underlies much of the polemic of the Restoration but seldom surfaces: "The great Art and secret of Government,"

he revealed, "is to make it the Peoples Interest to be True and Faithful to their Governours."³

Clarendon's short tract gets to the heart of the struggle between private interests and the government that embodies such interests. Never while he was Chancellor would he have thus advertised that public affairs demanded manipulation and compromise. Such thoughts could only appear in public under the cover of anonymity.

L'Estrange's professional duty, like Clarendon's, was to support monarchy through overt and covert manipulation of various segments of the British population. Their professional dependence on the Stuarts demanded that they advocate a hierarchical relationship among prince, government and subject, despite changing ideas of obedience and in the face of the battered arcana imperii of the past two generations. Moreover, L'Estrange in mid-career could not be as candid as Clarendon was in retirement. The contradiction between L'Estrange's model of deference and his professional dependence on activity within the booktrades did not impede the progress of his career, however. He convinced his audience that he believed what he wrote and that he represented the beliefs of the Court. His influential Observer came to be known while it ran as a "guide to the inferior clergy." Before he solidified his career as representative of a most intolerant brand of conservatism, however, L'Estrange had tried his hand briefly at political theorizing. His Memento describes a state less enlightened than the Clarendon of Second Thoughts might have envisioned. He also prescribed a pre-emptive strategy for its control: "To deal frankly; All

³Edward Hyde, first Earl of Clarendon, Second Thoughts; Or the Case of a Limited Toleration (n.p., n.d.) 6.

Seditions are to be imputed to Misgovernment," he wrote, asking "How easie a matter is it, to Smother a Spark in the Tinder-Box?"⁴

Both L'Estrange and Clarendon are imagining ways of governance. Both also claim that public writing is seldom a truly candid activity. Neither would admit in their role as governmental representatives what they did admit in their role as theorists. Clarendon, of course, was immortalized not as a theorist but as the author of the Clarendon Code. L'Estrange quickly moved his emphasis from misgovernance to the sins of the ungovernable. Clarendon recommends compromise; L'Estrange calls for the suppression of dissent. The different emphases in these formulations are at least in part a result of the different careers of their authors. They share a fundamental belief, however. Each articulates a pessimism about what motivates people to come together and remain in communities. Both assume that individuals tend first to their private interests, and that if these are compatible with the interests of the community, then those are served as well. The similarities between these formulations by two of the most staunch supporters of the House of Stuart must be balanced by acknowledging their disagreement: Clarendon's newer and more candid position emphasizes the futility of attempting to serve the interests of the community without taking account of the private interests of its members: "Man-kind in general," he observed, "is constantly true to nothing, but their Interest."⁵ L'Estrange's call for individuals to subordinate private interests to the good of the state forms part of a more traditional

⁴A Memento . . . The First Part (1662) 207.

⁵Clarendon Second Thoughts (n.d.) 6.

articulation than Clarendon's. Although the articulation might be familiar, it issues from the pen of one of the period's most active controversialists.

L'Estrange's successful career as polemicist contradicted his theory of deference. It has been contended that such theories as L'Estrange's were bound to fail, because

no definition of the public interest couched wholly in terms of national strength would suffice. The psychological lacuna in so many formulations of the common good had been the failure to appreciate the powerlessness of such an idea to win men's passions.⁶

Clarendon's scepticism about human nature ("All Men I confess, should be obedient to their Lawful Governours for Conscience sake, but all Men are not as they should be") led him to appeal to interest for the sake of expediency. If "we can make it their Interest to be good Subjects," he believed, "they will not fail of being so."⁷ L'Estrange's scepticism ("Who knows not that Interest governs the World") led him to advocate the complete subjugation, either voluntary or forced, of the individual to a legal or to a sovereign authority. Clarendon admits the need for manipulation; L'Estrange does not.

L'Estrange needed first to find his personal place in the Restoration order. Once he was established, his interests depended on his talent for writing and distributing texts of various kinds, and on political chance. His commercial success was measured both in terms of reputation and economic gain, and both of these influenced his articulation of his "beliefs." Even as he denied its legitimacy, L'Estrange built his career on what has been described as a "law of opinion": "If public opinion governed behaviour, then citizens and

⁶Gunn Politics and the Public Interest (1969) 63.

⁷Clarendon Second Thoughts (n.d.) 5-6.

magistrates must make use of it to shape that behaviour."⁸ The very nature of the press forced him to advocate extreme deference in a medium that grew only while debate flourished. L'Estrange was also scared. Long before, his shadowy activities and subsequent imprisonment over the Royalist rising of King's Lynn had early taught him the potential dangers of political involvement, and this was reinforced by his part in the pamphlet and other skirmishes that heralded the Restoration. However, participation in the power struggles of 1659-60 also taught him the personal and political power of a public voice in affairs of state. His profession demanded that he produce and reproduce texts to influence political affairs. His fear of civil war led him to advocate a theory of deference to external authority. His private interest depended on the active participation of Dissenters in the booktrades; he represented his public duty as the suppression of all forms of Dissent, including its written justification. He advocated a rigid and static hierarchical system which variously saw law and monarchy as its pinnacle. What his political theory lacked in subtlety it made up for in constancy and force. Emerging fully formed in the earliest toleration debates of the Restoration, it resurfaced essentially unchanged in his later attacks against advocates of Exclusion, a fact witnessed by the republication during the exclusion controversy of almost all of his political texts of the early 1660s.

The extreme pragmatism that shaped L'Estrange's political agenda discouraged extended meditation on the epistemological foundations of his political theory. His Hobbesian position, enunciated most systematically and repetitively in 1678-81, resembles such contributions to religious debates as Locke's early unpublished "Tracts on Government"

⁸David Wootton, John Locke: Political Writings (New York: Penguin, 1993) 108.

or the attacks on toleration published by Samuel Parker in the early 1670s.⁹ L'Estrange contributed little that was innovative to the philosophical responses to political and religious Dissent. Moreover, his primarily secular loyalty to the House of Stuart, bereft as it was of any conspicuous attachment to the religious hierarchy of the Church of England, simplified the arguments to be made for the case of monarchical absolutism against almost any type of popular involvement in political and religious debates on affairs of state.¹⁰

Public figures such as L'Estrange and Clarendon who were concerned primarily with the political rather than the religious consequences of dissent tended to scrutinize theological controversy only for "its secular consequences."¹¹ Dissenting religion was tantamount to political faction, impelled by private interests. As Clarendon well knew, arguments in religion needed to be interpreted according to their effects on political affairs:

⁹On Locke's early tracts see Philip Abrams, John Locke: Two Tracts on Government (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967) 3-107; Richard Ashcraft, Revolutionary Politics (1986) 88-92; John Marshall, John Locke: Resistance, Religion and Responsibility (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994) 12-24. On Parker's biography see Gordon J. Schochet, "Between Lambeth and Leviathan: Samuel Parker on the Church of England and Political Order," Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain, eds. Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993): 189-208. On Parker's political theory see Ashcraft Revolutionary Politics (1986) 42-55.

¹⁰Ashcraft suggests that it was in "the process of constructing" defences against charges of religious enthusiasm by polemicists such as Parker and L'Estrange that Dissenters evolved their most sophisticated theories (Revolutionary Politics [1986] 54). See also Gunn Politics and the Public Interest (1969) 154. Although Tim Harris contends that Tory arguments for the legal basis of hierarchical government were forwarded in order to "protect the legal position" of the Church of England, L'Estrange is clearly concerned with threats to the political, rather than to the ecclesiastical order. See his "Tories and the Rule of Law in the Reign of Charles II," The Seventeenth Century 8(1993): 14.

¹¹Wootton John Locke (1993) 29.

they are Strangers in the Affairs of the World, who have not learnt, that Interest and not Religion, makes all the great Enmitys, and amitys both Publick and Private.¹²

Rather than defending the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the Church of England, L'Estrange recalled the religious and political turmoil of the Interregnum and concentrated on equating any form of contemporary Dissent with potential political and social disorder. Since permitting or encouraging Dissent or "faction" had practical consequences for the state, he deferred to organized religion for its role "in the preserving of the social order."¹³ To the intermittent charges that he himself is an atheist--or worse, a crypto-Catholic--L'Estrange responds simply that his visible conformity is the only proof he has, or needs, of his loyalty to the Church of England.¹⁴

L'Estrange maintained that the primary task of religion was the maintenance of civil order. At the same time, religion could also prove civil society's most dangerous enemy. Like other writers pessimistic about Presbyterian requests for toleration, L'Estrange argued that the "Pretext" of religion "is Degenerated into a Point-blank Sedition."¹⁵ Religion is fodder for factions that desire to overwhelm the status quo. Presbyterians are "Preaching up

¹²Second Thoughts (n.d.) 7.

¹³Wootton John Locke (1993) 29. Polemicists derived political creed as surely from the laws of nature as they did religious principles. They are applicable "eternally and deducible from manifest truths about human nature" (J.P. Sommerville, "Absolutism and Royalism," The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700, eds. J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie [Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991] 353).

¹⁴In 1680 L'Estrange was forced temporarily to flee London in part because of accusations of Catholicism. For a narrative of these events see Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange (1913) 251-59.

¹⁵Considerations Upon a Printed Sheet, Entitled the Speech of the Late Lord Russel (b. T.B., f. Joanna Brome, 1683) 18.

a Schism, under the Colour of Formalizing upon Scruples."¹⁶ "To twist himself into the Myster of State," [sic] the Presbyterian uses the press and pulpit. He hopes to "convince" the "unwary Rabble" "With Jingling words that bear little sense" and "Religious pretence."¹⁷ L'Estrange contends that Dissenter appeals to "the Law of Nature, Self-Preservation &c. . . . signifie nothing more, then to puzzle the Multitude, and confound the Order of Civil Administration."¹⁸ He shared Samuel Parker's suspicion of nonconformist conviction that if granted liberty to practice according to conscience individuals "would use it wisely and peaceably";¹⁹ after all, the "Trade of Mankind," suggests L'Estrange's Citty, is the "Trade of Knavery."²⁰

Both political and religious establishments are viewed by L'Estrange as external and artificial systems whose function is to suppress individual instinct and thereby avoid "Mr. Hobb's Original State of War."²¹ When private interest overcomes the public good the community necessarily degenerates into "so many Loose Atoms that will need a more miraculous Concourse of Accidents then ever the Philosopher dreamt of, to Jumble them into a Body." Political unity comprises "Our Strength, as well as Our Reputation." Political

¹⁶L'Estrange's Narrative of the Plot (b. J.B., f. Henry Brome, 1 July 1680) 34.

¹⁷"A Narrative of the Popish Plot," A Collection of 86 Loyal Poems (b. N.T., 1685) 233[=254].

¹⁸The Free-Born Subject (f. Henry Brome, 1679) 6.

¹⁹Samuel Parker, A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity (f. John Martyn, 1670) lii.

²⁰Roger L'Estrange, Citty and Bumpkin . . . The Second Part (f. Henry Brome, 31 March 1680) 1.

²¹The Answer to the Appeal, Expounded (n.p., 1680) 26.

"mischief" stems not from diversity in religious conviction, but from "the Dissolution of [political] Order." In the words of the Tory John Nalson, only "due Subjection" will guarantee "Peace."²² The government is the "Band" that holds the community together; once it is loosened, what "ere while, was a Government" disintegrates into a "Multitude."²³ Individuals are "like Salamanders": by nature they function in "a perpetual State of War; Impatient of one another," governed by private needs and desires, and "consequently Incapable of any Political Establishment."²⁴ Any arguments for the primacy of individual reason are immediately suspect; these would include, of course, religious arguments for liberty of conscience.

Writers debating toleration articulated a fundamental disagreement about human morality. Their differences resisted compromise, despite the demands of political expediency and more genuine impulses toward compromise. Anti-tolerationist belief in the need for external constraint contradicted Dissenter belief in the sufficiency of individual reason. At their most irenic, arguments (such as Baxter's) for toleration assumed that "we all possess natural political virtue, both because we are disposed favourably towards each other in . . . our nature, and because, when we co-operate, . . . the tendency of what we do . . . will inevitably be towards the politically efficacious."²⁵ Advocates of toleration suggested that a

²²[John Nalson], England Bought and Sold (f. T.O., 1681) 1.

²³L'Estrange's Narrative of the Plot (1680) 9-10.

²⁴L'Estrange's Narrative of the Plot (1680) 10. Salamanders were reputed to be of "a biting venemo[us] nature," and to thrive "in the fire" ([John Bullokar], An English Expositour [Cambridge: b. John Hayes, s.b. George Sawbridge, 1676] [H9]).

²⁵Peter Laslett, introduction, Two Treatises of Government, by John Locke (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988) 111. Ashcraft points out that the "fundamental assumption underlying .

conjunction between individual and community interests is both a facet of natural law and a model informing day-to-day interaction. On the other hand, L'Estrange did not believe in the sufficiency of individual reason or natural morality. For him appeals to the law of nature are "the Plea only of Individuals"²⁶ which encourage the pursuit of private ends, since they lack the impartial or public authority necessary in cases of conflicting interests.²⁷ Once authority is granted to the individual

He Imparts himself to Others; They Conferr with Their Interests, and so the Mischief Branches it self, till it comes to Overspread a Nation.²⁸

Reason depends on will, which is grounded in private interest; private and public interest necessarily conflict. The recent history of national politics had proven the results of allowing the primacy of "little dirty Interests."²⁹ These, both Parker and L'Estrange assume, are the prime motivating force behind human action; "when men insconce themselves in their own Wills, they are there Impregnable,"³⁰ and cannot be moved by appeals from reason to the

. . . Parker's language was that opponents of the absolute authority of kings in matters of church and state were, quite simply, not rational beings" (Revolutionary Politics [1986] 42). See also his "Latitudinarianism and Toleration: Historical Myth versus Political History," Philosophy, Science and Religion in England, 1640-1700, eds. Richard Kroll, Richard Ashcraft and Perez Zagorin (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992) 162.

²⁶Roger L'Estrange, Citt and Bumpkin (f. Henry Brome, 10 February 1680) 38.

²⁷Ashcraft "Latitudinarianism and Toleration" (1992) 162.

²⁸A Memento . . . The First Part (1662) 207.

²⁹A Memento. Treating, of the Rise, Progress, and Remedies of Seditions (f. Joanna Brome, 1682) 87.

³⁰A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity (1670) xiv.

common good, nor to obedience to external authority.³¹ L'Estrange argued that religious faction, at once chaotic and malignant, had flourished during the Interregnum owing to the indulgence of individual will over the will to obedience. While the civil wars "proved" the influence of private interest, the fear of renewed civil strife provided a transparent justification for the stridently anti-participatory tone and arguments of most later anti-tolerationist tracts.

L'Estrange's suspicions of human nature and deep-rooted fear of popular participation encouraged him to be wary of the "Monstrous Opinions and Confusions which it would Infallibly produce" in national politics. As he knew from his own experience in 1659-1660, temporary alliances among groups normally at odds with one another represented a powerful political tool. Dissenters recommended such alliances now. They claimed sectarian differences could be overcome in the struggle for toleration outside the Church of England. L'Estrange responded that private interests could not coexist without external constraint. By "Asking a Toleration" writes L'Estrange, "they Ask, what they judge Unsafe, and Unlawfull to Allow. They Ask, what they Know, and Declare, will be our Undoing."³² The need for external restraint stems in part from the lack of a religious basis for unity. Human nature would force any alliance to dissolve unless it is based in tradition and law. Allegiance must also be enforced, because any other alliance is necessarily founded in private interest and

³¹They thus far and no further acknowledge the new vocabulary of the "psychological egoism" to which agency Gunn partially ascribes the contemporary practice of examining political and religious allegiance in terms of private interest (Politics and the Public Interest [1969] 56).

³²Roger L'Estrange, Dissenter's Sayings (f. Henry Brome, 1681) 9.

private interests conflict with the good of the community.³³ Clarendon argues that once "the Cement of a Joynt Interest [is] ... taken way" Dissenters "will naturally, and necessarily fall in sunder, and remain as divided in point of Faction and party, as they are in tenets and principles."³⁴

Tradition and law serve to bind the community together. L'Estrange opens his study of the "Free-Born Subject" by defining a subject as "the person that is born under the Protection of the Law."³⁵ People who band together outside the "legitimate" order do so outside the law. This includes, of course, most alliances based in religious principles. All Dissenting groups must define themselves outside the law. No matter that both the Restoration itself and the Exclusion debates revolved precisely around competing orders of government. For L'Estrange, allegiance to any other order than a monarchical one, in fact the very idea of an alliance itself, cannot be based in reason because reason acknowledges the depravity of human nature and the consequent need for external restraint. His character Citty clearly has these transient, ephemeral groups in mind when he characterizes the "General" "Conscience of Profession" according to its "being True to a Party." Cavalier and thief are both bound by their profession to uphold its dogma "without Formalizing [rationalizing] upon the Cause." The power of irrational adherence to arbitrary principles--principles L'Estrange would argue are not founded in tradition or law--makes "the

³³In fact, some sceptics advocating toleration suggested that this law of natural conflict would render any Dissenter alliance "fairly inoffensive" (Gunn Politics and the Public Interest [1969] 163).

³⁴Clarendon Second Thoughts (n.d.) 5.

³⁵The Free-Born Subject (f. Henry Brome, 1679) 1.

whole [Presbyterian] Party oppose Episcopacy; as the Independents to Presbytery; the Republicans, Monarchy, and the like." General conscience of profession allows "particular" consciences to unite for a specific and common cause; it is "the Subordination of a Partiall, to a Generall, of a Private Profession to a Publick." For L'Estrange, as for Clarendon, alliances based on private interests must always, however, devolve into the "particular" consciences from whence they arose. Citt invokes the "Late Revolutions" to demonstrate the relative power of the two, recalling the aspersion L'Estrange had cast at Presbyterians at the moment of the Restoration: "so soon as ever we had subdu'd that Popish and Tyrannicall Interest, through the Conscience of our General Profession, we then consulted our Particular; and every man did Conscienciously labour for the Establishment of his own way."³⁶

In most ways, then, L'Estrange's polemic conforms to the pattern followed by intolerant Anglicans such as Parker. There is a difference, however. L'Estrange's texts are distinguished by their lack of religious arguments, and by his political emphasis in arguing for religious uniformity. He offers few recommendations on the side of ecclesiastical as distinct from political hierarchy. This secularism serves to narrow and focus his arguments on the relationship between political action and individual conscience. Since political principles were grounded in competing epistemologies, and since Dissenter religious principles were founded on "an inseparable link between belief and action, will and understanding,"³⁷ there never existed an opportunity for dialogue between those who denied and those who propounded the convergence between personal will and political expression,

³⁶Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 11-13.

³⁷Ashcraft Revolutionary Politics (1986) 66.

whether individual or collective. The act of association, on any grounds, was unfailingly interpreted by L'Estrange as a plot against the status quo. The very existence of Dissenter organizations was subversive. How to place L'Estrange's theory of extreme deference within the political debates of the Restoration without stating that such a reactionary model was teleologically doomed to failure? It would seem so doomed, especially when compared to the political pragmatism of Clarendon, even more so when compared to the individualism soon to be enunciated in Locke's "central claim": that there are "certain decisions that it is irrational, and perhaps impossible, to allow others to make on our behalf."³⁸

It is participation, indeterminacy, which frightens L'Estrange, whether that indeterminacy takes the form of prayer in the street, a signature on a petition, or a declaration of war. He distrusted not so much appeals to liberty of conscience as the actions which derived from such appeals. In his second unpublished tract on toleration Locke defined conscience as "that fundamental judgement of the practical intellect concerning any possible truth of a moral proposition about things to be done in life."³⁹ In the relationship between "practical intellect" and the religious foundation of action Locke enunciated the central problem faced by writers engaged in debates over religious toleration, which revolved around liberty of conscience. Writers disagreed not about the propriety of certain opinions over others so much as over the propriety of opinions themselves as they were translated into practical action.⁴⁰ The Dissenter Robert Ferguson defined conscience as "properly nothing

³⁸Wootton John Locke (1993) 104.

³⁹John Locke, "First Tract on Government," Two Tracts on Government, ed. Philip Abrams (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967) 225.

⁴⁰Ashcraft Revolutionary Politics (1986) 95n.

else but the soul reflecting upon itself and actions."⁴¹ He too foregrounds the primacy of action in the articulation of belief. The political side of this same coin manifests itself in the debates over the right of individuals to organize into political opposition based on religious beliefs,⁴² and the immediate political implications of this debate often overshadowed theological concerns about the individual's search for grace. "Conscience," spat Parker, "is nothing but the judgement and opinions of their own Actions."⁴³ The emphasis here moves from Ferguson's reflecting soul to "opinion" (no more nor less than "judgment") of action. Although the Dissenter and Anglican definitions are almost identical, the religious concern with the relationship between understanding and action shifts for the anti-tolerationist to an emphasis on the implications of the unpredictable, the uncontrollable, the act itself. L'Estrange argues that "it is the Liberty of Acting, as well as of Thinking, that they insist upon, which . . . is . . . a License to do what they please."⁴⁴ His distrust of appeals to conscience derives from a fundamental distrust of motive: "Who can say," he asks, "what any Man is, or he is not, in his Heart"?⁴⁵ Stillingfleet, too, had recourse to this distinction between liberty of thought and action, distinguishing "liberty of mens judgments" from

⁴¹Robert Ferguson, A Sober Enquiry into the Nature, Measure, and Principle of Moral Virtue (n.p., 1673; qtd. in Ashcraft 51).

⁴²Ashcraft "Latitudinarianism and Toleration" (1992) 165.

⁴³Parker A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity (1670) 7.

⁴⁴The Reformed Catholique (f. Henry Brome, 1679) 12.

⁴⁵Locke's Essay Concerning Human Understanding raised the same suggestion: "if we could but see the secret motives that influenced the men of name and learning in the world, and the leaders of parties, we would not always find that it was the embracing of the truth for its own sake, that made them espouse the doctrines they owned and maintained" (qtd. in Mark Goldie "John Locke and Anglican Royalism," Political Studies 31[1983]: 81).

"freedom of practice."⁴⁶ L'Estrange knew that to "Judge . . . Thoughts" is "only the Prerogative of Almighty God";⁴⁷ that "Conscience lies out of the Reach of Law."⁴⁸ Clarendon recommended that "we ought to exclude Conscience, or rather the pretense of it (which is all we can know of it in another) from being a sufficient warrantly [sic] of Allegiance."⁴⁹

The distinction between thought and action, between the right to hold and to express individual opinion, provided for anti-tolerationists an opposition by which they measured the events of the Interregnum. John Berkenhead reminded his readers that when they

remember the villainies . . . committed under pretense of conscience . . . and that no oath (of which they had taken many) would bind or hold . . . [Dissenters], we may well be cautious that we be not again cheated and destroyed by indulging their conscience into a new rebellion.⁵⁰

L'Estrange warned that liberty of conscience of necessity degenerates into "Mr. Hobb's original State or War." Regard "for tender consciences" caused the rebellion. Locke in 1660 claimed it was "the first inlet to all those confusions that overspread this nation."⁵¹ Parker more directly claimed that "Every thing that any man has a mind to, is his Conscience; and Murder, Treason, and Rebellion plead its Authority."⁵² Once "Dissent comes to be

⁴⁶Qtd. in John Marshall, "The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-Men 1660-1689: Stillingfleet, Tillotson and 'Hobbism'," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 36(1985): 411.

⁴⁷The Reformed Catholique (1679) 10.

⁴⁸The Free-Born Subject (1679) 7.

⁴⁹Clarendon Second Thoughts (n.d.) 6.

⁵⁰Qtd. in Seaward Cavalier Parliament (1988) 69.

⁵¹Locke "First Tract on Government" (1967) 160.

⁵²Parker Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity (1670) 6.

Practical," warned L'Estrange, "when it comes to make Parties, to divide into Sects, to Plead and to Challenge the Law; it is no longer a Plea for Conscience, but a direct Conspiracy against the Government."⁵³ Arguments for the sufficiency of reason, translated into "Practical" action, of necessity imperil the status quo. The single greatest challenge faced by Restoration Dissenters attempting to achieve legislated toleration was the Hobbesian equation forwarded by writers such as L'Estrange and Parker between legislated liberty of conscience and legislated anarchy, in which religious pluralism leads to civil war.

Conscience as an abstraction was of no interest to L'Estrange. Since it did not form part of his epistemology he preferred not to deal with the concept at all: "Who can say what any Man is, or he is not, in his Heart"?⁵⁴ Not even his politically motivated agenda, however, could avoid addressing in some way the problem of conscience. In the case of the royal prerogative, he argued, the interpretation of law was the external manifestation of the conscience of the king. For individual subjects, on the contrary, thought could never be reproached so long as it did not manifest itself as action.⁵⁵ Parker posited the same argument on behalf of the Anglican Church: "Whereas Liberty of Conscience is Internal and Invisible, and confined to the Minds and Judgments of men; and whilst Conscience Acts within its

⁵³Free-Born Subject (1679) 11. See also Parker, qtd. in Ashcraft Revolutionary Politics (1986) 70.

⁵⁴Roger L'Estrange, An Account of the Growth of Knavery (b. H.H., f. Henry Brome, 1678) 19. L'Estrange maintained that "We have no Windows into our Breasts, and there's no proving or disproving of a Thought" (Citt and Bumpkin . . . The Second Part [1680] 20).

⁵⁵John Nalson made the same point: "private opinion should confine itself to private breasts . . . and not be allowed to walk abroad to affront authority, no more than particular gain is suffered to undo the public stock" (qtd. in Gunn Politics and the Public Interest [1969] 196).

proper Sphere, the Civil Power is so far from doing it violence, that it never can."⁵⁶ On the other hand, law based on individual conscience cannot be distinguished from individual will, governed by the desire for personal gain.⁵⁷ Citty builds a clear distinction between conscience in the form of private judgment and that which is translated into action. He posits that there are two forms of conscience natural to all people, and two peculiar to Presbyterians. Every "man living" possesses a "plain, simple Conscience." It serves to "keep a man Right, if he meet with nothing else to put him out of the way"; the "Religious" conscience, much more "scarce," is a "quiet peaceable Conscience, that rests in the Affections of the Heart, in submission to Lawfull Institutions."⁵⁸ Neither of these forms of conscience incites subjects to action. The only ones acceptable to L'Estrange, they subordinate the beliefs of the individual to obedience in externals. Since they are bounded by existing laws they receive scant notice from Citty, who focuses his lesson on the more "profitable" types.

L'Estrange's most systematic attack on the idea of conscience comes in Citty and Bumpkin, his personal attack on the Presbyterian bookseller Henry Care. They had locked horns over their contending histories of the Popish Plot, and over the anti-Catholic propaganda informing Charles Blount's Appeal from the Country to the City. The structure

⁵⁶He elaborates: all human beings "have the same Natural Right to Liberty of Conscience in matters of Religious Worship as in Affairs of Justice and Honesty, i.e. a Liberty of Judgment, but not of Practice" (Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity [1670] 91-92).

⁵⁷Dissenters on the other hand, cited Hobbes and Filmer to argue the wilful base of absolute monarchy (Laslett Two Tracts [1988] 70).

⁵⁸Citty and Bumpkin (1680) 11-12. Goldie writes that "it was not to private conscience that [the Anglican hierarchy] . . . appealed, but to the rightly ordered conscience, which is the public conscience of the divine corporation of Christ's church" ("The Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution," The Revolutions of 1688, ed. Robert Beddard [Oxford: Clarendon, 1991] 125).

of L'Estrange's dialogue is simple: to Bumpkin's naive questions ("may I deny any thing that's charg'd upon me, point blank, if I be guilty of it?") he opposes Citt's Presbyterian casuistry, couched in vocabulary drawn from religious polemic: "Yes in the case of self-preservation, you may; but you must be sure then that no body can disprove you; for if it be known, 'tis a Scandall, and no longer Lawfull."⁵⁹ As he had done twenty years earlier, L'Estrange equates Dissenter issues and vocabulary, which take the form of legal arguments based in self-preservation, with political subversion. Bumpkin asks how conscientious Dissenters can hope to influence government policy if their refusal to take the sacrament bars them from sitting or holding public office. Citt responds with an "honest" description of the ways in which conscience can be employed as a shield for private interest.

L'Estrange's uncertainty about motive partakes of what has been characterized as "the gradual seventeenth-century elevation of sincerity of intention above correctness of belief."⁶⁰ If to be "sincere" means to acknowledge the primacy of private interest, then no writer, including L'Estrange himself, can be motivated entirely by civic virtue; but no public writer translates thoughts of salvation truly from mind to page. L'Estrange is trapped by his own scepticism. Some used the developing language of economics in order to argue the incompatibility of the pursuit of personal profit with that of the public good. John Nalson's attack on the writer of the pro-Exclusion pamphlet A Certain Way to Save England, links

⁵⁹Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 8.

⁶⁰Blair Worden, "Toleration and the Cromwellian Protectorate," Persecution and Toleration, ed. W.J. Sheils (London: Blackwell, 1984) 207.

personal and monetary "credit" to draw an explicit connection between interest, money, and personal integrity:

It was your great Interest to have passed currant [sic] for a Man of superfine Honesty. And I must assure you this flaw in your Credit . . . will render your Reputation suspicious in whatever you say hereafter.⁶¹

L'Estrange ignores or forgets his own economic ties to the House of Stuart, when he maintains that Presbyterian booksellers, whose allegiances depend in part on economic reward, are caught in this same bind between public and private interest. To attack the reputation of professional Presbyterian polemicists and booksellers, Citt and Bumpkin equates religious with socioeconomic interests. The "Trade of Mankind" is for polemicists "The Trade of turning Dirt into Gold."⁶² In L'Estrange's attack, Citt, "a little [Presbyterian] Grubstreet-Insect, that but 'tother [sic] day scribled Handy-dandy for some Eighteen-pence a Job, Pro and Con," lectures Bumpkin, "a simple Fellow drawn in" by Citt's rhetoric.⁶³ Citt and Bumpkin assumes that professional and religious allegiances conflict with economic interests. "The Interest of this World is Mony."⁶⁴ The most "Profitable" accusations exploit intention, "as the late Kings designe of setting up Arbitrary Power and Popery."⁶⁵ By linking political, religious, and commercial interests, he "proves" the degeneracy of writers engaged in the defence of any cause, as he "proves" the practical impossibility of founding

⁶¹[Nelson] England Bought and Sold (1681) 4.

⁶²Citt and Bumpkin . . . The Second Part (1680) 1.

⁶³Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 26.

⁶⁴A Memento . . . The First Part (1662) 81.

⁶⁵Citt and Bumpkin . . . The Second Part (1680) 19-20.

arguments for toleration in religious belief. Writers' consciences must by definition be informed by considerations of their own profit rather than by any disinterested pursuit of public good.

Since he distrusted the source of religious enthusiasm, it is unsurprising that L'Estrange should also distrust its external manifestation. Personal interests necessarily influence actions. What individuals appear or claim to be loses all credibility. Having already equated economic interests with sedition, he expands the equation to encompass religious enthusiasm. "Conscience of State, or Profit," protects the hypocrite, who hides private interest behind the "vizard" of pious behaviour. Since it stems from the most basic impulse in human nature, such conscience of state is stronger than plain conscience. The more ostentatious or enthusiastic an expression of faith, the more likely it is to be feigned. He derides those who "in Fits of the Spirit," "Jump, and fling about a Pulpit so desperately, that they set the children a crying to have 'um let out." An expression of faith is a conscious attempt to deceive. When he attacked faith's external manifestation L'Estrange focused on a sensitive Dissenter practice. According to Dissenters outward acts of worship had God, not the magistrate nor L'Estrange as an audience:

Far from being secondary, or irrelevant, they were a means for the worshipper to communicate with God, and the worshipper was bound therefore to prefer those modes of behaviour that he thought God would approve over those selected by the magistrate.⁶⁶

⁶⁶Wootton John Locke (1993) 37.

The action central to Dissenter belief is defined by L'Estrange as a sign of moral degeneracy. People who "love to Pray and Sing Psalms next the Street" do so "that their Neighbours may hear 'um."⁶⁷

Deception is magnified through spectacle. If religious enthusiasm is pernicious, how much more dangerous the conscious manipulation of the appearance of piety, when it aims to stir "People that measure Other mens hearts by their Own, and are consequently the more liable to be impos'd upon, under Forms and Pretensions of Zeal, and Religion"?⁶⁸ If moral judgment is not innate, the "Vulgar" can be manipulated through rhetoric or a charismatic leader into believing that they follow the dictates of their own individual reason. They possess no natural ability to discriminate between genuine matters of conscience and "Phancie." Parker agreed: "silly and well-meaning Zealots," he wrote, can be "abused by sly and crafty Incendiaries for the compassing of their own ambitious ends,"⁶⁹ whether personal, or, more often, the "Phancie" of a consciously manipulative faction. The "very Persons that so artificially make the People sick" L'Estrange observed, "are to Reap the Profit of the Cure."⁷⁰ Religious enthusiasm works "a very effectual operation upon the People." A "Holy

⁶⁷Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 11.

⁶⁸The Dissenter's Sayings (1681) 11-12.

⁶⁹Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity (1670) xliv. Ashcraft argues that the Tories asked Whigs for definitions of the "people" precisely in order to foreground the precariousness of Whig appeals to natural law: "Indeed, the Tories asked, what could the language of natural rights, equality, and popular sovereignty mean, except a defense of 'the sovereignty of the rabble' or 'the dregs of mankind'?" (Revolutionary Politics [1986] 298).

⁷⁰L'Estrange's Narrative of the Plot (1680) 13.

way of Language"⁷¹ "moves the hearts of the People . . . effectually toward the Work of the Lord"; the "Multitude" then helps this "Judgment" to civil disorder.⁷² Double danger lies in the observable action: the more ostentatious the display, the more compelling and at the same time the more deceptive. If the "People," managed by those who recognize their political power, are "as much Tinder now, as they were Formerly," he asks, are they not "as apt to take Ill Impressions"? The indulgence of popular dissatisfaction led to revolution in very recent memory. "What if the same Method should work the same Confusion over again? or in Truth," he concludes, "what is there else to be expected"?⁷³ There is no way to distinguish an hypocrite, a traitor, or a political subversive from a Presbyterian. The more "typically" Presbyterian an individual's trade, language or behaviour, the more likely the same person plots to overthrow the status quo.

Although he is sceptical, the only evidence available to L'Estrange is phenomenological: "we are not judg'd by what we are in Our Selves, in our Conversations, and Opinions; but by what we are said to be."⁷⁴ Since he assumes with Hobbes that action derives from the impulse toward personal advantage ("Who knows not that Interest governs the World?"), motive, and the "Design" which it propels, can only be inferred by the

⁷¹Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 12.

⁷²Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 2.

⁷³Account of the Growth of Knavery (1678) 24. On the function and power of the of the "rabble" in political events see Harris London Crowds (1987) 22-35 and *passim*; E.P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," Past and Present 50(1972): 76-136.

⁷⁴L'Estrange's Narrative of the Plot (1680) 25.

observation of actions and interpretation of texts: "a Correspondence in Method, cannot be without some Conformity also of Design."⁷⁵

If the opposition between wilful and obedient conscience could be so simplistically sketched, the nature of the external authority to which obedient consciences should submit themselves is, for L'Estrange, much more difficult to characterize. The choices available to the individual who subordinates will to temporal authority are based in tradition, since religious authority is ineffable:

The Two main Springs that Move, and Govern the Affections of reclaim'd Nature, are Conscience, and Law. By the Former, we are obliged, in relation to our Immortal Being and by the Other, as Men Link'd in Society.⁷⁶

Moreover, because it is external, the source of authority, whether the law or the magistrate, is subject to interpretation in the first instance and censure or coercion in the second.

According to Pocock:

The case for the crown was not that the king ruled as a sovereign and that there was no fundamental law, but that there was a fundamental law and that the king's prerogative formed part of it.⁷⁷

Where Pocock explored the implications of appeals to the ancient constitution for participatory theories of government, Tim Harris has recently extended this analysis to argue the place of law as authority for the emergent Tory party. L'Estrange's texts, however, offer a warning against assuming such a closed system. He never resolves this tension, and the authority he places at the pinnacle of his hierarchical model varies according to

⁷⁵Account of the Growth of Knavery (1678) 16.

⁷⁶A Memento . . . The First Part (1662) 96.

⁷⁷Pocock Ancient Constitution (1987) 54-55.

circumstance. When the political environment is unstable, and Dissenters and recusant Catholics rely upon parliament and the judicial system to represent their interests, L'Estrange employs the rhetoric of absolute monarchy. The formula also worked conversely. The greater his anxiety about the Stuart Court (usually provoked by the King's personal indiscretions or political disagreements), the more insistently L'Estrange invokes law as the foundation of responsible government action. Neither the Court nor law consistently occupied the centre of L'Estrange's paradigm. No philosopher abstracting principles of human nature from observed interaction, he was more concerned with the action--concrete, unpredictable--of subjects within a system he represented as the only fragile bulwark between order and chaos. Mark Goldie sets this apparent inconsistency in a philosophical framework, suggesting that Royalists generally

were caught in an intolerable tension between positivist sovereignty, where law was the artificial creation of the human governor, and patriarchal naturalism, where law carried authority because it harmonized with the natural economy of creation.⁷⁸

The "tension" so formulated presents a problem for writers who wish definitively to formulate a coherent political theory for the emergent Tory party. L'Estrange, however, was a polemicist engaged in damage control and impelled by immediate fear, who seldom formulated his responses in abstract terms.

If private interest motivates human activity, and if the law was vulnerable to multiple interpretations, there existed an obvious temptation for individuals to interpret the law according to personal advantage, justified by claims of conscience. The law could be misapplied: "We may make the best of the Law," admits L'Estrange, as long as "we do not .

⁷⁸Goldie "John Locke and Anglican Royalism" (1983) 74.

. . . raise Inferences of Equitable Supposition, in Contradiction to the Naked and Express Letter of it."⁷⁹ In some cases factions acknowledge the power of the law, as, for example, with legislated indulgence. In these cases, by the "Unwarrantable Application and Construction" of the law Dissenters tend to undermine the role of legal custom as universal and impartial standard.⁸⁰ More often than they misapply it, however, factions defy the law entirely, again using appeals to conscience as a shield for "Usurpation. Arbitrary Practises, and Proceedings."⁸¹ The "Outward, and Visible Law" only binds when "the Inward and Invisible Spirit move . . . [them] to do the same thing."⁸² There is a logical extension of attacks on the sovereignty of the established law. The substitution of a participatory for a deferential theory of government makes "the Lawmaker . . . Master of his own Laws; and . . . the Spirits dictating of a New Law, is the Superseding of an Old one."⁸³

Neither the law nor the will of the monarch had prevented Interregnum anarchy. How might it be prevented now, except through the abrogation of private interests? The obedient subject,⁸⁴ L'Estrange writes, curbs the impulse toward individualism by combining an outward conformity in matters spiritual and political with respect for a legal system that

⁷⁹The Free-Born Subject (1679) 8.

⁸⁰L'Estrange's Narrative of the Plot (1680) 29.

⁸¹[Roger L'Estrange], Tyranny and Popery (f. Henry Brome, 1678) 5.

⁸²Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 13.

⁸³Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 15.

⁸⁴The law "takes no Cognizance of . . . Honesty, but of . . . Obedience," no notice of the internal motive, but of the external manifestation of that motive (A Further Discovery of the Plot, Drawn from . . . Oates [1680] 5).

applies "universally" in all cases of conflict. Again, though, this is not a closed system.

L'Estrange's arguments for the supremacy of monarchy and law shared a foundation in the will to obedience to superiors, and both found their impulse in the prospect of civil war, the continuing challenges to arcana imperii, and the concurrent popular participation in political and religious affairs of state, as well as, more immediately, the debates over toleration and Exclusion, all of which had foregrounded the arbitrary and fragile basis for both the law and the sovereign. Whatever his Bodinian language describing the monarch, and his shrill insistence on the "Sober and Impassionate" (dispassionate) nature of the law,⁸⁵ L'Estrange's appeals to hierarchical order betray his anxieties about both.

If a tension nags at L'Estrange's advocacy of both an absolutist and a legal positivist model of government, his arguments in favour of the latter model themselves disguise the contradictions inherent in legal positivist theory. In response to the press activity of the Exclusion Crisis L'Estrange recommends that

it is not the Cutting Strictures of a sharp Tongue or a Virulent Pen, but the Sober and Impassionate Sentence of Law; that by Prisons, Axes, and Gibbets, determines These Controversies.⁸⁶

Revealing once again his doubts about human nature, L'Estrange recommends a system built on the equality of all community members but which at its heart depends on coercion for its efficacy. The law can only be effective if it binds all members together impartially, "without any difference of regard to Dignities or Persons."⁸⁷ All subjects are "to be try'd indifferently

⁸⁵Laws represent "Sobriety and Moderation" (L'Estrange, History of the Plot [1679] 1).

⁸⁶L'Estrange's Narrative of the Plot (1680) 12.

⁸⁷The Free-Born Subject (1678) 6.

by the same Law."⁸⁸ He leaves the final word, however, to the law's most terrifying aspect: "Prisons, Axes, and Gibbets." Laws exist for "the preventing of Ouvert Deeds of Violence" and punish the "Action[s], not . . . Conscience[s]"⁸⁹ of a collection of individuals whose private interests conflict to the extent that no "natural" concourse is possible. Impartial, immemorial, and sovereign laws ensure that clashes do not degenerate into civil war. Just as allegiance is ensured through coercion, equality under the law is guaranteed by repression and punishment.⁹⁰

The law exists above and in spite of the community it protects and the individuals bound by it, and must therefore be upheld even when it acts as a destabilizing force. The proper obedience to law provides the subject of L'Estrange's response to Henry Care's Narrative of the Heilish Plot. In ironic response to Care's calls for public vigilance against incendiary Roman Catholics, L'Estrange writes that

it is not but that I highly approve of your Zeal for the Discovery of the Plot, and Suppressing of Popery; but we are not yet to Trample upon Laws, and Publique Orders, for the attaining even of those Glorious ends.⁹¹

Individual effort, although admirable, by its nature disregards the law on behalf of an individual's "conscientious" judgment of what constitutes the greater good of the community. The invocation of "Zeal," a well-known word in the Presbyterian lexicon, associates religious Dissent, private interest, and the overturning of law and "Publique Order." Zeal

⁸⁸Account of the Growth of Knavery (1678) 62.

⁸⁹The Reformed Catholique (1679) 13.

⁹⁰The Free-Born Subject (1679) 13.

⁹¹Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 35.

undermines the basis upon which the community depends for its maintenance. "[W]here ever Presbytery reigns, there can be no Law, but their own Will."⁹² On the contrary, argues L'Estrange, individual action must be subordinate to laws long ago established to provide for the good of the state; the "law is our common resting place: the main foundation upon which we are all to Bottom."⁹³

Because the end and prospect of all laws "is Publick Convenience," and because private interest almost always conflicts with the good of the community, "there was never any Law invented, so Profitable to a Community, but it was in some Respect or other, to the Detriment of some Particulars." The only recourse to a perceived inequity in law is "patience." Even when the law works against the good of the individual in its impartial role as protector of public stability, it must be obeyed. "[W]e must onely" argues L'Estrange, "Oppose Legal Remedies to Illegal Wrongs," no matter what the offence. An individual acting according to principles of self-preservation necessarily weakens the whole structure. If the law will "not relieve us, we must be Patient."⁹⁴

L'Estrange appeals to the equity and stability of a legal system which has itself undergone vigorous and sustained attack for at least a generation. "As the Law hath been hitherto, so it must be henceforward the Rule and Measure of all our Proceedings."⁹⁵ His reasons are clear. Once questioned or misapplied, the law becomes arbitrary and

⁹²Tyranny and Popery (1678) 77.

⁹³He continues: "The Law is an impartial Judge" (Interest Mistaken [1661] 139). See also The Answer to the Appeal, Expounded (1680) 8.

⁹⁴The Free-Born Subject (1679) 4-6.

⁹⁵The Free-Born Subject (1679) 10.

unpredictable, and "we cast ourselves out of the Protection of it"; "Common Equity" gives over to the whims of "Partialities and Factions." Without an absolute standard we "transport our selves into an Absolute Impossibility" of understanding or resolving controversies, by substituting for the "Fact" of law the conflicting "Propositions" from nature or self-preservation. Factions rhetorically confound "the Order of Civil Administration" by appeals to individual conscience. The priority of the individual case over the greater good is represented once again as the nightmare triumph of private interest: "the Ambitious . . . the Malicious, and the like, Stalk . . . their Unrighteous and Self-Ends."⁹⁶ L'Estrange calls for the abrogation of speech in favour of a system which is itself dependent on the interpretation of written texts. he does this despite his own history and current practice of "determining controversies" with polemic such as his Narrative of the Plot,

When impartial and sovereign laws were not adequate to present needs, L'Estrange presented himself as defender par excellence of absolute monarchy.⁹⁷ The law functions, in part, to curb the human failings of princes, who, "'tis true, may have their Errours, and their Passions" he writes, which "the Innocent Laws" help to mitigate.⁹⁸ In the person of the monarch the law finds its ultimate arbiter, and in theory at least, his is the only word which must be interpreted as the external manifestation of his conscience. This is not to suggest that the conscience of Charles II is any less opaque than those of his subjects. It does mean

⁹⁶The Free-Born Subject (1679) 6.

⁹⁷ The question of the legal accountability of the monarch was central to seventeenth-century political debate. That L'Estrange did not resolve the issue is unsurprising. See Harris "Tories and the Rule of Law" (1993) *passim*.

⁹⁸Tyranny and Popery (1678) 77. "Princes themselves are not without their Tractable, and Easy Seasons, of being Prevail'd upon" (Citt and Bumpkin . . . The Second Part [1680] 11).

that subjects are bound to act as though it were. The shape of L'Estrange's larger oeuvre and of his career as a polemicist and controversialist, however, reveals a profound contradiction between the deferential theory he supports and his manipulation of the press, his personal enemies, and supporters of religious toleration, for the sake both of national safety and personal gain.

The legal unaccountability of the monarch (and by extension of the magistrate) develops from practical political necessity, as well as from patriarchal precedent.⁹⁹ L'Estrange's Bodinian monarch is characterized by his sovereignty over the law (this sovereignty is the result of popular turmoil).¹⁰⁰ The prince maintains the community through his function as arbiter of law, and as a symbol of the public interest toward which deference can be directed. The king is "the United Power and Will of the People,"¹⁰¹ and consequently, his interest is "Common, and Inseparable" from the interest of his subjects.¹⁰² "Government," writes L'Estrange, is "the Will, and Power of a Multitude, United in some One Person . . . for the Good, and safety of the whole."¹⁰³ As the absolute head of state, the monarch can be held morally but not legally accountable for his actions and those of his

⁹⁹Mark Goldie provides a summary of arguments for divine right in the later Restoration in "The Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution" (1991) 112. See also J. Marshall "The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-Men" (1985).

¹⁰⁰Julian Franklin, "Sovereignty and the Mixed Constitution: Bodin and his Critics," The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700, eds. J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991) 299.

¹⁰¹Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 38.

¹⁰²An Account of the Growth of Knavery (1678) 27.

¹⁰³Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 38.

representatives in their official functions. The maxim of unaccountability ("the King can do no wrong") exists in "Law, but not in Morals." Because of his place at the head of the judicial and religious hierarchies, he is legally accountable to no-one, and spiritually accountable to God alone. His conformity within legal boundaries extends to "Honour and Conscience, but no further,"¹⁰⁴ "for there lies no Appeal, but to a Superiour, and the Supreme [monarch] has none but God Himself."¹⁰⁵ It is "ridiculous" to appeal downwards, "or from Sovereign Princes, to any other Power, than to the King of Kings, who alone is above them."¹⁰⁶ If we recall L'Estrange's secularism, his suggestion that the monarch can be bounded only by his religious duty is to suggest, essentially, that the boundaries do not exist. His defence of monarchy, like his defence of law, is based in a pessimistic theory of government and human nature, and a deep fear of civil war.

At its most extreme, L'Estrange's theory compels subjects to submit to an inequitable law administered by a magistrate whose private interests seem to conflict with the public good or the good of an individual. As important to the career of the Surveyor of the Press, the monarch's immunity from legal prosecution extends to magistrates in the public exercise of functions as representatives of the crown: they are "Equally Unaccountable," let them "do Right or Wrong."¹⁰⁷ Even though they will on occasion act in their own interests, rather than in the interests of the common good, "That Abuse does not yet void the Authority, to

¹⁰⁴The Free-Born Subject (1680) 3-4.

¹⁰⁵Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 37.

¹⁰⁶The Free-Born Subject (1680) 3.

¹⁰⁷Citt and Bumpkin (1680) 36-37.

which the Law . . . requires Obedience, or at least Submission."¹⁰⁸ The Surveyorship of the Press depended precisely on this type of rigid hierarchalism. On the other hand, L'Estrange's practice broke all the rules he built in theory. He worked in the booktrades, among the social spheres which were so busy reflecting on and building Restoration public life. If "public opinion governed behaviour" then L'Estrange had also thus to engage the public, because for a writer of his station and particular talents, political polemic offered a career and some influence. The great advocate of passivity and deference, when he is examined in the light of his work, proves surprisingly active and independent. He advocates silence in his noisy texts. He defends the status quo and persecutes Dissenters and moderates, even as the status quo censures his own activities.

¹⁰⁸Account of the Growth of Knavery 59.

Chapter 3

L'Estrange and His Bookseller

Throughout the course of his career as propagandist L'Estrange depended on the print trades for wide and efficient circulation of his writings. Even so, some of his most successful critiques, including Considerations and Proposals in Order to the Regulation of the Press (1663), took aim at significant figures in these very trades.¹ The growing print trades sanctioned relationships among writers, printers, binders, financiers and sellers, many of whom were also members of the Stationers Company. As Habermas has pointed out, the associations among these agencies played a decisive role in the formation of a public sphere of critical-rational reflection. This public sphere also maintained figures such as L'Estrange who, by functioning as Surveyor, helped shape the open and clandestine circulation of tracts, just as, as propagandist, he helped shape the rhetorical indirection so distinctive in the

¹Other tracts that are comprised largely of attacks on the liberties of the booktrades include A Seasonable Memorial (f. Henry Brome, 1680), A Short Answer to a Whole Litter of Libellers (f. Henry Brome 1680), and A Word Concerning Libels and Libellers (f. Joanna Brome, 1681). Many of L'Estrange's published tracts include attacks on individual booktrade members.

writings of this period. L'Estrange depended on the booktrades, and his most important professional relationship was that with the Royalist bookseller Henry Brome, who (along with his family) published L'Estrange's steady supply of written responses to domestic political crises. L'Estrange's activity in print culture is inextricably bound with Brome's expanding business as Royalist supporter and general bookseller.

Brome began his career in the closing moments of the Royalist publishing movement described by Lois Potter.² He drew his earliest literary acquaintances and partners from the Cavalier community in England.³ They included such Royalist artists as Henry Bold, Richard Brathwaite, Richard Brome, Charles Cotton, and Izaak Walton. The Cavalier writers formed a famously close community, and saw themselves "as a breed apart, distinguished by their courageous defence of a virtuous, though unfortunate cause, and by their resolute renunciation of private advantage for honour and public service."⁴ Famous for poems of lament and drinking songs, their writings ranged from the drama of Richard Brome to the poetic celebrations of Bold, from the satiric verses of Brathwaite to the prose polemic of L'Estrange himself. Further, artistic and political connections to other Cavaliers remain so integral to many of these texts that confusion often arises as to their authorship (Anthony

²Secret Rites (1989) Chapter 1.

³In spite of Brome's eventual close association with L'Estrange, the earliest group with which the bookseller overtly identified himself did not include his later partner.

⁴Seaward Cavalier Parliament (1989) 52. See also Earl Miner, The Cavalier Mode from Jonson to Cotton (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971) 5.

Wood, for example, erroneously ascribed Cotton's Scarronides to Henry Bold). Brome sold Bold's anonymous Anniversary to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty (1661) and his collected Poems Lyrique Macaronique Heroique (1664). Alexander Brome edited many of Richard Brome's plays, and Henry Brome sold a congratulatory poem of Alexander's in the year of the Restoration. Alexander Brome also edited the famous Rump collection, predictably sold by Henry Brome and Henry Marsh in 1662.⁵

The study of seventeenth-century booksellers has already traced some of the close links among family, faction, and commercial allegiances. While many works tend to focus on the personalities of individual sellers as historical figures,⁶ some more recent studies, inspired by D.F. McKenzie's 1976 Sandars Lectures, have explored the mutual influence between political life and the growing industries of book production and distribution.⁷ This

⁵ Brome also sold three editions of Alexander Brome's Songs and Other Poems (1661, 1664, 1668). On Alexander Brome (1620-1666) see Roman Dubinski, ed. Poems (1982).

⁶ Works which focus largely on biography and anecdote include G.M. Peerbooms, Nathaniel Thompson: Tory Printer, Ballad Monger and Propagandist (Nijmegen: Katholieke Universiteit, 1983), and Leona Rostenberg, Literary, Political, Scientific, Religious, and Legal Publishing, Printing, and Bookselling in England, 1551-1700 (New York: Burt Franklin, 1965). H. Geduld, Prince of Publishers [Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1969] and Kathleen Lynch, Jacob Tonson, Kit-Cat Publisher [Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1971] have produced book-length studies of Jacob Tonson, who was famous as the seller for John Dryden and other luminaries, and for his role in the professionalization of the book trades. Their efforts are not, however, primarily engaged in exploring Tonson's professional and political affiliations. In the following chapter, I will make reference to Donald Wing's Short-Title Catalogue . . . 1641-1700 2nd ed., 3 vols. (New York: MLA, 1972-1986) when necessary in order to make clear distinctions among editions.

⁷ D.F. McKenzie, The London Book Trade in the Later Seventeenth Century (Sandars Lectures) (Cambridge: privately printed, 1976). Modern studies tracing individual allegiances and political and professional affiliations include M. Bell, "Elizabeth Calvert and

chapter will extend the analysis of political culture to include the book trades and will examine their dependence and influence on factional party politics. Modern concern with the work of Dissenter presses has left the efforts of many Royalist press agents largely unrecognized and unexplored. The assumption that press activity is coterminous with Dissenter press activity results in part from a line of inquiry which assumes that the "church and state" worked in a more or less uniform way to "prevent the flow of ideas" in the press.⁸ This theory suggests that most seventeenth-century governments were as yet too unschooled in the sophistications of print culture to "recognise that opposition propaganda had to be met on its own ground and by the same techniques."⁹ According to this position, since 'dominant groups' benefit most directly by the silence of the press, and Royalists were the 'dominant group' in late seventeenth-century England, the shops of the sellers who represented the interests of the Court must have been quiet indeed. On the contrary, however, Royalist presses were as active as their Dissenter counterparts. That we know less about them is

the 'Confederates'," Publishing History 32(1992): 5-49, and "Hannah Allen and the Development of a Puritan Publishing Business, 1646-51," Publishing History 26(1989): 5-66; H. Love, "Preacher and Publisher: Oliver Heywood and Thomas Parkhurst," Studies in Bibliography 31(1978): 227-35; and R. Mayer, "Nathaniel Crouch, Bookseller and Historian: Popular Historiography and Cultural Power in Late Seventeenth Century England," Eighteenth-Century Studies 27(1994): 391-419. Among the newer studies of press activity in the politics of the later seventeenth century are Crist, "Government Control"; Potter Secret Rites (1989) 1-37. On the opposition press see N.H. Keeble, The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England (Leicester: Leicester UP, 1987) 93-126, and Richard Greaves, Enemies Under their Feet (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1990).

⁸John Feather, "The Commerce of Letters: The Study of the Eighteenth-Century Book Trade," Eighteenth-Century Studies 17(1984) 410.

⁹John Feather, A History of British Publishing (London: Croom Helm, 1988) 54.

owing not to their supposed 'dominance' but to the models we have used to explore the issue of censorship.¹⁰

As alliances served as a means in the political process, so too they formed a core of Restoration bookselling. Temporary and lasting partnerships could be ideologically motivated,¹¹ but as often they were founded on a combination of commercial and political interests. These partnerships influenced print culture as much as did government legislation. Although L'Estrange was Brome's most stalwart ally, the seller's success in his trade was not bound exclusively to L'Estrange's activities, polemical or censorial. Brome's thirty years of Royalist selling helped to shape a public intimately engaged in popular debates in the press. Unless they worked on behalf of religious groups, however, few booktrade members left traces of their activity other than what can be gleaned from their imprints. This handicaps discussion of the nature and extent of Royalist professional and personal networks. This does not mean, however, that these networks did not exist. This chapter suggests likely connections by looking at ties between L'Estrange and Brome and other Cavalier writers and sellers, and the ownership and history of some Royalist texts.

For example, on behalf of the Court during the heat of the Exclusion Crisis Henry Brome teamed up with Charles Harper, "an honest man, and a warm votary for High

¹⁰Lois Potter first suggested that Royalist texts in the mid-seventeenth century did not lend themselves to examinations based on an oppositional model of censorship. See her Secret Rites(1989) 3.

¹¹See Bell's discussion of the "Confederate" group, for example (Bell "Elizabeth Calvert" [1992]).

Church."¹² The two sold only one text together. They resurrected a tract that had proved serviceable in the early Restoration and in the negotiations over toleration between political Anglicans and Presbyterians during the Savoy Conference in 1662. Boscobel: Or the History of his Sacred Majesties Most Miraculous Preservation after the Battle of Worcester recounts in much detail the trials of Charles Stuart after the abortive Royalist attempt at Worcester in 1651. Ignoring the tract's history as a Royalist apologia, its modern editor calls it "the best single account of the whole affair."¹³ In the Restoration, each successive edition of this tract was emended to suit present circumstances. To adapt the text to circumstances in 1680, moreover, the third (1662) edition was rewritten even more heavily. The 1680 edition was substantially expanded by the addition of a second and third parts, descriptive of Charles' further travels into France after the successful escape from Worcester. It recounts in detail "the great work of His Majesties delivery from the hands of such unparallel'd Rebels, who even ravenously thirsted after Royal blood."¹⁴ There is no need to belabour the explicit parallel between the betrayal of the rebels of 1651 and the activity of Whig exclusionists in 1680. The imprint of Brome and Harper places the tract in a Royalist context: simply by

¹²John Dunton, The Life and Errors of John Dunton (New York: Burt Franklin, 1969) 210.

¹³Richard Ollard, The Escape of Charles II After the Battle of Worcester (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1966) 152.

¹⁴Thomas Blount, Boscobel: Or, The History of His Sacred Majesties Most Miraculous Preservation after the Battle of Worcester 1st. ed. (f. Henry Seile, 1660); 2nd. ed. (f. Henry Seile, 1660); 3rd. ed. (f. A. Seile, 1662); 4th. ed. with additions (b. M. Clark, s.b. Henry Brome and Charles Harper, 1680) 4th. ed., "The Second Part" 18.

recognizing Brome's imprint Boscobel's readers know before they turned the first page the likely ideological interpretation of the events recounted in the text, Brome had well established himself early as a supporter of Royalist writers and a purveyor of their texts. His imprint thus served as a brand for a particularly dogmatic form of Royalist writing.

The tract had served Royalists well when it first made the rounds in three editions between 1660 and 1662. In the case of an obviously commercially successful text such as this one, republication allowed sellers further to contribute to debates with texts that had already proven their popularity, and to update their contributions by subtle (and sometimes not so subtle) textual manipulation. The bookseller Henry Seile published Thomas Blount's Boscobel in 1660 and published a second edition in the same year. His widow, Anna Seile, produced a third edition in 1662. For Royalists the value of the first edition for Royalists stemmed from its representation of Charles II. Charles is a princely hero, hardy when abandoned by almost all his subjects, saved by the grace of God, a few Cavaliers, and his own fortitude, finally fated to return to his rightful place as God's anointed ruler. The text also voiced the complaint of the Cavalier, avoiding specific accusations which might contravene the Act of Indemnity. Finally, the text establishes Thomas Blount's reputation as a Cavalier pen and historian, and reinforces Seile's role as official publisher to the new Restoration order. The evident popularity or effectiveness of Boscobel prompted Blount and Seile (advertising his allegiance by calling himself 'Stationer to the King's Majesty') in partnership to republish the text within the same year.

This new edition of Boscobel contains slight but telling emendations. It sharpens both the valour of the Cavaliers and the treachery of the Presbyterians. The dangers endured by

Charles Stuart and his selfless patriotism now appear in sharper focus. The propaganda value of Boscobel lies in Blount's interpretation of the monarch's actions rather than in the words or actions themselves. After recounting his defeated uprising at Worcester, Blount reports Charles' disappointment thus: "I had rather you would shoot me," the exiled monarch confesses, "then keep me alive to see the sad consequences of this fatal day." Rather than assuming these words stem from naked distress after a lost bid for power, Blount interprets them as a stoic response to desperate circumstance: the words originate, Blount claims, in "the magnanimity of this Prophetique King."¹⁵ Thus Blount does not invent the story of the events at Worcester, but rather interprets it according to present political circumstance. Blount adds in the second edition of Boscobel a mention of the 'natural' affection between the rightful ruler and his subjects, and deepens Charles' selflessness:

I had rather you would shoot me, then keep me alive to see the sad consequences of this fatal day: *So deep a sense had His prophetick Soul of the miseries of his loved Country, even in the midst of his own danger.*¹⁶

Blount's reinterpretation of Charles's words in this second edition reinforces the progression of English society from misery to 'prophetick' deliverance--in the shape of the restored monarchy.

If the first and second editions worked to establish the Royalist Court and market, the third edition of Boscobel had an even more topical function: playing to the tensions in Presbyterian-Anglican negotiations during the Savoy Conference. Blount's text took its place

¹⁵Boscobel 1st ed. (1660) 11.

¹⁶Boscobel 2nd ed. (1660) 11-12 (emphasis added).

with L'Estrange's among those of the least tolerant Anglicans, and was directed against the conciliatory efforts of Clarendon toward comprehension, and the even more conciliatory impulses of Charles. Boscobel brought to the debate a long-winded warning that a Presbyterian Scot might have difficulty swearing at once to the Covenant and to the Oath of Supremacy. The first two editions suggested that "some of the Scots took exception" to Charles's place as "Supreme Head and Governor." In 1662, these same Scots are revealed in their true religious colours: "*the Presbyterian Scots took exception*" to Charles "Supreme Head and Governour."¹⁷ If the Presbyterian party had resisted monarchical supremacy in 1651, what would prevent them from resisting again after the Savoy Conference in 1662, or later?

The anti-Presbyterian vision offered by the third edition of Boscobel supported the Anglican efforts of 1662. Boscobel's Royalist sellers too, in professional competition and ideological conflict with Presbyterian and other factional sellers, understandably encouraged this particular interpretation of events. The text served its purpose, and lay dormant for eighteen years until pulled back into service on behalf of the once-again embattled Royalists of 1680. The fourth edition, resurrected and structurally (rather than subtly) amended, foregrounds the role of Dissenters generally in the now-distant past; the passage of time also allows for the embedding of the language of divine right in history. Brome seldom published texts in partnership, but he joined with Harper, since the latter owned the copyright to Boscobel, in order to circulate the text as a reminder of "the great inundation of Rebellion and Treason, which then did overspread the face of . . . [Charles's] whole Dominions" and,

¹⁷ Boscobel 1st ed. (1660) 5; 2nd ed. (1660) 7; 3rd ed. (1662) 11 (emphasis added).

by implication, once again threatened the fragile monarchical system and the peace of all Britain. Perhaps the seller felt the need to carry a title more entertaining and less hysterically Plot-driven than the regular diet of L'Estrange he had lately been offering his clientele. In 1680, as in 1660, a change in government seemed too close for Royalist propagandists to sit quiet. The republication of a history with such a clearly-embedded moral could only strengthen Brome's reputation as one of the foremost Royalist sellers in the precinct of Saint Paul's churchyard. Royalist sellers, like members of all factions within the trade, established partnerships to produce texts which spoke to political circumstances, and which also served the professional interests of the sellers themselves.

Seldom, however, were Royalist partnerships maintained. The publication and republication of Boscobel demanded the talents and resources of Henry and Anna Seile, Thomas Blount, Henry Brome, and Charles Harper. Brome worked with Blount and Anna Seile on a few other projects, but there is no evidence other than the Boscobel history to link Brome with Harper, nor Harper or Blount with either Seile. To establish the existence of a 'network' of Royalist press workers the net must be widely and loosely cast. Henry Brome, as one of the very few clearly Royalist sellers active both at the Restoration and during the Exclusion Crisis, is a central figure here.

L'Estrange's career suggests that print ephemera exerted a rising influence in the political sphere as the seventeenth century progressed. Such ephemera could only become more widely available once the systems for producing and distributing broadsides and pamphlets were established. Before the closing of the theatres political drama had functioned as the medium of choice for political dialogue. By the Restoration, drama had firmly been

displaced by a wide range of media, of which the products of the ephemeral press were the most widely consumed.¹⁸ As difficult as trying to establish the 'Royalist' seller, then, is drawing a firm distinction between artistic and non-artistic texts in the development of print culture.¹⁹ What is traditionally considered 'literary' work forms only a small proportion of the output of seventeenth-century presses. Scholars writing about Dissenter publishing activities have taken these proportions to heart; it remains to remember them in the study of Royalist sellers.

At the political and cultural nexus of 1660 debate exploded around the returned monarchy. Activity in the printing trades had increased during the Interregnum. The media in which debates took place were also evolving and expanding. The frenetic activity of Brome and L'Estrange in 1659-1662 and later from 1678 to 1681 suggests that, rather than serving a secondary or subsidiary role to the production of more 'permanent' texts, the production of ephemera--texts whose primary function is contemporary commentary or incitement to action--could serve as the foundation of a successful publishing business.²⁰ Brome's earliest imprints appeared conspicuously on the work of established Royalists. At the same time, however, he also encouraged an underground market for virulent anti-parliamentary propaganda, including the tracts later acknowledged by L'Estrange in his

¹⁸McKenzie "Sandars Lectures" (1976) 2-5.

¹⁹McKenzie "Sandars Lectures" (1976) 13.

²⁰For the opposed view--that ephemera served simply to augment more important work--see John Feather "The Commerce of Letters" (1983) 408.

Apology. The new printing opportunities available to individuals from all parties shaped Henry Brome's role as a bookseller, as strongly as did the political agenda of the Royalist party. Brome's stock contributed, especially with the works of L'Estrange in the early Restoration, to the contests for power in the late 1650s and early 1660s, even as it helped establish what it meant to be a 'Cavalier' and encouraged the self-identification of this group.²¹

By 1680 those who followed political debates in the press recognized Brome's imprint as representing a type of deferential monarchism set in direct and explicit opposition to the emergent Whig doctrines of popular participation in the political process. Unlike his son Charles, who will be considered briefly below, Henry Brome functioned in the vanguard of the emerging bookselling class which served primarily as a source of information on politics, the class whose readership was comprised increasingly of the politically literate and engaged public sphere, while he concurrently maintained a wide stock of advice and instructional texts. The political side of Brome's reputation grew alongside L'Estrange's as a proponent of that particularly virulent monarchism whose self-proclaimed mandate was to "aggravate suffering . . . [and] pursue the quarry to the death."²²

²¹The self-identification of Cavaliers will be discussed below in Chapter 5.

²²Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange (1913) 432.

This growing reputation is reflected in the changing function of the initials "H.B."²³ An early shield to his identity in an unstable political environment, "H.B." served to disguise the origin of texts in the later period as well, but not for Brome himself so much as for those who wished to use his imprint either to attack or deceptively to claim fraternity with the monarchist party. The close connection between Brome, L'Estrange and the Court in the Exclusion period encouraged several writers to exploit Brome's imprint. Sellers had been required to own up to their texts from the time of Berkenhead's appointment as licenser in 1660 (and before).²⁴ If these imprints sometimes protected sellers from unauthorized reproduction of their work, they also served to identify texts as the propaganda efforts of a particular group or faction. These imprints then, served as an aid to interpretation, especially when appended to plentiful and contradictory "Impartial Discoveries" and "True Narratives." Since Brome and L'Estrange were associated to the point of identification, "Printed for H.B." signals not necessarily Henry Brome's involvement, but the author's desire to claim some sort of association between a text and Brome or L'Estrange. Both conservative monarchists and their enemies used his imprint. It served as a guarantee of a certain brand of political opinion, and as a cypher for attacks on those opinions. Whether

²³This connection between imprint and reputation is first discussed by Nicholas von Maltzahn, Milton's History of Britain: Republican Historiography in the English Revolution (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1991) 5-11.

²⁴This requirement was seldom enforced. More often, the printer's name was required on an imprint.

they lent credence to a text or sharpened its satirical power, however, these imprints reinforced Brome's reputation.

The early use of the initials "H.B." on an imprint might have reflected Brome's early uncertainty about his career and the future of the Royalist party, or it might simply have comprised a form of shorthand. In 1660 he sold 21 works which advertised his full imprint: "Printed for Henry Brome." Under the initials "H.B." in Morrison are a further eleven texts dated 1660-1663.²⁵ A group of five can be ascribed to a printer "H.B.,"²⁶ and the other six tracts can be ascribed to Brome. These include three simple propaganda pieces: M.D.'s The Subject's Desire to See Our Gracious King,²⁷ Thomas Jordan's Speech to . . . Monck,²⁸ and A Royal Prophecy, Written Long Since.²⁹ The conservative Royalism of L'Estrange's Popish Plot tracts is foreshadowed in Francis Bacon's Letter of Advice to the Duke of Buckingham, first published (for H.B.) at this time, which advised courtiers to "Remember .

²⁵ Since there are no texts listed for H.B. between 1656 and 1660, the latter date has been listed here as terminus a quo. The figures come from Morrison's index (Paul G. Morrison, An Index of the Printers, Publishers and Booksellers in Donald Wing's Short Title Catalogue [Charlottesville, VA: U of Virginia P, 1955]). These figures have been cross-checked with Donald Wing's Catalogue, and discrepancies have been silently corrected.

²⁶ These tracts all bear the imprint "printed by H.B." It is possible but unlikely that these tracts are connected to Brome, who (although he was married to the widow of the printer Thomas Leach), did no work as a printer.

²⁷ (f. H.B., 1660; D65) not on microfilm.

²⁸ (f. H.B., 10 April 1660; J1062) An earlier edition (J1061C; not in Morrison) bears the imprint "for Henry Brome, 1660"; neither is on microfilm. Jordan associated with the Alexander Brome circle. See below.

²⁹ (f. H.B., 1660; R2146)

. . . what your true condition is[;] . . . the King himself is above the reach of his people . . . and you are his shaddow."³⁰ Brome also published John Fell's commendatory Life of Thomas Fuller³¹ with other sellers (J.W. and H. M.). Salmasius his Buckler: or a Royal Apology, a long panegyric, was originally published anonymously in 1660, but took Brome's initials in its second, 1662, issue.³²

If Brome sometimes used his initials for imprints in the early period, his well-established Royalist reputation in the 1680s encouraged other sellers to ascribe satirical or spurious texts to his agency. There are six tracts with the imprint "printed for H.B." produced between 1676 and 1685. Some of the imprints from these tracts are misleading, misrepresenting the publishing agencies involved in the production of the text. A True Copy of a Letter (Intercepted) Going for Holland. Directed Thus for His (and His Wives) Never Failing Friend Roger Le Strange (f. H.B. at his Holinesses Gun in Pouls Church-yard, vvhere they vvill be Delivered to you Gratis: 10 February 1680) was probably published while L'Estrange was in hiding (winter 1680-81), and was certainly not printed for Brome,

³⁰ Francis Bacon, Letter of Advice (f. R.H. and H.B., 1661; B302) 2. Bacon's modern editors assume that although "the evidence of authorship is chiefly internal . . . [its right to appear in Bacon's oeuvre] may be regarded . . . as indisputable" (James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denton Heath, eds., The Works of Francis Bacon 14 vols. (1857-74; New York: Garrett, 1968) 13: 10. The letter's politics is consistent with the position L'Estrange would adopt, especially in the later Free-born Subject.

³¹ (f. J.W., H.B., and H.M., 1661; F616).

³² The work is by Giles Duncombe (alias Cimelius Bonde). The 1660 edition, titled Scutum Regale. The Royal Buckler (D2599A), lists no seller on its imprint. The second (S411) is a reissue of the first, some final pages removed, with new title page.

as the imprint suggests.³³ The title promises that the letter will reveal the secret sexual desires of Joanna Brome. The title also exploits the genre of intercepted (and thus candid) letters. Finally, the imprint associates the tract with Brome, implying that both he and L'Estrange represent Catholic interests. The satire depends on its reader's knowledge of Brome's and L'Estrange's association and careers, and Brome's imprint was popular enough effectively to be falsified. Almost always, misleading imprints date from the later 1670s or 1680s, and signal attacks on L'Estrange as much as his bookseller. Along with the Letter discussed above, false imprints include those on Dialogue upon Dialogue,³⁴ and Tories Confession.³⁵ Occasionally, sellers used "H.B." to advertise biting satire or promote the credibility of the text covered by the imprint. This is almost certainly the case with The Popish Plot More Fully Discovered, which claims kinship with L'Estrange's polemic and begs the protection of Brome's reputation as a defender of Court interests.³⁶ The

³³ Wing B80. Michael Treadwell cites Travels of the Devel and Towser (f. Roger Catflogger, 1682?; N36), an obvious attack on L'Estrange, as an example of a false, satirical imprint ("On False and Misleading Imprints in the London Book Trade 1660-1750," Fakes and Frauds: Varieties of Deception in Print & Manuscript, eds. Robin Myers and Michael Harris [Detroit: Omnigraphics, 1989] 37).

³⁴ Dialogue upon Dialogue: or, L'Estrange, no Papist nor Jesuite; but the Dog Towser (f. H.B., 1681; D1370).

³⁵ The first edition of this piece is The Tories Confession, Or, A Merry Song in Answer to The Whigs Exaltation (f. T.H., 1682; T1910). Wing lists H.B.'s edition as another (T1911).

³⁶ This is a pro-Plot piece of propaganda which no doubt uses H.B.'s imprint to encourage sales among Brome's clientele, which the title page claims include the "Weak and Doubting Protestants" (1679; P2955). This leaves two texts. The translation of Francois Charpentier's A Treatise Touching the East-Indian Trade (b. Thomas Mabb f. Henry Brome, 1664; C3714) was reprinted in 1676 (f. H. B., s.b. Robert Boulter; C3715). The other text is

appropriation of Brome's name underlines his association with L'Estrange (to attack one was to wound both), his association with Anglican Royalists, and the assumption that his name was widely enough known that the invocation of his initials would have the resonance necessary to situate the text within contemporary political discourse.

It is unsurprising that other sellers should exploit a connection with Brome; his imprints are legion. He was to become one of London's most prominent partisan booksellers, especially at the Restoration and in 1678-81.³⁷ Approximately 500 titles were sold with the imprints of Henry, his wife Joanna (who took over the business at his death early in 1681) and their son Charles. In the period 1657-1663, Brome published more titles with his imprint than any other seller but the King's Bookseller Richard Royston; from 1676 to 1684 only Benjamin Tooke came close to Brome's 292 titles, with 255. The Bromes were the only partisan sellers to have been extensively involved in distribution during both periods. In these years, when the political order was under siege, their output increased dramatically: from eight (acknowledged) texts in 1659 to thirty-five in 1661, back to five in 1665, and

Sweet Songs of Israel (f. H. B., 1678; S6248).

³⁷A distinction must be drawn here between open and surreptitious financing and selling. Even if the monarchy, once ensconced, understood the benefits of a firmly controlled and apolitical press (and this is not necessarily the case), the publishing opportunities in times of crisis were fostered by booksellers eager to take advantage of a volatile public which found increased sustenance in the printed word. The size of Brome's output during periods of conflict, relative to other partisan sellers, is very large but no doubt misleading. As Treadwell and Crist (among others) have demonstrated, some oppositional sellers were certainly widely engaged in anonymous financing and selling after 1660. Brome, on the other hand, could only benefit by advertising through his imprint a close and clear connection between himself and the Royalist cause he served.

from twenty in 1676 to fifty-eight in 1680 and back to seventeen in 1683.³⁸ Brome was active from 1656 to his death in 1681. By this time he was well-established; Joanna Brome, "rich and proud," assumed some, but not most of her late husband's titles.³⁹ In 1684 Charles Brome began issuing under his own imprint, and continued selling until 1711. Whatever the apolitical texts that supported Henry Brome during times of political calm, his Restoration reputation rested on his participation in political debate, and especially on his association with L'Estrange.

The little that is known of both Brome's professional and personal backgrounds suggests that he held no close ties to the Stationers' Company, the organization responsible for regulating the political and professional activities in the book trades. He was a member of the Company of Haberdashers until admitted into the Stationers' Company in 1678. This migration from one company to another was not unprecedented. L'Estrange's own efforts to control the activities of the press had led him as early as August 1671 to convince the king to propose "to the Lord Mayor that men of other companies who were working in the book trade should be turned over to the Stationers' Company or suppressed."⁴⁰ It is clear that

³⁸ These figures are approximate; not all Brome's texts are listed in Morrison's index, and a reduction in the number of texts sold after 1681 followed from Henry Brome's death (Morrison Index [1955] 39).

³⁹The epithet is given by George Hickes in a letter to Thomas Comber (17 January 1683/4). Dean and Chapter Library, Durham. Raine MSS, vol. 33. Comber letters 1682-1692.

⁴⁰Cyprian Blagden, The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403-1959 (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1960) 164-5. Brome had three apprentices (one of whom, Edwin, might have been bound to Brome as a Haberdasher); Henry Brome is listed as gaining the freedom of the Company 4 November 1678 "Gratis" (D.F. McKenzie, Stationers' Company

Brome's family connections also encouraged his allegiances. His brother, Alexander Brome, was a prolific Royalist poet of the Interregnum who "enjoyed the acquaintance if not the close friendship of many in the Cavalier community from the late 1640s on."⁴¹ Alexander Brome also enjoyed the acquaintance of the widow of seller Thomas Whittaker, whom he married sometime before 1653.⁴² He provided his brother with some of the earliest texts sold under his imprint, including Alexander Brome's own collected Songs and Other Poems (1661) and a collection of previously unpublished plays by the Royalist playwright Richard Brome, who was probably an older relation to Henry and Alexander. This latter collection fulfils the promise made by Henry Brome in his preface to The Queenes Exchange: the "kinde entertainment of this will enable me to make known to the World divers more of the same Authors works of this kind, which have not yet seen light," and which "came into my hands among other things of this nature written and left by Mr. Rich Brome." Henry Brome's access to these texts, together with the fact that his brother Alexander edited the 1659 edition of Richard Brome's collected plays (along with the 1653 collection for the Royalist sellers Humphrey Moseley, Richard Marriot, and Thomas Dring), is strong circumstantial evidence Henry and Richard were related. From the time Henry Brome was

Apprentices, 1641-1700 [Oxford: Oxford Bibliographical Society, 1974] 21).

⁴¹ Roman R. Dubinski, introduction, Poems, by Alexander Brome, 2 vols. (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1982) 1: 5-6. Dubinski claims the family came from the parish of Evershot, Dorset (1: 3).

⁴² Alexander Brome and Whittaker sold all her stock on 7 March 1653 (G.E. Briscoe Eyre, H.R. Plomer and C.R. Rivington, A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers from 1640 to 1708[1709], 3 vols. [London: Roxburghe Club, 1913-14] 1: 412).

established, all of Richard Brome's work was sold with his imprint.⁴³ When an editor is acknowledged for Brome's texts after 1657 it is invariably Alexander Brome, for Henry Brome.

Henry Brome established an important early financial partnership with Randall (or Randolph) Taylor between 1656 and 1659, when he acquired Richard Brome's The Queenes Exchange among other titles from Taylor, who is not actively selling during these years.⁴⁴ This change in ownership is not recorded in the Register. Taylor later claimed the rights to L'Estrange's The Relaps'd Apostate (1661), only to disappear from the scene until 1680. Taylor probably entered texts in the Register on Brome's behalf, according to Company practice, in order to provide some copyright insurance for Brome since he was until 1679 unnumbered among the members of the Stationers' Company. It is also likely that, as early

⁴³Henry Brome sold four of the fourteen first editions of Richard Brome's plays listed in Wing, and one second edition.

⁴⁴Randolph (or Randall) Taylor (listed as two sellers in Paul Morrison's Index) served as beadle for the Stationers' Company from 1674 until 1692 (Blagden Stationers' Company [1960] 161-62). He did not put his imprint on more than two texts in any one year before 1680. Thereafter, he became very active as a seller, until his death in 1694. However, he bound his first apprentice in 1650 (he would free a total of eight during his career; McKenzie Apprentices [1974] 162), one year after being made free of the Company (McKenzie Apprentices [1974] 108). Most of Taylor's few entries in the Register are made on behalf of Henry Brome: The Queenes Exchange and Two Essays on Love and Marriage on 20 November 1656 (Eyre Stationers' Register [1913-14] 2:151), sold by Brome in 1657; Samuel Speede's gardening manual, Adam Out of Eden on 16 August 1658 (VII:191), and William Glisson's Survey of the Law on 3 February 1659 (VII:213). Brome's imprint advertises both of these texts for sale in 1659. On Taylor's activities as a trade publisher see Treadwell "London Trade Publishers" (1982) 128 and *passim*.

as 1661, Brome felt confident enough of his professional reputation not to bother entering his titles in the Register.

Brome's emerging career as a bookseller solidified when he moved to the precinct of St. Paul's churchyard at the end of the 1650s. At this early stage, however, he was still in need of support from established members of the trades. Brome appears to have taken over a practice at the sign of the Gun in Ivy Lane from two Stationers, Edward Dod and Nathaniel Ekins. Brome acquired the shop from Ekins in 1659 or 1660.⁴⁵ Imprints suggest that Ekins shared this sign with Brome from 1657 to the time of the stationer's appointment as licenser to pedlars and petty chapmen at the Restoration, although they shared no imprints.⁴⁶ Brome did, however, take over the publishing of Hamon L'Estrange, Roger's father, from Edward Dod, who published his Reign of King Charles with Henry Seile in 1656. Brome sold Hamon L'Estrange's Alliance of Divine Offices in 1659. Dod and Ekins also sold Richard Brome's play A Joviall Crew in 1652, to which Alexander Brome contributed commendatory

⁴⁵Dod stopped publishing in 1657 (Henry R. Plomer, A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers Who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667 [Oxford: The Bibliographical Society, 1968] 65). Ekins may have shared the shop with Brome after Dod left; imprints from 1659 place both Ekins and Brome at the Gun, and Plomer notes Ekins was active until 1660 (70). Brome issued under his imprint at several signs, all close to the traditional bookselling area of St. Paul's Churchyard throughout his career. See Peter Blayney, The Bookshops of Paul's Cross Churchyard (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1990) 85, 89. Brome abandoned his earliest shop at the Hand in St. Paul's Churchyard in favour of the Gun probably in 1657, where he stayed until the fire of 1666. After the fire he worked for several years out of the Star (1666-1669), finally reclaiming the Gun in St. Paul's from 1669.

⁴⁶Ekins's appointment as licenser provides the only circumstantial evidence that he was involved in the propaganda wars of 1659-60. See Plomer, Dictionary . . . 1641-1667 (1968) 70.

verses. Henry Brome published another edition of this play in 1661 without entering the transfer of rights in the Register. It may therefore be that Ekins and Dod, like Taylor earlier, protected copyright on behalf of the fledgling bookseller. Dod, Ekins, Brome and Taylor formed part of a broad Cavalier book distribution network, sharing commercial and political interests.

These sellers, along with others such as Henry and Anna Seile and Andrew Clarke, all worked to protect Brome from the commercial or punitive attentions of the Stationers' Company and other sellers, most obviously by entering Brome's titles in the Register on his behalf. In fact, Brome thrived outside the Stationers' Company. It is instructive here to compare the careers of Henry Brome and his son Charles. The father's career exemplifies the ways a dealer could flourish outside the control of the company ostensibly responsible for the commercial and regulatory control of the book trades. On the other hand, Charles Brome transformed the legacy he received in 1683 into a vital but nonpolitical business, in line with the commercial and ideological imperatives of the Company.

The power of the Stationers' Company expanded and contracted with political circumstance in the seventeenth century. During the course of the Interregnum, for example, the Company diminished to the extent that it was functionally 'disestablished' from its mandate.⁴⁷ The decades after the Restoration saw a progressive increase in the Company's powers, both through legislation and negotiation. By virtue of its new charter in 1684, its jurisdiction increased "beyond what even Laud had thought necessary" in his efforts to

⁴⁷The term is from Siebert Freedom of the Press (1965) 232.

enforce religious conformity in part through censorship.⁴⁸ The Restoration Company maintained a strongly Presbyterian flavour and, while mandated to regulate practice, was accused of being too much concerned to preserve its members' interests in the English Stock and of blunting governmental interference by agents such as L'Estrange.⁴⁹ Henry Brome remained peripheral to the Company by virtue of his Cavalier family connections, his professional affiliation with the Haberdashers, and his allegiance with L'Estrange. He is seldom mentioned in records and was, of course, never elected to any position within the Company, despite his success in the bookselling trade. Nor does he enter most of his texts in the Stationers' Register,⁵⁰ the Stationers' central regulatory organ.

The Company, designed to be a cohesive and powerful force, experienced a tension between those, like Henry Brome, Nathaniel Thompson and Benjamin Harris, who established themselves significantly as dealers in ephemera and those, such as Henry Brome's son Charles or Jacob Tonson, who built strong but less volatile careers without the political activity so integral to Henry Brome's success. If John Dunton remembered Henry Brome only as L'Estrange's seller, he could characterize Charles more generously as "a genteel man

⁴⁸Blagden Stationers' Company (1960) 170.

⁴⁹Blagden Stationers' Company (1960) 173. The English Stock, granted in 1603 by James I to the Stationers' Company and valid in perpetuity, allowed the Stationers the sole rights to enjoy the profits from the publishing and selling of psalms, psalters, and primers. The Company had further, within two years, used the profits from this privilege to buy the sole right to publish common-law books (Blagden 92-94). See also Robin Myers, The Stationers' Company Archive: An Account of the Records, 1554-1984 (Detroit: Omnigraphics, 1990) xvii.

⁵⁰This with the exception of the mass registration of 1679, discussed below.

in his garb, a prudent man in his actions, and a thriving man in his Shop"⁵¹-- a conventional Stationer. Charles' "gentility" and "prudence" kept him clear of association with L'Estrange for the most part. Nor did Charles need the protection of anonymous publication, as his father did.⁵² Charles was not satirized for his political affiliations, maintained only the most neutral of his father's titles under patrimony, and carried a selection of moderate Church of England titles. In other words, he provoked no authorities within the Company, government, or Church. The Company supported such "genteel" and prudent sellers as Charles, along with those clearly within the traditional categories of book publishing: Henry Herringman and Jacob Tonson in dramatic literature, for example, or Thomas Parkhurst or Walter Kettilby in divinity. It also supported major stock holders, such as George Sawbridge or the Royalist Richard Royston. Within the upper hierarchy of the Company was little place, however, for sellers whose polemical activities impelled them into positions prejudicial to the Company or jeopardized its independence from the Court. These sellers established their reputations and businesses on the strength of their political engagement rather than by virtue of their connection with the Company. Dealers in ephemera did not need the copyright protection offered by the Company. The fact that Henry Brome entered no ephemera in the Register is more typical than not: sellers seldom deemed the cost of entry in the Register (and thus copyright) worth the expense in the case of topical publications.⁵³ If Brome's

⁵¹Dunton Life and Errors (1969) 222.

⁵²Charles only published one tract under his bare initials, in 1691.

⁵³Potter Secret Rites (1989) 6.

activities left him outside the Company, however, they also left him unconstrained by tradition from exploring the rewards to be reaped by the production and distribution of political commentary.

More detrimental to Brome's relationship with the Stationers' Company than his Royalist political sympathies or personal Cavalier background were his close professional ties with L'Estrange. L'Estrange was no friend to the Company. By order of the king he was made free of the Company upon his appointment as Surveyor of the Press in mid-1663. In 1669 the Wardens and Master of the Stationers' Company received a royal admonition against hampering L'Estrange's efforts at suppressing libels.⁵⁴ Texts were entered in the Register under the Surveyor's hand until the lapse of the Printing Act in mid-1679. The Bromes sold almost all of L'Estrange's texts.⁵⁵ The Surveyor and his bookseller presented a single face to the public during times of political crisis. L'Estrange's polemic was Brome's; the bookseller was ideologically implicated in L'Estrange's programme to an unusual degree. Fear or dislike of L'Estrange manifested itself in attacks on his seller, whose successes in the book trade during these periods were to a significant degree adjuncts of their association.

⁵⁴CSPD 9: 446.

⁵⁵Following is a list of L'Estrange's tracts (London imprints) for which a publisher other than Henry, Joanna or Charles is listed. This list does not include works from L'Estrange His Apology, those which list a tract as 'sold by', or works for which authorship is doubtful: The History of the Plot (f. Richard Tonson, 1679; L1258; anr. ed.; f. M.R., 1689; L1259A); Histoire de la Conspiration (f. Richard Bentley and Marc Pardoe, 1679; L1257); The Lawyer Outlawed (b. N.T. f. the Author, 1683; L1266;); An Answer to a Letter to a Dissenter (f. R. Sare, 1687; L1195); Tyranny and Popery (anr. ed; f. B.C., 1688; L1323A); The Reformation Reform'd (anr. ed.; f. B.C., 1688; L1288).

Writers often satirized Brome, representing him as subservient to L'Estrange, emphasizing Brome's exclusion from the Company with disparaging images of dependence on the Surveyor. From early in their partnership satirists characterized Brome as L'Estrange's "creature." The seller depended on the writer, who was the "Chief Squire of the Quill to ... [Brome's] Body; and the only Broom-staff of . . . [his] support and maintenance."⁵⁶ Brome, L'Estrange's "ill ridden Slave,"⁵⁷ was used by his "Benefactor"⁵⁸ for his "own ends."⁵⁹ Since he remained "tyed to Towsers Tail,"⁶⁰ Brome, by implication, owed his success in the trade neither to personal effort nor to confraternity with the Company, but to a sycophantic relationship with one of the Company's most worrisome critics. Brome's close ties with L'Estrange brought him into direct conflict with the activities of the Stationers, since those members who did not oppose L'Estrange's political platform distrusted his active attempts to carve for himself a professional place within the dynamic of Court, Company, booksellers and consumers.

⁵⁶ H. B., A True Copy of a Letter (Intercepted) going for Holland (f. H.B., 10 February 1681) [1].

⁵⁷ A Dialogue Betwixt H.B.'s Ghost, and His Dear Author R.L.S (f. J.M., 20 May 1681).

⁵⁸ H.B. True Copy (1681) [1].

⁵⁹ A Dialogue Betwixt H.B.'s Ghost (1681).

⁶⁰ A Letter out of Scotland, from Mr. R.L.S. To his Friend, H.B. in London (f. N.F., 1681) 3. This satire responds to another, Strange's Case, Strangely Altered (n.p., n.d.) which represents Brome as a broom tied to the tail of the dog Towzer (L'Estrange).

Brome and L'Estrange had worked together, and largely in opposition to the Stationers' Company, for years by the date of the appearance of published satire against them. They had learned from their underground activities before the Restoration the power of the press in the movement of political events. In 1659 L'Estrange held that the press--and the close links among writers, sellers and parties--were the only bulwarks against 'arbitrary rule'. He claimed the Rump fought for silence in the public sphere. On the other hand, the tracts he and Brome produced "Ëncourag'd [readers] into Resolves . . . [and] direct[ed] the Seasonable Execution of them." Published propaganda afforded party affiliates systematic access to a wide audience, something they could not personally have maintained without extreme danger. The press served "to Engage . . . many Persons, with . . . much Probability of good, and with . . . Little Hazzard of the Contrary . . . at a time, when 6 Persons could not meet, without as many Spyes upon their Actions."⁶¹ These close links among members of the book trades and political factions are not coincidental. Professional and personal connections were established among the factional booktrade members who thrived after the abolition of the Star Chamber in 1641, and these connections expanded in 1659-60.

Sellers such as Brome circulated texts without imprints to avoid punitive attention, since the underground publishing system specialized in the dissemination of propaganda: Brome, for example, published many of the early anonymous short tracts acknowledged immediately after the Restoration by L'Estrange in his Apology. By 1680 'trade publishers' sold their imprints and openly assume the risks of circulating politically compromising

⁶¹ L'Estrange His Apology (1660) B2['-B2'].

texts.⁶² This practice does not appear to have been common during the early years of the Restoration, nor do Brome's imprints point to this type of activity. Rather, his interests were linked more closely to those of the party he served. In the latter period the profit associated with the publication of propaganda outweighed its danger. This was not, however, the case in 1659.

What forces drew Roger L'Estrange and Brome together? Brome had been working to establish himself as a literary publisher, not unlike Humphrey Moseley in the early years of the Interregnum. Moseley acknowledged his Royalist sympathies while advertising a relatively uncontentious stock.⁶³ If Brome's commercial imperatives were clear, the professional reasons for L'Estrange to publish were less obvious. Brome and L'Estrange did share Royalist ties, but L'Estrange never revealed the origin or nature of his relationship to the seller. Only once, while reminiscing about his activities at the Restoration from a twenty-year vantage point, and recalling, as he was wont to do, his personal record on behalf of the Royalist cause, did L'Estrange admit that his publishing ventures of 1659-60 depended on the help of a partner:

⁶²Treadwell "London Trade Publishers" (1982) 129-31.

⁶³On Moseley's "literary Royalism" see Potter *Secret Rites* (1989) 19-22. She maintains that many sellers with Royalist sympathies escaped persecution because "the licensing authority . . . prosecuted publications defined as blasphemous (mostly those of the sects), but largely ignored the numerous poems, plays, and romances with a strongly anti-government line" (20).

Twenty [tracts] at least . . . I publish'd upon that bloody Crisis in 1659 . . . here in Town, (and honest Harry Brome got them Printed too, to his very great Hazzard).⁶⁴

Nowhere in the Apology is Brome acknowledged, although the seller's aid was clearly necessary both for the production and the distribution of the tracts. The first imprint that firmly associated Brome with L'Estrange appeared as a colophon to No Droll but a Rationall Account dated 30 January 1660.⁶⁵ Brome cannot with certainty be associated with the tracts written before that date. The four anti-parliamentary broadsides appeared between 12 December 1659 and 3 January 1660, while the Rump was in disarray, Monck was marching toward London, and the navy was sailing up the Thames.⁶⁶ L'Estrange would later suggest that this very uncertainty afforded him the chance to canvass Royalist sympathizers. All four texts seem to be the product of the same press; probably hasty productions, they are of poor type quality, containing a large proportion of gothic script of a size at odds with the Roman interspersed throughout. The titles of each are cast with the same type, in the same style. There is no firm internal evidence that Brome was involved in these earliest works; however, it is likely, considering the political and commercial connections among Royalist families,

⁶⁴Discovery Upon Discovery, 2nd. ed. (f. Henry Brome, 1680) 31.

⁶⁵No Droll but a Rationall Account (colop: f. Henry Brome, [30 January] 1660; not included in L'Estrange His Apology). Brome also lent his imprint to Physician Cure Thy Self (f. H.B., [23 April] 1660, not in L'Estrange His Apology), and to No Blinde Guides (1660), appended to L'Estrange His Apology.

⁶⁶The Engagement and Remonstrance of the City of London (1659) in L'Estrange His Apology 42-44); The Final Protest, and Sense of the City (1659) in L'Estrange His Apology 44-47); The Resolve of the City (1659) in L'Estrange His Apology 47-49); A Free Parliament Proposed by the City to the Nation [The Engagement] (n.p., [3 January 1660] in L'Estrange His Apology 50-54).

that he was at least aware of their circulation, if not personally or directly involved in their production.

What is clear is that Brome's and L'Estrange's activities in late 1659 and early 1660 placed them in danger. The dearth of imprints from this period suggests that the seller feared both the punitive and commercial risks attendant on openly hostile attacks on the Rump. Monck's arrival in London did not suggest that the dissolution of Parliament (let alone the restoration of the monarchy) was imminent. Although L'Estrange did not openly advocate monarchy at this time, both his animus against the Rump and the incendiary nature of his publications would have rendered him and his partner vulnerable to attack. The three broadsides which date after Monck's march in London, between 15 February and 24 March 1660, suggest that Brome and L'Estrange were in fact becoming more confident, more efficient.⁶⁷ The type and setting of these texts is of better quality than the four earlier ones, which suggests that these issued from another printing house than the former. With their confidence came system. In fact, Brome can firmly be associated with all of L'Estrange's remaining pre-Restoration productions. These six short tracts, issued between 14 March and 23 April 1660, were timed to coincide with the parliamentary elections.⁶⁸ All but Be Merry

⁶⁷ A Word in Season (1660) in L'Estrange His Apology 72-77); No Fool to the Old Fool (n.p., [16 March 1660] in L'Estrange His Apology 93-96); A Necessary and Seasonable Caution (n.p., [24 March 1660] in L'Estrange His Apology 99-100).

⁶⁸ Rump Enough; or, Quaere for Quaere (n.p., [14 March 1660] in L'Estrange His Apology 87-92); Be Merry and Wise (1660) in L'Estrange His Apology 79-86); Treason Arraigned, in Answer to Plain English (n.p., [3 April 1660] in L'Estrange His Apology 114-45); Double Your Guards (n.p., [5 April 1660] in L'Estrange His Apology 145-56); No Blinde Guides (1660); and Physician Cure Thyself (1660).

and Wise are probably the product of one press.⁶⁹ Physician Cure Thyself and No Blinde Guides bear Brome's imprint. Treason Arraigned is advertised for sale in a list appended to No Blinde Guides. All these texts except for Be Merry and Wise share an ornament appearing on the two Brome imprints. This ornament also appears throughout A Short View. These tracts call for voters to "look Back, and learn, from Thence, the menage of the Future [sic]," ⁷⁰ and are written in furious response to the anti-monarchical rhetoric of such tracts as Newes from Brussels, A Letter Intercepted and No New Parliament, and The Readie and Easie Way.⁷¹ Most are addressed to General Monck, as L'Estrange asserts, to "convince you and the World, where the Abuse lies:"⁷² that is, firmly at the door of the Rump House of Commons. The political astuteness of the Brome and L'Estrange partnership in these uncomfortable months places them among the most informed political observers and manipulators of London opinion. There is little indication, however, that L'Estrange and Brome worked in concert with any other writer/seller team.

Although the Rump might object to topical volleys directed against it, there were no impediments against less topical Royalist writings. While Brome was engaged in his political

⁶⁹ Since this text is dated the same day as Rump Enough, it is possible that the texts were printed on different presses in order to allow the simultaneous production of both.

⁷⁰ Be Merry and Wise (1660) in L'Estrange His Apology 85.

⁷¹ [Nedham] Newes from Brussels (1660); N.D., A Letter Intercepted (1660); No New Parliament (n.p., 12 March 1660); and John Milton, The Readie and Easie Way (1660).

⁷² Treason Arraigned (1660) in L'Estrange His Apology 145.

campaign with L'Estrange against the Rump, the seller also owned copyright for and occasionally published Cavalier and Royalist texts. The Cavalier literature sold by Brome encouraged cohesion among the group. The literature also demonstrates a discipline in not recommending monarchy too quickly during the "Cavalier winter."⁷³ At the same time, however, anonymous texts hastily printed and surreptitiously circulated were meant to mould opinion and incite the London population to political action. The texts that bore his imprint did not espouse the open monarchism of his surreptitious stock. Brome's caution reflects both his nascent reputation and the uncertain political climate in which he operated. In his only acknowledged preface, to the first published edition of Richard Brome's comedy The Queenes Exchange (1657), he acknowledges only a commercial interest in literary texts: His "ayme is, & prodesse & delectare, by delighting thee to profit my self."⁷⁴ But Brome moved quickly to support less literary representatives of the Court. Within two years his imprint appears on equal numbers of polemical and non-polemical texts, almost all of them by identifiable Royalists. He published an edition of five further previously unpublished plays by Richard Brome, edited by Henry's brother Alexander Brome.⁷⁵ Among the works published for Brome in 1659 is the first evidence of the association between the bookseller and the L'Estrange family. Hamon L'Estrange's Alliance of Divine Offices, sold by Brome,

⁷³Earl Miner, qtd. in Potter Secret Rites (1989) 34.

⁷⁴ Richard Brome, The Queenes Exchange, a Comedy (f. Henry Brome, 1657) "The Stationer to the Reader" A1[?]. The play was probably written for the King's Men in 1631 or 1632 (Catherine M. Shaw, Richard Brome [Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1980] 25).

⁷⁵ (f. A. Crook and Henry Brome, 1659; B4872).

was the culmination of a five year pamphlet skirmish between Roger L'Estrange's more moderate father and the Laudian divine Peter Heylyn over L'Estrange's Reign of King Charles (1655).

Royalist writing and publishing during the dark days of the Interregnum had helped maintain strong professional, religious and political ties. "'Tis hoped," suggests Alexander Brome in the Rump collection of Interregnum verse, that the poems "did His Majesty some Service, 'twas for that end they were scribbled."⁷⁶ The new Restoration order presented new raisons d'être for Royalist publishing. So Charles Cotton reminded the Court that

although our hands were manacled from the service of Your cause, and our feet fettred from the pursuit of Your fortunes, yet our hearts went along, and were wounded with every impious stroke that was made to the danger of Your Sacred Majesties life, or to the prejudice of Your Royal Interest.⁷⁷

What these writers represented as political powerlessness had been mitigated by their mutual encouragement in artistic endeavour. Writing and publishing encouraged group identification among Cavaliers by establishing and reinforcing a political, personal and artistic fraternity

⁷⁶ Rump: Or an Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times (f. Henry Brome and Henry Marsh, 1662) [A3^v]. On Cavalier poetry, see Earl Miner Cavalier Mode (1971), Potter Secret Rites (1989), and Dolores Palermo, "The Halcyon Moment of Stillness in Royalist Poetry," Huntington Library Quarterly 44(1981): 205-221.

⁷⁷ A Panegyrick to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty (b. Tho. Newcombe, 1660; C6387)
3. A contemporary claimed that Cotton's contribution to the newly-restored monarchy was "the worst Panegyrick that ever was writ" (John Buxton, The Poems of Charles Cotton [London: Routledge and Kegan Paul: 1958] xxv).

which was "sensitive to the arts."⁷⁸ During the Interregnum their writing identified them with Charles Stuart while allowing them to remain in England largely unthreatened directly by political events and the punitive attention of authorities. Now, with the return of Charles Stuart, their existing publishing networks could be employed to strengthen personal ties with his Court.

Commendatory verses and panegyrics written to Charles II served both to redefine the monarchy and to reestablish the position of their Royalist authors.⁷⁹ While the poems glorified the Court, their subjects and sentiments situated Cavaliers in the nascent political order. Henry Brome published many of these ephemeral verse forms, most of which are characterized by the narrow hyperbole of Henry Bold's several contributions:

Thus Upper-Jove (once) when secur'd, and free
From Heaven-assayling-Giantomachie,
Conver'd the gods, at his commanding call,

⁷⁸ Butler Theatre and Crisis (1984) 10. Butler contends that the commendatory verse was developed as royalist propaganda (9). For the genre's earlier history see Franklin B. Williams, jr. "Commendatory Verses: The Rise of the Art of Puffing," Studies in Bibliography 19(1966) 1-15.

⁷⁹ Alexander Brome had a prolific career as a writer of commendatory verses. He wrote letters for Izaak Walton's second edition of The Compleat Angler (1655), the 1652 edition of Richard Brome's A Joviall Crew (f. E[dward] D[od] and N[athaniel] E[kins]), the 1653 edition of his Five New Plays (f. Humphrey Moseley, Richard Marriot, and Thomas Dring), and to his 1659 edition of Five New Plays (f. Andrew Crook and Henry Brome), and to Henry Bold's 1664 Poems (f. Henry Brome). Richard Brome, who died before the Restoration could allow him retrospectively to confirm his alliances, contributed to Thomas Jordan's 1637 edition of Poeticall Varieties (b. T. C[otes] f. H. Blunden). Alexander Brome received commendation both from Walton and (probably) from Brathwaite, the former included in all three editions of his Songs, the latter in the last two. On Restoration panegyric see C. Edie, "The Popular Idea of Monarchy on the Eve of the Stuart Restoration," Huntington Library Quarterly 39(1975-6): 344-63.

Like Charles and's Peers, at George's Festival.⁸⁰

Panegyrics rebuilt the seats of the Stuarts in the celestial sphere, in part by employing extended metaphors to compare the king to the sun or, as Bold does here, to the gods.⁸¹ Commendatory verse and panegyric contributed to the cohesion of Royalist literary figures among themselves and with the exiled and newly returned Court, and helped in the maintenance and reconstruction of the arcana imperij.

Charles Cotton, the most artistically talented of this early group of Brome acquaintances, also maintained the longest and most prolific association with the Brome family, who sold almost his entire oeuvre.⁸² Cotton's own family had extensive ties to an earlier generation of English poets and essayists. The association of his father, the elder Charles with Jonson, Herrick, Donne, Selden and others was augmented by the younger Charles's close ties with Walton, Lovelace and other Cavaliers. Richard Brome had dedicated the 1639 edition of Fletcher's Monsieur Thomas to Charles the elder. The posthumous edition of Alexander Brome's Poems (1668) contains a verse exchange between

⁸⁰ "St George's Day, Sacred to the Coronation of . . . Charles the II" Poems (1664) 207. Thomas Jordan offered an extended comparison between Charles and Christ: "He whom his Subjects would confound/ And crucifie, shall now be Crown'd." See his "March 16. 1661. An Advent to the Kings Coronation," A Royal Arbor of Loyal Poesie (b. R. Wood f. Eliz. Andrews, 1663) 25.

⁸¹ Bold writes: "So comes the Sun, after a half-years night,/ To the Be-numb'd, and Frozen Muscovite" ("To His Sacred Majesty Charles the II. At His Happy Return," Poems [1664] 205). See also his "On Hampton Court," Poems (1664) 228.

⁸²On Cotton see Ken Robinson, Charles Cotton: Selected Poems (Manchester: Carcanet New Press, 1983) 11-19.

Brome and Charles the younger, who contributed a long and friendly commendatory verse to Izaak Walton's 1675 edition of the Lives, as well as augmenting Walton's Compleat Angler with an important second part in 1676, to which in turn was appended a further commendatory letter by Walton. Brome's stock included Cotton's popular works, such as the three editions of the Compleat Gamester and the eleven versions of his translation of Virgil's Scarronides, which remained on Charles Brome's list through 1700.⁸³

Although such personal and party affiliation could affect the success of a seller, political engagement was seldom the sole driving force behind a seller's actions, nor was affiliation simple or absolute, except perhaps in the case of the most committed of sectarian sellers. For example, Nathaniel Ekins spent part of his early career distributing the irenic Dissenter work of Richard Baxter and might therefore be supposed to have maintained at least an affiliation with moderate Presbyterians. Again, however, the evidence suggests that Ekins sold his business to Henry Brome a few years prior to the Restoration and assumed immediately after 1660 the position of Court licenser for pedlars and dealers in chapbooks. Ekins' professional interests brought him into contact with Brome, and it brought him into contact with the restored Court. Whether or not Ekins agreed with Cavalier politics or Cavalier Parliament religion, his professional background qualified him to carry out the will of the Court in the book trades.

Just as Ekins's career warns us against drawing conclusions about professional and political interests too firmly, so too Henry Brome's career warns us against overemphasizing

⁸³ The Compleat Gamester (C6382-84). The popularity of Scarronides prompted Brome to have the tract entered in the Stationer's Register by Andrew Clarke in 1664 and 1665 (Eyre Stationers' Register [1950] 2: 339, 355).

on the dominance of the Cavalier connections. He did not maintain himself on the strength of his early patrons. In the first place, many of these Cavaliers had died or been dropped by Brome within three years of the Restoration. In the second place, Brome most often avoided the murky waters of political controversy by maintaining an open stock of religious and technical advice literature, along with the Cavalier texts mentioned above. Academic audiences read Ralph Johnson's The Scholars Guide, selections from Horace, and Christopher Simpson's musical oeuvre, along with other such texts as could be republished, unchanged, from existing publications.⁸⁴ A variety of Bishop Sanderson's cases of conscience, as well as Edward Sparke's Scintilla Altaris were republications of moderate Church of England Interregnum tracts, and Giovanni Bona's guides to Heaven, translated by L'Estrange, outlined conventionally pious spiritual bulwarks against sins such as gluttony.⁸⁵

⁸⁴ Henry and later Charles Brome published three of the four extant editions of this work, in 1677, 1679, and 1699 (J788-J790). Henry Brome published four editions of The Poems of Horace between 1666 and 1671 (H2781-H2783A), and another in 1680 (H2784). He published all but one of Simpson's seven musical works in 1665-68 and later in 1678 (S3809-S3811, S3814).

⁸⁵ Brome stocked three collections of Robert Sanderson's cases of conscience, each in two editions, in 1666-67, 1674, 1678 and 1685 (this last bears Charles Brome's imprint) (S598-598A, S603-604, S618-619). The Bromes were involved in the production of eight of the 13 various editions of Sparke's work (S4805B, S4809, S4810, S4811-4814), and this involvement ranged from financing to selling. Henry Brome published editions of Bona's work in 1672 (B3551), 1678 (B3553) and 1680 (B3545). Very broad alliances could be formed to produce and distribute large or very popular works. For example, in 1671 Henry Brome joined an early 'conger' with a large number of sellers of various factions to produce a 700-page edition of Sanderson's sermons (S635), from a copyright owned by Seile. The group included eminent Stationers George Sawbridge, Richard Chiswell, and Benjamin Tooke, as well as the nonconformist sellers Elaine Brewster and John Starkey, the law book specialists John Place and Thomas Basset, along with John Martin, Thomas Williams, Robert Horn, John Wright, and Robert Boulter.

Technical advice literature ranged from cards and maps to Edmund Wingate's contribution to the reestablishment of monarchical law and order in the new regime, The Exact Constable, which organized and epitomized the "Originall and Power" in all cases falling under the jurisdiction of the Justice of the Peace.

This overview of Brome's stock suggests that contrary to the published literature of the Restoration (which seldom mentions Brome except in terms of his relationship with L'Estrange), the bookseller maintained this strong and thriving business outside his political publishing. In 1679 he entered in the Stationers' Register a list of seventy-two titles, comprised of advice, instructional and light, occasional literature; this mass entry includes no texts by L'Estrange, nor were the Surveyor's writings entered separately. The few entries on behalf of Brome in the Register, other than the seventy-two entries of 1679, do not include any polemical texts. The evidence of the Register indicates how far Brome worked outside the Company but does not show the extent of his political involvement.⁸⁶ There are clear reasons for this. L'Estrange contributed little to published debates during his tenure as Surveyor of the Press.⁸⁷ Bereft as Brome was of the polemical contributions of his most

⁸⁶The editors of the transcripts of the Stationers' Company speculate that the large entry under Brome's name on 2 October 1679 "was perhaps made shortly after the death of Henry Brome, senr., by his son Henry" (93). In fact, Henry Brome had no son of the same name who worked as a seller. As suggested earlier, this entry is much more likely connected to his admission to the Company some 11 months earlier. It may also be precipitated by the expiry of the Printing Act in June or July 1679.

⁸⁷He published little, that is, with the exception of the Newsbook (1663-1666), an organ which, much more than his Observer, specialized in the dissemination of the least controversial 'news.'

prolific partner during this sixteen-year period, he established a reputation as a successful general bookseller.

However, during the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis, Henry Brome again divided his activities, this time between publishing propaganda and maintaining the traditional stock that was entered en masse in the Register the year following his admission to the Company in 1678. This later period, however, differed from his early years as a party publisher. Specifically, Brome's established reputation allowed him to admit his allegiances, through his imprint, to the Court and to L'Estrange, and thus against the Company. Although he suffered vilification and personal attacks for this strategical manoeuvre, by 1679 Brome's career was strong enough both as a general seller and as a major representative of the Royalist factions that he could maintain an open allegiance to L'Estrange and still thrive within a profession considered largely unsympathetic to Court interests. But by then the market for ephemera was well established, and Brome's name sold texts.

Henry Brome died in 1681, leaving his bookselling business to his wife, Joanna. She, in her turn, passed on the legacy to Charles in 1683. Charles Brome transformed the Brome enterprise into one against which neither Stationer nor Court authority could ever find fault. The business passed on to Charles Brome was established, however, on the relationships his father maintained with Roger L'Estrange and members of the Cavalier community in England. If it was born with the Cavaliers, Brome's ventures flourished on a combination of political patronage and professional acuity. Although clearly a supporter of Court interests, Brome seemed seldom to mistake the benefits of an active and engaged bookselling public.

He flourished in a public sphere that encouraged his particular blend of public and personal interests.

Chapter 4

Rhetoric and Interests

Seventeenth-century polemicists, in order to undercut opposition arguments, commonly accused their enemies of using rhetoric.¹ Since these accusations were often embedded in rhetorically sophisticated texts, it was necessary that writers distinguish their own practice from that of the opposition. This usually involved the claim that the accused dissimulated for the sake of personal advantage. The potency of the charge lay as much in the motive as in the act. Thus one's enemies dissimulated, but dissimulated because they hoped to gain personally from the act, not because they hoped, for example, to protect the right of succession of the Duke of York.

The debates that comprise a significant part of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis of 1678-81 offer evidence of the widespread indirection in Restoration texts. Despite the very real dangers faced by those who were implicated by Oates and other witnesses, Kitchin notes

¹Debora Shuger notes that "Under Elizabeth and James, Puritans accused High Churchmen of using rhetoric, a charge which the latter denied; after the Civil War, Anglicans directed the same accusation against the Dissenters, a charge again rejected" (Sacred Rhetoric: The Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance [Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988] 3).

that "the Plot was almost as much a matter of lying Narratives and Pamphlets as actual trials and executions, and . . . the Government was as much moved by the former as by the latter."² Due to generic constraints writers active on polemical issues between 1678-1681, especially those producing narratives of the plot, had at their disposal a limited number of themes and a limited vocabulary. Dissimulation served to shift the meaning and acceptability of terms within this lexicon, such as 'free-born', 'Cavalier', and 'association'. As Royalists and other factions had done before the Restoration, writers exploited popular words and phrases, stretching them to encompass opposing moral valuations. L'Estrange opened his Further Discovery of the Plot, for example, by 'admitting' that

the Kings Witnesses have ventur'd as far, and done as much as men could do . . . to make out the Truth of a Damnable, and Hellish Popish Plot upon the Life of his Sacred Majesty.³

L'Estrange did not believe in the existence of the Popish Plot as Oates described it. In this quotation L'Estrange insinuates that the "Damnable, and Hellish Popish Plot," being described is not just any plot. It is the "Damnable, and Hellish" plot. L'Estrange recasts these particular adjectives, often used to excoriate Catholic mysteries, to build a connection between the plot and Oates. L'Estrange uses the same strategy he had used against Dissenters in the early 1660s. Then he had explained that "coupling" two concepts together linguistically, such as "Popery and Prelacy," permitted writers "tacitly [to] instil . . . the same Disaffection to the one, which the people had to the other."⁴ So too, coupling

²Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange [1913] 234.

³Further Discovery of the Plot . . . Drawn from . . . Oates (1680) 1.

⁴Memento . . . The First Part (1662) 17.

"Damnable and Hellish"--anti-Catholic adjectives--with Oates's version of an anti-Stuart plot, invited readers to associate Catholic duplicity with Oates's duplicity. "Damnable, and Hellish" come to mean *the* "Damnable, and Hellish Popish Plot," one which no longer has credibility for readers familiar with the debate. This is Oates's plot, one which is largely his fabrication.⁵

From the relative safety of his position in 1687, L'Estrange excused his own "Coasting, and Slanting, Hinting, and Trimming" on the grounds that it was "the Best Office a body could Perform in That Season." He continues by sketching the method of this equivocation:

A little Skirting now and then upon the Narratives; and Bantering, betwixt Jest and Earnest, . . . gave people, by Little and Little, to Understand, as much as any man could Safely Communicate.⁶

The dangers L'Estrange here insinuates are difficult to characterize. Certainly he had enemies who implicated him briefly in the Plot. He was called to appear before the House of Commons on 6 November 1680. Several other individuals were sacrificed to the combination of fact and fiction that comprised the Plot itself. L'Estrange's confession reveals, however, more than the prospect of imprisonment or exile. As much as he feared for his safety, he feared for his career and status as Court apologist. Had he admitted, for example, that his published attacks against Titus Oates were motivated by professional pride

⁵On dissimulation and vocabulary, see Steven Zwicker, "Language as Disguise: Politics and Poetry in the Later Seventeenth Century," *Annals of Scholarship* 1.3 (1980) 55.

⁶*Brief History of the Times* (1687) 39. L'Estrange's joco-serious method derives from an earlier generation of pamphleteers; it had been employed, for example, by Marchamont Nedham in his *Interregnum* journalistic efforts on the side of Parliament (see Worden "'Wit in a Roundhead'" [1995] 307-308).

and personal animosity as much as by ideological disagreement, L'Estrange's authority, and thus the authority of his tracts against Oates, would have suffered in consequence.

In the same text where L'Estrange admits to "Coasting and Slanting" for the sake of personal safety, the retired Surveyor vilifies "the Sin, as well as the Scandal, of Irreverent, and Contemptuous Innuendo's."⁷ There are two sides to this anxiety about dissimulation and other forms of rhetorical indirection. L'Estrange deprecates the practice, counterpoising it with an ideal of simple, clear and unadorned truth. But he also acknowledges the need for elaborately constructed and persuasive arguments. Whether his "Coasting" was motivated by personal or party anxieties, he here implicitly condemns his own rhetorical practice. The ideal of pure and clear expression coexists with the belief that personal interests can best be served through rhetorical manipulation.

When writers rail against the use of rhetoric during this period, it is most often the practices of dissimulation or equivocation that bear the brunt of the attack.⁸ An equivocal word or phrase as a "Logical term," was defined simply as "having a double signification, or whole sense and meaning [that] may be taken either way."⁹ Moved from the realm of logic to that of rhetoric, the practice of equivocation absorbed pejorative associations. Widely thought of as a Jesuit strategy, to equivocate meant "To speak or answer with a secret

⁷A Brief History of the Times (1687) 3.

⁸Quentin Skinner argues that the century as a whole suffered from an anxiety arising from the humanist revival of the classical art of eloquence. He concentrates on the rhetorical strategy of amplification ("Moral Ambiguity and the Renaissance Art of Eloquence," Essays in Criticism 44 [1994] 269).

⁹Edward Phillips, The New World of English Words, 2nd. ed., (b. E. Taylor, f. Nathaniel Brooke, 1662) O2[?].

meaning reserved in ones own minde, which peradventure the hearers do not understand."¹⁰
 It is this negative valuation of equivocation which lay at the root of the Restoration anxiety over published debates.

A survey of Restoration arguments suggests that their "problem of ambiguity" was "too intractable to be solved within the framework of . . . existing linguistic resources." Contemporary rhetorical manuals (which were experiencing rising popularity) cast this ambiguity in classical terms. Church and state institutions provided few absolute interpretations. The monarch (who was offered as an authority, by Hobbes for example) was no more transcendent than the church hierarchy.¹¹ Writers struggled to establish an authority which could stand as a measure of the truth of an assertion outside the 'existing framework' Skinner describes.¹² Consequently, writers of plot narratives adopted a particular authorial stance, and a particular kind of narrator: one characterized by self-denial on one hand, and a high moral tone on the other. Classical rhetorical manuals provided models of the ethical orator, and L'Estrange was especially interested in the Ciceronian model, as his 1680 translation of Tully's Offices shows. This ideal of the good or virtuous orator harmonizes the external needs and responsibilities of the individual with his or her internal impulses. Thus a virtuous person "will not only fear to Do, but not dare so much as to Think any thing

¹⁰John Bullokar, An English Expositour (b. John Field, 1667) [D7].

¹¹Hobbes was aware of this practice, and shared this century's concern over the influence of humanist rhetoric (Skinner "Moral Ambiguity" [1994] 269).

¹²For Christians such as Augustine, God served as the "Ultimate to which any particular matter of controversy might be . . . reduced" (Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives [Berkeley: U of California P, 1969] 76).

which he would not frankly own in Publique."¹³ The virtuous person can integrate external pressures, allegiances and professional obligations with his or her spirit. For the good person, duty and conscience integrate naturally. The test of a good person, then, is to ask

How many things are done out of Avarice, Ambition, Pride, Lust, that no body knows of, or so much as suspects? Suppose that this Impiety could be kept so secret, that neither God nor Man should come to know it. Would you commit it?¹⁴

The century's overwhelming concern with interests, motives, and intentions, and the tendency to polarize complicated arguments fostered in many readers an ideal of moral transparency and psychological consistency. The development of the public sphere, the professionalization of the writing trades and the conflicting interests this engendered prevented many polemicists from offering themselves to their readers as models of consistency. However, the authority of the ephemeral text came often to depend on the character of the author/narrator, owing to the instability of church and state hierarchies. Since he or she acted as the source of authority for the text, this author/narrator suffered a barrage against his or her personal reputation and a scrutiny of his or her most secret motivations:

if we could but see the secret motives that influenced the men of name and learning in the world, and the leaders of parties, we would not always find that it was the embracing of truth for its own sake, that made them espouse the doctrines they owned and maintained.¹⁵

¹³Cicero, Tully's Offices. In Three Books, trans, Roger L'Estrange, 5th edition (f. Henry Brome, 1680) 182.

¹⁴ Cicero Tully's Offices (1699) 146.

¹⁵John Locke, Essay Concerning Human Understanding, qtd. in Mark Goldie, "John Locke and Anglican Royalism," (1983) 81.

Even as evolving concepts of interest fuelled the distrust of motive, they provided a vocabulary for the expression of these anxieties. It was during the Restoration that interest theory "ripened into theoretical significance" in England, and

the analysis of society in terms of interest and an increased awareness of the social implications of self-interest . . . were related to each other in the closest way.¹⁶

While polemicists might debate the individual's place and rights, they also self-consciously used the language of interest, and especially the vocabulary of self-interest, to impugn one another's reputations. They accused one another of writing either for money or on behalf of party (which came close to the same thing). "[T]here's a Club to his Pen," asserts L'Estrange of Marvell, "as well as to his Pocket."¹⁷ This distrust of motive encouraged, in turn, the idealization of the ethical narrator. The motives of Cavaliers, self-described as above the public sphere, were particularly vulnerable to attack when they vied for position through the ephemeral press. Many a call for civic obedience was combined with a bid for personal reward.

Since rhetoric on behalf of party was rhetoric for self-interest under another guise, narrators either denied employing it on their own behalf or denied employing it at all. Accusations of rhetorical persuasion were often set up in opposition to "Words Delivered with simplicity and Candour," the "common Speech," or the "One plain Truth."¹⁸ Joseph

¹⁶Gunn Politics and the Public Interest (1969) 153.

¹⁷An Account of the Growth of Knavery (f. Henry Brome, 1678) 5.

¹⁸Roger L'Estrange, Considerations Upon a Printed Sheet, Entitled the Speech of the Late Lord Russel (b. T.B., f. Joanna Brome, 1683) 45, 41, 32. According to the recollection of Samuel Parker, Parliament had "so familiarly accustomed themselves to . . . monstrous lies that at the first opening of Oates' Plot, they with a ready and easy credulity received all his fictions: for whatever he published, they had long before expected" (qtd. in Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange

Glanvill prescribed "plainness" in sermons, which he claimed "is for ever the best eloquence."¹⁹ His calls for "genuine and proper representation" assume that a naked truth did exist, and that it could be communicated through language.²⁰ It was to this end that Glanvill and other members of the Royal Society were famously encouraged by Thomas Sprat to prefer the "language of Artizans, Countrymen, and Merchants, before that, of Wits, or Scholars."²¹ The narrator of L'Estrange's History of the Plot, a "Compiler" rather than a rhetorician, lays before his readers "the naked state of things," "opposing Authentick Records to wandring Rumours."²²

Writers are accused of dissimulating for "Unrighteous and Self ends" or for the sake of party. One of its most dangerous effects, though seldom its end, is the manipulation of the "people" against authority. Marvell's "Appeal to the Rabble" will yield a "General Tumult."²³ In the pulpit, complained Glanvill, rhetoric has "put many conceited people upon meddling with what they can never well understand, and so hath . . . made them . . . troublesome; [and] disobedient to their Governours."²⁴ L'Estrange agrees that when

[1913] 225n).

¹⁹[Joseph Glanvill], An Essay Concerning Preaching: Written for the Direction of a Young Divine (b. A.C. f. Henry Brome, 1678) 25.

²⁰Glanvill Essay (1678) 60.

²¹Thomas Sprat, The History of the Royal-Society of London (b. T.R., f. J. Martyn and J. Allestry, 1667) 113.

²²History of the Plot (1679) [A2^v].

²³Account of the Growth of Knavery (1678) 4.

²⁴Glanvill Essay (1678) 19-20.

heightened rhetoric holds the imagination of the populace, as it did during the Popish Plot, reason is abandoned, "We . . . come to govern ourselves by Dreams, and Imaginations; We make every Coffee-house Tale an Article of our Faith." Instead of relying on "the protection" provided by external "Lawful Authority," authority is lodged in the texts themselves, and

every Mercenary Scribler shall take upon him to handle matters of Faith, and State; give Laws to Princes; and every Mechanique sit Judge upon the Government.

The distrust of the orator, then, was based on a distrust of motive. More immediately, writers feared the anarchy that a successful orator with a sympathetic audience could provoke.

If the dangers of heightened rhetoric had been amply demonstrated by the anarchy of the Interregnum, however, so had the potency of this language. Writers knew the power of sophisticated rhetoric to achieve personal gain. The narrator of L'Estrange's Interest Mistaken (1661) concludes the text's accusations against political Presbyterians by admitting that "I dare not trust my self further with my own thoughts, and yet I take them to be such as very well consist with [my] . . . Duty."²⁵ The apparent contradiction between thoughts that "consist with . . . Duty" which he nonetheless "dare[s] not trust" himself to articulate illustrates L'Estrange's struggle to establish his membership among the Cavaliers while concurrently promoting his own personal interests. The tension between the idealized public character of a Cavalier and the private character of an individual often animates Restoration texts. This conflict between public duty and private interest shapes L'Estrange's polemical

²⁵Interest Mistaken (1661) [A4^v].

strategy. Few polemical texts escaped addressing the apparently unresolvable tension between that which could and could not be publicly admitted. L'Estrange concludes his preface to his Caveat to the Cavaliers by insinuating against "such . . . as have contracted Interests of their own, that Crosse the Publique: of whom I shall say no more, for Reasons best known to my self."²⁶ For reasons motivated by private interest, known only "to my self," he accuses others of his own crime, which is keeping secret the "Interests of their own, that Crosse the Publique."

The conflict between self and others' interests makes itself felt especially in polemical texts, but also on the stage. The two impulses of Restoration protagonists, whether dramatic characters or the narrators of prose, are to argue sincerity of intention and to manipulate the response of the audience. Restoration drama emphasizes pathos rather than judgment, concentrating on the response elicited in the audience rather than on the process of reason in the orator. This devalues the analysis of character, replacing the self-examination which characterizes the best drama of the earlier age with the response of the audience as the "determining formal principle" of tragedy.²⁷ In the dramatic theory of the Restoration, "writers to an astonishing degree define genre solely in terms of effects--one might say supposed effects--wrought upon the audience."²⁸ The orator is judged strictly by his or her

²⁶A Caveat to the Cavaliers (1661).

²⁷On the connections between polemics and the stage, see Appendix.

²⁸Hume, Development of English Drama (1976) 151. On Restoration and eighteenth-century theories of the effect of drama on audience see Baxter Hathaway, "The Lucretian 'Return Upon Ourselves' in Eighteenth-Century Theories of Tragedy," PMLA 62 (1947): 672-689; Earl R. Wasserman, "The Pleasures of Tragedy," ELH 14 (1947): 283-307; A.O. Aldridge, "The Pleasures of Pity," ELH 16 (1949): 76-88.

ability to persuade the audience. Keeble argues that the "whole energy of the Restoration protagonist is devoted to the effort to persuade."²⁹ "Self-examination" would reveal conflicting loyalties and motives, an admission impossible in the cultural climate of the Restoration for any but the most private of texts.

While protagonists' speeches focused on persuasion, however, contemporary dramatic theory suffers from what Robert Hume characterizes as "a disturbing vagueness about the connections between play and spectator: the process by which the play is supposed to affect spectators remains unclear." Nonetheless, he argues, "This idea, that arousing emotion is the immediate aim of every writer of tragedy, is widespread."³⁰ The problem of defining the nature of persuasion in drama offers an analogue to the problem of acknowledging conflicting interests in political life. The ideals of "unified" character representation handicapped dramatists struggling to create credible tragic characters who could also appeal to Restoration audiences accustomed to interpreting language in terms of interests. The playhouse can not be considered separately from other spheres that discouraged the articulation of conflicting motives and desires. Protagonists, like many narrators, were mistrusted by other characters and the audience. Audiences, too, assumed that self-interest was the primary motivating factor behind the actions of protagonists and that these and other interests were irrevocably in conflict. Characters would not be credible so long as the unified character, the ethical protagonist, remained the public and dramatic ideal. It was at least partially due to political realities, concedes a modern critic, that dramatists writing in the late 1670s

²⁹Keeble The Literary Culture of Nonconformity (1987) 217.

³⁰Hume Development of English Drama (1976) 154.

could no longer supply an admirable heroic protagonist, complete with his neat list of Platonic or epic virtues, and hence, they could no longer produce the straightforward character assessment that had marked the prime of the heroic action.³¹

L'Estrange's earliest struggles to represent his past and build his present career as a balance between private and public interests set the stage for the split narrator who equivocates during the literary battles of the late 1670s and early 1680s.

At the beginning of June 1660, one month after the landing of Charles II, L'Estrange published his first long text, that collection of most of the broadsides and short tracts he had contributed to the debates surrounding the Restoration, L'Estrange His Apology. This collection comprises two parts: an extended preface, in which he describes his reasons for publishing the collection, and the collection itself,³² where the editor, who is the Cavalier L'Estrange, places each of the approximately twenty pamphlets in historical context. L'Estrange His Apology recounts equally L'Estrange's personal history and the events of recent public history. He attempts to control the audience's reception of the pamphlets reproduced in the collection, to fill the gaps, and to place his texts in a personally advantageous context. In order to control his audience's interpretation, "To make . . . [his] medly lesse Intolerable," L'Estrange admits that he "Inserted some Cohærences of Story, and . . . Reduc'd all into an Orderly Relation."³³ In the new preface to a reissue of the text he further describes his editorial function:

³¹Brown English Dramatic Form (1981) 76.

³²The collected tracts were also published separately, as A Short View.

³³L'Estrange His Apology (1660) [B3].

To make the folly the more pardonable, I shaped it like a little Story, tracing the whole course of Affairs then in motion by the best Method I could give it, but for the Truth of what is there contain'd, I dare account.³⁴

The editor organizes disparate facts and renders events pardonable, and coherent. The turn of events, on the other hand, establishes L'Estrange's authority; he backed the right horse. L'Estrange's authority as a supporter of the monarchy renders his own shaping of the events of the past year pardonable. The presence of this editor moves the work away from history toward the realm of memoir, however, since L'Estrange chooses to include his own polemical contributions, decides what to omit, how to order the movement of past events, and purposefully and openly colours the past according to his own present needs. L'Estrange His Apology is thus exactly what the title advertises. The editor, in the preface, 'apologizes' for his presence in the text, necessary for coherence. However, he does not simply intrude for coherence. Although he does not admit this in this confession, the narrator attempts to build a bridge between his actions motivated by self-interest (the republished collection as a whole) and those putatively motivated by a desire for public good (the anonymous pamphlets themselves).

Most writers strongly denied that their writing could be motivated by self-interest. In fact, the connection between private and public interest was most often attempted through avowals of disinterest, a rhetorical strategy with venerable antecedents. The circulation of the texts themselves, however, often formed part of a bid for personal advancement. Avowals of disinterest had often to share limited space with personal calls for attention. In

³⁴A Short View (f. Henry Brome, 1660) [x]. This tract is a reissue of L'Estrange His Apology, with a new preface, and without No Blinde Guides, which had been appended to the first issue.

his response to L'Estrange's first published attack against him, for example, Edward Bagshawe would not "offer to answer one, who would faine be Answered, that he might appear Considerable. I will not . . . by taking any notice of him, suffer him to Rail himself into Reputation."³⁵ In the Apology L'Estrange claims never to write "but with a prime Relation to a Common good," and claims to have "Subjected all private Injuries, and Passions, to a Superior Principle of Publique Duty." However, "an Inward Shame, and Indignation" compels him to produce this particular narrative.³⁶ His earliest published text suggests no such conflict of motives. In his very personal vindication of his activities in the abortive uprising in Kent in 1649, the young L'Estrange, "Conscient of mine own Integrity," is "resolv'd to Iustifie it." He worries, in words conspicuous for their lack of disinterest, that his accusers "have not left one Atome of my Reputation without a Wound."³⁷ Concern for personal honour motivates the L'Estrange of the Vindication. The conflict between private and public interest did not confront him until the Restoration, when circumstances afforded him the opportunity for personal advancement. He could not expect reward, however, unless he established his place among the Cavaliers, then presented his case over and above the group among which he counted himself. He forged his character, so distinctive in the personal and ideological battles of the Popish Plot, in the conflicts provoked by his membership among these emergent royalists.

³⁵D.E. [Edward Bagshawe], A Second Letter . . . Containing Some Farther Animadversions . . . Together with a Brief Answer unto All that One L'S----- Intends to Write (n.p., 6 February 1662) 3.

³⁶L'Estrange His Apology (1660) [B1^v].

³⁷Roger L'Estrange, L'Estrange His Vindication, from the Calumnies of a Malitious Party in Kent (n.p., 1649) A2[^v].

The relationship between public and private interest is most often, in L'Estrange's work, cast in terms of the relationship between conscience and duty. L'Estrange's conscience, of course, is aligned to public rather than private or personal authority. He is impelled to debate not by "the Leaven of an Unquiet Humour," but according to "Conscience in the discharge of a sober and a seasonable duty to . . . [his] Prince and Country."³⁸ He "render'd my self odious" to nonconformists "according to . . . [his] Conscience and Duty."³⁹ He has no "other Motive," he claims, "than the sense of what he owes to the Publique, and to his Conscience."⁴⁰ Conscience has legitimacy as a motive, but only when this internal, personal impulse of the individual maintains a congruence with its external manifestation, duty or conformity. However, these two impulses, suggests L'Estrange, operate in conflict for nonconformists. In order to maintain membership in a community, nonconformists are forced to dissimulate or to conform. Conformity entails the sacrifice of their private interests to the interests of the community. L'Estrange can claim a natural identity between the two only by subordinating his individual will and spiritual nature to a secular obedience to external authority.

Public and private interests were not always at the centre of published debates. The personal debates between Edward Bagshawe and L'Estrange, for example, display an evidently personal animosity. Both writers' personal credibility and reputation (as opposed to their loyalty or party affiliation) were at stake, belying their hollow claims to be writing

³⁸The Reformed Catholique: Or, The True Protestant, 2nd ed. (f. Henry Brome, 1679) 7.

³⁹L'Estrange's Case in a Civil Dialogue Betwixt 'Zekiel and Ephraim 2nd ed. (f. Henry Brome, 1680) 32.

⁴⁰Reformed Catholique (1679) 2.

primarily on behalf of larger interests. Bagshawe, irascible Under Master of Westminster School before the Restoration and thorn in the side of the monarchy after, engaged his enemies with an unusually open personal bias. He admits his texts suffer from "those failings which necessarily cleave to the writings of every man who thinks himself wronged."⁴¹ Bagshawe knows and uses the vocabulary of public interest, claiming repeatedly to impugn the Upper Master of Westminster "in the behalf of my Successours"⁴²; "God forbid" he exclaims, "that I should preferre my Private Interest . . . before a Publick Good." Bagshawe may have struggled between the personal regard he claims for Busby and "the Duty I owe my Successours," but the repetitive, formulaic nods at public interest pale before vivid descriptions such as that of Busby's "procuring my staircase to be cut down, thereby to hinder my access unto my Chamber."

A gradation may be detected in these admissions of conflicting motives: quiescent Cavaliers used the press to advertise their longstanding and far-flung allegiances, especially if their activities during the Interregnum were unlikely to yield direct or immediate reward. Cavaliers early started defending their actions or introducing themselves in print, even if they were not directly advertising themselves to the Court. Bagshawe's histrionic attack on Busby, also born of "some things [that] may have been secretly insinuated unto my Prejudice, tending to Disparage and asperse my Life and Manners," may be extreme, but it

⁴¹Edward Bagshawe, A True and Perfect Narrative of the Differences between Mr. Busby and Mr. Bagshawe (b. A.M., 6 May 1659) [A2^v].

⁴²Bagshawe True and Perfect Narrative (1659) 10. He makes similar claims on pages 9, 11, and 13.

is not anomalous.⁴³ In the epistle to Clarendon, which prefaces the Memento, L'Estrange objects to a "Lash" directed at him by this same Bagshawe, and calls for the personal intervention of the Chancellor.⁴⁴ The political inactivity of many of the Cavaliers during the Interregnum fuelled their avowals of support once the Restoration was accomplished. A nascent conflict between L'Estrange's public and private interests is apparent in some of his earliest texts in defence of the re-established monarchy on behalf of the Cavaliers. He speaks for Cavaliers, in the name of "all persons that are well-affected to the established Government" in his first extended description of what, "Under this notion, (OUR SELVES) we understand." ⁴⁵ A Cavalier is a monarchist who behaves as though the Restoration regime were already firmly "Established." A Caveat to the Cavaliers, written by L'Estrange in furious response to James Howell's call for patient acceptance of adversity,⁴⁶ defines Cavaliers not only as "well-affected," but also as patient, loyal, as those who have borne their "Sufferings and Services"⁴⁷ motivated by the "single and changeless Principle of Loyalty, and Honour."⁴⁸ L'Estrange places himself conspicuously among these long-suffering

⁴³Bagshawe True and Perfect Narrative (1659) 31, 28, 13.

⁴⁴epistle A Memento . . . the First Part (1662) [A4].

⁴⁵Caveat to the Cavaliers (1661) 30.

⁴⁶J[ames] H[owell], A Cordial for the Cavaliers (s.b. Henry Marsh, 1661). L'Estrange's animus against his fellow Cavalier likely stemmed from Howell's success at the Restoration in securing himself a position. In February 1661 Howell received a free gift of £200. He was appointed, at £100 per annum, historiographer royal, "a place which is said to have been especially created for him" (Dictionary of National Biography).

⁴⁷Howell Cordial (1661).

⁴⁸Caveat (1661) 3. Kitchin suggests that the "peculiar offence of the work was that it came so soon after the King's Speech (8th May 1661) warmly recommending the Indemnity Act. From

Royalists: "He that concerns himself" with the trials of the Cavaliers, after all, "makes himself One of them." He has "steadily, and Positively employed all the Faculties, and Interests I had in the World" on behalf of the monarchy.⁴⁹ Impecunious, honest, loyal, Cavaliers are ranged against a "Court dangerously throng'd with Parasites."

In the response to these slights against Cavaliers L'Estrange begins to distinguish himself from other members of the community: "It troubles me exceedingly," he confesses to James Howell, "that You, and I, united by a Common Sense, and Tye of Duty, should so far differ about the manner of expressing it, as to dissent in Print." If Cavaliers are poor and loyal, they also betray an alarming tendency, suggests L'Estrange, toward inactivity. "It will require not only Constancie, but Skill, so to demean our selves, as to scape Oversights, and yet not dash upon Distemper." If L'Estrange shared the "Constancie" of the Cavalier community in recent history, to this constancy he claims to add his own personal "Skill," which is the political acuity he hopes will permit him "to scape Oversights." While reinforcing his place within the community, he sets himself apart from it by implication. "Our best part is to behave our selves with Clearnesse and Prudence; and honourably to Bear what we cannot honestly avoid: without mincing or palliating the Worst, or Looking into the Starrs for Better."⁵⁰ L'Estrange will adopt the Cavalier's "best part"; he is here bringing into focus the persona he intends to adopt both within and against the community. "[B]itter

Clarendon's remarks thereon . . . we infer that he half approved L'Estrange's indiscretion" (Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange [1913] 89n.).

⁴⁹L'Estrange His Apology (1660) 39[=5].

⁵⁰Caveat (1661) 9, 1-2, 30, 12-13.

reasons," never made explicit, motivate his writing.⁵¹ He will behave "honestly," and "honourably," as a Cavalier, but unlike others in the community, by implication, he will not excuse oversights, nor will he passively wait for restitution.⁵² By admitting he is actively engaged in the process of rebuilding Court culture, he reinforces his characterization of the other Cavaliers as apathetic, as passive. While he calls Cavaliers to arms to protect the nascent order, L'Estrange accuses them of inaction: "We live in an age of Treachery," he warns, "and it behoves us to be wary." But he finds Cavaliers "looking About, when we should look Forward; and Asleep, when we should be looking About us: as if a Good Game would Play it Self, and a Good Cause work alone."⁵³

L'Estrange circulates his Caveat against Howell in order to distinguish himself from other Cavaliers in the public sphere. Brilliantly composed, passionate, and articulate, the text forms part of L'Estrange's personal bid for advancement. While he accuses the "Cavalier" of apathy, he also impugns the members of the community to whom this epithet patently does not apply. He condemns material success, by strong implication that of Howell himself, when it is the result of sycophantic praises and "high flying Raptures, and large Epithetes." L'Estrange, on the contrary, "shall study to supply that want of Ornament, with

⁵¹A Caveat to the Cavaliers (3rd ed; f. Henry Brome, 21 August 1661). This is the first edition to be acknowledged by L'Estrange. "They talk as if they meant to question the Author of [the earlier editions]. . . ; wherefore for Brevity-sake, this Impression shall wear his Name" [A2^v].

⁵²L'Estrange's enemies would later put a different emphasis on his activities during this early period, claiming that "No sooner was that Blissful Change [i.e. the Restoration], but our Observator first endeavour'd to set the old Cavaliers at Variance . . . [and] as far as he durst snarl'd at the Court and Chief Ministers for not preferring himself . . . as well as others" (The Loyal Observator [1683] 8).

⁵³Caveat 3rd ed. (1661) A3[^v].

Zeal, and Reverence."⁵⁴ Sobriety and reverence in opposition to empty hyperbole, sharp cunning in opposition to open allegiance, respect for the power of the published word: armed with these qualities and insights L'Estrange claims to be particularly equipped to do battle against the "Popular contempt, and the Infamous lash of every daring Libell."⁵⁵

The circulation of the Apology and A Short View also advertise L'Estrange's peculiar talents for the role he has assigned himself. In this text, the tension between the private and the (originally) public function of the propaganda do not compromise the reliability of the editor, because the public function of the texts reproduced in A Short View has been transformed into an open bid for personal reward. L'Estrange openly expects that the collection and republication of his late-Interregnum propaganda will advantageously position him among Cavaliers and others seeking recompense for late Interregnum support of Charles Stuart. His "Ambition seeks only that Allowance of my Actions, which I Deserve."⁵⁶ Publicly he proposes to act as the voice and the pen of party, to adopt and disseminate the doctrine of deferential politics. At this point there is no necessary conflict between L'Estrange's private interests and his public duty on behalf of the state. As personal vindication, this text positions L'Estrange the individual against Howell and other potentially "successful" Cavaliers. Publicly, the texts in A Short View had served literally to "Imprint Honest Notions in the People . . . [and] to direct the Seasonable Execution" of those

⁵⁴This is certainly a jab at Howell's Restoration panegyrics.

⁵⁵Interest Mistaken (1661) [A4^v].

⁵⁶L'Estrange His Apology (1660) [B2^v].

notions.⁵⁷ It looks outward at the past, inward at the present. The texts served originally to point their readers in one political direction, treating them as a homogeneous group. The propaganda reproduced in A Short View conforms to the persuasive function of rhetoric, "intended only for the Plain, Honest businesse of disposing the Common People to their Obedience."⁵⁸ But when the deliberative texts are reproduced as part of A Short View, controlled by the narrator's point of view, they become part of his personal history. The introspective turn of the additional preface, by contrast, defines L'Estrange's place among the Cavaliers.⁵⁹ The larger text, with preface and controlling narrative, serves complementary private and public functions.

While polemicists and other popular writers second-guessed one another's motives, the ideal of the ethical orator recommended by rhetorical manuals remained elusive. Classical theories of rhetoric suggested to Renaissance writers three possible relationships between orator and audience, and by extension, between writer and reader.

Isocrates depicted the orator as taking his moral tone from his audience. . . . Plato sought to detach his orator from any audience at all . . . [and] Cicero implies that the audience will take their moral tone from the orator.⁶⁰

Early Renaissance English texts on rhetorical theory adopted the Ciceronian model, which stressed the ethical function of the orator. "Suche a force hath the tongue," argued Thomas

⁵⁷L'Estrange His Apology (1660) [B2^{r-v}].

⁵⁸L'Estrange His Apology (1660) [B3^r].

⁵⁹With the exception of his unsuccessful activities on behalf of monarchist forces in King's Lynn, L'Estrange's support of the exiled king, like that of the Cavalier poets, was based largely on writing.

⁶⁰Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present (Boston: St. Martin, 1990) 33.

Wilson in 1553, "and such is the power of eloquence and reason, that most men are forced euen to yelde in that, whiche most standeth againste their will." Rhetoric served primarily to convince hearers.⁶¹ The primacy of logic, based in a belief in natural reason, encouraged a simple process of instruction or persuasion by the ethical narrator (the orator) of the audience. The pedagogical function of rhetoric on a Ciceronian model privileges the knowledge of the orator over that of the audience. The art is "compiled together, by the learned and wise men, that those whiche are ignorant, might iudge of the lerned; and labour . . . to follow their workes accordyngly."⁶² The orator teaches; if the oratory is successful, the hearer listens, and is persuaded. Since he or she has so much power, the moral character of the orator is of central importance.

If Wilson admired the hypnotic power of the ethical orator, at the other end of the spectrum sat, for example, the 1681 edition of Hobbes' Art of Rhetoric. The anonymous editor of this edition ignores altogether the possibility of constructing an ideal or ethical narrator, in favour of a narrator constructed according to the expectations and desires of the audience, built according to its interests. The narrator explains that "the Art of speaking, . . . by use of Common places of Probability, and knowledge in the manners and passions of Mankind, throu the working of Belief is able to bring about whatsoever Interest."⁶³ Interest

⁶¹Thomas Wilson, The Arte of Rhetorique, intro. Robert Hood Bowers (Delmas, N.Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1977) [10]. On Wilson's tract see Russell H. Wagner "Thomas Wilson's Arte of Rhetorique," Speech Monographs 27 (1960): 1-32.

⁶²Wilson Arte (1553) [17]. On the distinctions in Wilson's writings between logic and rhetoric see Thomas O. Sloane, Donne, Milton, and the End of Humanist Rhetoric (Berkeley: U of California P, 1985) 132-33.

⁶³Thomas Hobbes, The Art of Rhetoric, with a Discourse of the Laws of England (f. William Crook, 1681) [A3^v].

still lies at the heart of the rhetorical act, but it is interest disguised by the speaker's knowledge of the "manners and Passions of Mankind." Where Wilson assumed that the function of rhetoric is the persuasion through teaching of the "ignorant," this editor uses the vocabulary of interest to acknowledge that the function of rhetoric is to persuade for the sake of personal advantage, but through knowledge and overt manipulation of the audience's interests.

In 1659 the polemicist Marchamont Nedham had spelled out this same rhetorical model, and noted the interest relationship it assumed:

if a man state his own Interest aright, and keep close to it, it wil [sic] not lie to him or deceive him, in the prosecution of his Aims and ends of Good unto himself.

He argues first that fulfilled self-interest follows naturally from self-examination and self-knowledge. Though he avoids explicit mention of rhetoric, Nedham does imply that the self-knowing orator holds power over his or her audience, thereby positing the foundation of his view of eloquence:

If you can apprehend wherein a man's Interest to any particular Game on foot doth consist, you may surely know, if the man be prudent, whereabouts to have him, that is, how to judge his designe.⁶⁴

To "have" a person signifies, here, to judge design, or to understand motive. Motive is always based in self-interest. If this prescription applies to written as well as spoken discourse, understanding the interest which motivates a reader allows a writer to persuade, to "have," this reader. The writer's own motives remain hidden; he or she concentrates on those of the audience; he or she dissimulates. Once the interests of the audience have been

⁶⁴Interest will not Lie. Or, A View of England's True Interest (b. Thomas Newcomb, [17 August] 1659) 3.

determined, equivocation serves to formulate a writer's own self-interest as that of his or her audience.

Again, the increased concern with and admiration for rhetoric must be attributed at least in part to a renewed fear of popular participation in national politics. Just as rhetoric could persuade individuals to action, the nature of those actions themselves were cause for concern. "[A]ll their shifts" states L'Estrange, in one of his attacks against the witnesses of the Popish Plot, "are but so much Lime thrown in the People [sic] Eyes, to Blear, and Confound them that they may not distinguish Prelacy and Popery, Papists, and Church-Protestants, the One from the Other."⁶⁵ Since various authorities were nervous about popular participation, rhetoricians of the pulpit and propagandists claimed to use their talents precisely to prevent or subvert the efforts of oppositional rhetoricians. L'Estrange claims to respond to an "Invective Course of Liberty against both Church and the State, [which is] proceeding without any Check or Controll." In the midst of this revolution

I thought my self bound in Honour and Duty . . . to use the best means I could, either to Stop, or divert that Torrent . . . [of] Erroneous and Disloyal Positions, that were dayly Published, and imposed upon the Unskilful and Unwary Multitude, to the extreme Hazard and Dishonour of the State.⁶⁶

Such is the apology of L'Estrange, who excuses his heightened rhetoric on the grounds that he employed it on behalf of authority, for the sake of national peace.⁶⁷

⁶⁵L'Estrange's Narrative of the Plot (1680) 30. See also Account of the Growth of Knavery (1678) 10; Free-Born Subject (f. Henry Brome, 1679) 9.

⁶⁶L'Estrange His Appeal Humbly Submitted (1681) 24-25.

⁶⁷Of course nobody, including those he purported to represent, believed L'Estrange worked selflessly: "He is the most improper person in the World to combat the freedom of Scribling, or at least to pursue that Subject with so much virulence and bitterness of Spirit. For all the world will judg that to be Self-Interest in him, which would be thought real

Pulpit orators, too, claimed to work for the quiet of the kingdom. Joseph Glanvill, Anglican Divine and member of the Royal Society, in the title to his Essay Concerning Preaching: . . . Useful . . . for the People, in Order to Profitable Hearing, points to the connection between rhetoric (the subject of the tract) and the audiences toward which rhetoric is directed. Glanvill sees the preacher as a pragmatic instrument of social control. The oral appeals to the interests of his audience afford the passage to the audience's reason or understanding. "[P]ractical preaching" focuses on "convincing mens understanding that their interest is in their duty, and by this way endeavouring to influence their resolutions, and their practice."⁶⁸ Clarendon suggested that "if we can make it in their Interest to be good Subjects, they will not fail of being so."⁶⁹ Rhetoric appeals to private interest, and convinces auditors that "interest" and "duty" are, if not identical, at least mutually beneficial.

L'Estrange's practice suggests that talk of rhetoric was not confined to academic, literary or aristocratic spheres. If only a small segment of the London population found delight in Hobbes' Art of Rhetoric or other technical manuals, a wider range of readers or auditors might be engaged by the urbanity of Edward Phillips' Mysteries of Love and Eloquence or the ribald and satiric Whore's Rhetoric of Ferrante Pallavicino. Popular writers borrowed, unsurprisingly, the vocabulary of public and private interest to describe the goals of eloquence. In the realm of popular but non-partisan texts, prescriptions could be blunt: Pallavicino's Whore's Rhetorick argued that "Interest is the subject of this art; and

Sentiment in another" (The Portraicture of Roger L'Estrange [n.p., 1681] 16).

⁶⁸Wilbur Samuel Howell, Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700 (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1956) 37.

⁶⁹Second Thoughts (n.d.) 5.

what ever an insatiable avarice can either pretend to, or desire, may be included in the object thereof."⁷⁰ Popular manuals, too, highlighted the practical application of rhetorical strategies in the pursuit of private interests. "Rhetorique is a faculty" announced John Smith, "by which we understand what will serve our turn concerning any subject to win belief in the hearer."⁷¹ Most prescriptions more subtly explored the connection between private and state affairs. Royalists like Glanvill, as we saw, wrote about rhetoric as a method of popular control. He shared with Wilson the belief that rhetoric must remain strongly subordinate to logic, but the prime motive for the use of rhetoric, he argues, is persuasion to civic duty. "The foundation for good life" he writes, "must be laid in those principles, that promote, direct and incourage it, which the people must be frequently and plainly taught."⁷² To "promote, direct and incourage"--he assumes that the possessors of language or eloquence manipulate the opinions and movements of amorphous mass of those without.

The Ciceronian ideal of the ethical orator thus paled in popular rhetorical manuals before the possibilities inherent in a sophisticated and urbane control of language. Writers reassured readers that the surest way to achieve their own ends was by dissimulation and appeal to the interests of their audience. And their own ends comprised the perennial theme. The negative moral weight assigned to terms from the rhetorical lexicon was thus intimately tied to its ethical doublesidedness. Equivocation and dissimulation were perceived as both the cause and proof of this ethical duplicity. The whore's candid instructions to the hapless

⁷⁰[Ferrante Pallavicino], The Whores Rhetorick (f. George Shell, 1683) 39.

⁷¹John Smith, The Myserie of Rhetorique Unvail'd (b. E. Cotes f. George Eversden, 1657) 1.

⁷²Glanvill Essay (1678) 28-29.

Dorothea provides the proof: "you must . . . never fly any occasion of increasing your stock," she tells her protege. "and your whole life must be one continued act of dissimulation."⁷³ Edward Phillips suggests that, in the pursuit of pleasure, without "Artifices and Masteries together, with most subtil Conducts . . . a man cannot so well attain his ends."⁷⁴ Writers dissimulated for the sake of personal advantage. Audiences in turn assumed that writers dissimulated and thus did not trust these narrators as figures of authority, although these narrators remained at the centre of the texts.

Eloquence is dangerous. It demands a good and virtuous orator, an orator incompatible with a society founded in self-interest. In this community, rhetoric serves only the interests of the speaker; thus rhetoricians arguing for public virtue are particularly suspect. René Rapin argues, from a belief in the ethical responsibility of the orator, that the "degeneration" of rhetoric is a result of the degeneration of orators themselves: "We labour in the composition of Perfumes," he laments, "and our cares are only scrupulous in the disposition of Words,. . . whilst we neglect, out of a sloathful impatience, what goes to the essence of it."⁷⁵ "Reason," which comprises the "essence" of genuine rhetoric, "cannot inhabit but in a Spirit fine and penetrating: The rareness of such a Character is the reason that we find Eloquence so defective in the most part of those which make profession of it."⁷⁶ Of course, oppositional writers could not possess spirits fine and penetrating by their very

⁷³[Pallavicino] Whores Rhetorick (1683) 40.

⁷⁴The Mysteries of Love and Eloquence (f. N. Brooks, 1658) a2[7].

⁷⁵ René Rapin, epistle, Reflections upon the Eloquence of these Times (f. Richard Preston, 1672) [A5^{r-v}].

⁷⁶Rapin Reflections (1672) 19.

nature as oppositional. L'Estrange at his most charitable would suggest that the more convincing or popular an oppositional tract, the more likely that the tract is 'empty' rhetoric. Invoking the first book of Bacon's Advancement of Learning, he condemns Andrew Marvell's influential Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government on these grounds:

his Talent is that which the Lord St. Albans calls Matter of Wonder without Worthiness; being rather the Suppleness and Address of a Tumbler, than the Force and Vigor of a Man of Business.⁷⁷

Thus L'Estrange attacks Marvell's reputation, both as a Member of Parliament, and as the writer of such popular satire as The Rehearsal Transpros'd. Marvell's success becomes his failing. L'Estrange wants Marvell's contributions to be moved into the realm of rhetorical exercise without personal political commitment, thus removing them from the realm of the 'business' of propaganda in the print culture of the nation: "tell me next time I see you, whether he has not taken more Pains to Shew his Skill, than Care to Deliver his Opinion."⁷⁸ The ethical commitment of the orator provides the only measure of the legitimacy or authority of the written or spoken text. The ubiquitous employment of rhetoric for the sake of selfish ends has led to its abuse and, in natural consequence of this, to the scepticism of the audience.⁷⁹

⁷⁷Account of the Growth of Knavery (1678) 4.

⁷⁸Account of the Growth of Knavery (1678) 65.

⁷⁹"The nobleness of its end, and dignity of its use, is so little preserved in this vain and voluptuous Age, that it is no wonder to see it degenerated into a thing meerly superficial" (Rapin Reflections [1672] [A5]).

Polemical writers, too, speculated on the grounds for the contemporary distrust of rhetoric, both assigning it historical roots and tying it directly to the degeneration of the character of the orator. First, rhetoric could be used for its own ends, for the glory of the speaker, and not for the good of its hearers, as Glanvill complained of the "Orators, and Rhetoricians" of New Testament times, who "coveted the glory of being accounted eloquent; and when they were praised, they had their reward."⁸⁰ If rhetoric could be used for the glory of the speaker, then it could also achieve the wrong ends; it could promote the interest of party. Rhetoric on behalf of party was more pernicious, if possible, than its use for personal advantage, since appeal to party constructed an apparent external authority (the community) with which the orator and the audience could identify themselves. Marvell's "Mercenary Pen" serves "his principall's Animosity, as well as his Ambition."⁸¹ The external authority, the party, was not universal or transcendent; appeal to party was appeal to self-interest and was thus grounds for distrust of the motives of the orator.

Cavaliers had had trouble establishing their authority at the Restoration by associating themselves with the recently re-established monarchy. By 1679, writers could seldom establish their authority by traditional means at all. Social institutions were fighting for their own legitimacy. One increasing source of authority outside the text, however, was the culture of print itself. According to the system of print culture, Titus Oates published his narrative of the plot, in ornate folio, in part because he could thus "be credited with the heroic, Promethean act of having transferred this concealed information into print where it

⁸⁰Glanvill Essay (1678) 20[i.e. 22]-23.

⁸¹Account of the Growth of Knavery (1678) 6.

was available to all and could be properly assessed."⁸² Battles for the definition of public and private interest took place, in part, between and within polemical texts, their authors, publishers, and distributors. Polemicists such as Oates, Bedloe, and L'Estrange himself built their characters as authors, editors and narrators. Narrators and editors were closely identified with authors. To attack a text meant often to attack its writer. The ethical character these author/narrators managed to build and maintain influenced the direction of the political battles they purported to "report." On the other hand, the narrator and the protagonist remained integral to Restoration texts, operating as a major source of authority in an unstable society. Clarendon notes that, in the early Restoration, "all men were full of bitter reflections upon the actions and behaviour of others, or of excuses and apologies for themselves for what they thought might be charged upon them."⁸³ It was perhaps writers like L'Estrange that Clarendon remembered: writers who, while they wrote about their adventures as Cavaliers at the opening of the Restoration, helped erode the period's ideal of the ethical narrator.⁸⁴

But by 1679, when L'Estrange engaged in controversy with Titus Oates and the other witnesses to the Popish Plot, the narrator's function was entirely to represent the interests of the audience. Writers tried to deflect accusations of private interest by deflecting accusations

⁸²Love Scribal Publication (1993) 172.

⁸³Qtd. in Seaward Cavalier Parliament (1988) 217. On the internecine battles of the early restored Court see Seaward 217-35.

⁸⁴L'Estrange joins such writers as Marchamont Nedham whose careers survived major structural changes in the public sphere on the strength of their connection with the book trades. Surprisingly few of the writers who participated in the polemical mayhem of the Popish Plot cut their teeth, as L'Estrange did, on the debates surrounding the Restoration of the monarchy itself in 1660.

onto their enemies, and by proclaiming their own selfless will to public duty. A Further Discovery of the Plot (1680) is an ironic but clear attack on Oates' credibility as a Plot witness. L'Estrange writes as though there exists naturally a congruence between his own and the enlightened reader's interpretation of events, employing first-person plural pronouns to suggest that Oates' credibility depends directly on the credulity of L'Estrange and, by extension, of his audience:

We are yet assured, that . . . the Plot is still carried on with Confidence and Vigour. And this we have, even from those very Persons themselves that formerly wrought in the same Mine with the Conspirators.⁸⁵

'We' creates a community of belief that encompasses both the narrator and his audience.⁸⁶

The reader is encouraged to share the narrator's incredulity. Both narrator and audience are potential victims of Oates' incredible tales. The narrator's scepticism is offered as a moderate interpretation for all rational readers, while Oates is accused of being motivated by his own interest. The effectiveness of this rhetorical attack depends on the credibility of the narrator. Narcissus Luttrell notes the distinction: next to this entry on 23 January, 1680, Luttrell notes that "It pretends to be a further discovery &c but is rather a great abuse & affront to ye Dr."⁸⁷ Under the colour of writing about the Plot, L'Estrange writes about Oates' character, suggesting that evidence for the Plot depends substantively on the character of this inconsistent and privately motivated individual. Consistency remains the most sought-after virtue, and the most vulnerable. Oates' tendency to self-aggrandizement, his conversion

⁸⁵Further Discovery of the Plot, Drawn from . . . Oates (1680) 1.

⁸⁶On the process of identification between orator and audience, see Burke A Rhetoric of Motives (1962) 55-57.

⁸⁷Narcissus Luttrell, Popish Plot Catalogues, ed. F.C. Francis (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956).

from Catholicism and unsubstantiated claim to have been awarded a doctorate at Salamanca, all lend themselves to L'Estrange's scepticism: "we have the same Authority" for the Plot, L'Estrange suggests, as we have for Oates' personal and professional credentials.⁸⁸

In response to texts in the Further Discovery vein, which impugned the credibility of the witnesses by foregrounding inconsistencies in character, William Bedloe used the same rhetorical strategy as L'Estrange, mining L'Estrange's writing in order to "see what I can find how . . . good a Son Mr. L'Estrange hath proved himself . . . to his Mother the Church of England."⁸⁹ This ad hominem attack was not particularly successful, but its failure owed less to the strength of L'Estrange's reputation than to the quality of Bedloe's writing.⁹⁰ Other writers struck more successfully. After L'Estrange's flight at the end of 1680 he faced a barrage of attacks, most of an intensely personal nature.⁹¹ These created a range of effects. They enhanced his reputation, but only insofar as they acted as an impetus for some of his best-known work (most notably The Dissenter's Sayings), thus helping establish his place in the Court. They also broadened his exposure, since few polemicists entered the field of controversy without acknowledging his presence; thus, published attacks ensured his place in

⁸⁸Further Discovery . . . Drawn from . . . Oates (1680) 1.

⁸⁹B. W. [William Bedloe], An Additional Discovery of Mr. Roger L'Estrange his Further Discovery (n.p., 1680) 3.

⁹⁰Bedloe's tract is so impenetrable that L'Estrange fears Bedloe might be "Hir'd to write the Three Kingdoms asleep; and a Foreign Enemy, in the mean while [might] . . . come in, and catch us Napping" (Discovery Upon Discovery [f. Henry Brome, 1680] 1).

⁹¹They include such pieces as Mr. L'Estrange's Sayings (which prompted The Dissenter's Sayings, one of L'Estrange's most enduring works), An Hue and Cry after R.L.S., The Gyant Whipped with His Own Rod. Many of these followed L'Estrange into hiding at the end of 1680.

print culture. The question remains, however: what of the Cavalier character who had populated the pages of L'Estrange His Apology? The most common charges against him were of Catholicism or sympathy for Catholics, and of complicity in the Plot.⁹² L'Estrange's relative political constancy throughout his career, however, allowed him to return to London and resume his place and activities on behalf of conservative monarchists in the opening months of 1681. During the first half of the 1680s L'Estrange's private and public interests moved once again into alignment. His success stemmed from his dogged reiteration of some simple themes: that liberty of conscience, indeed all forms of religious dissent from the Church of England, was a religious mask for private interests. Even tyranny was preferable to the political pluralism which marked the Interregnum.

It is no coincidence that L'Estrange opens a text on rhetoric by acknowledging the tension between his own motives and the motives of others. There exists "a great Difference," he notes in Tully's Offices,

betwixt a Good Reason, for the doing of a thing, and the True Reason why the thing was done [W]e cover our Passions and our Interests under the Semblances of Virtue, and Duty.⁹³

Even as Restoration writers acknowledged that the primacy of private interests in others precluded the possibility of the good person speaking well, the authority of the writer, in the person of the narrator or editor, remained at the centre of successful persuasion. How, then, convincingly to present a political or religious argument to a heterogeneous and sceptical audience hardened against logical arguments by "the effect[s] of a Popular Licence and

⁹²See for example, Answer to the Appeal, Expounded (1680) 6-7.

⁹³L'Estrange, Tully's Offices. In Three Books, by Cicero (f. Henry Brome, 1680) [A2].

Appeal"?⁹⁴ Considering the personal and vituperative nature of contemporary debates, the embattled narrator could not help but be ethically suspect. But Thomas Sloane argues that the tensions in Renaissance rhetoric "showed us how, through its controversial mode of thought, to create *voice* on paper, how to create in writing the sense of a person speaking."⁹⁵ The voice or ethos so central to polemical texts emerged in the attempts of polemical writers using the press to influence political events both on their own behalf and that of faction or party.

Polemical writers, like dramatists, had difficulty creating and sustaining an ethical or whole character, since these characters/narrators carried the weight of the tension between public and private interests. Polemical writers engaged in the factional warfare of the late 1670s and early 1680s embodied this contradiction as well, denying private motives and vilifying adherence to party as the basest manifestation of private interest, even as they proclaimed themselves as the voices of parties, and worked on behalf of party often in the hope of reward. The ephemeral dialogue genre was well suited to deflecting the charges of inconsistency that plagued polemical writers. Dialogues allowed writers to avoid addressing the problem of the ethical or credible narrator. When writers gave voice and character to the opposition--especially when that voice and character was flattened or demonized as it tended to be in polemical dialogue--attention was deflected away from the polemicist him- or herself, onto the ideology of the opposition as it was represented by the polemicist.

⁹⁴History of the Plot (1679) A2[?].

⁹⁵Sloane Donne, Milton, and the End of Humanist Rhetoric (1985) 87.

Theatrical or otherwise powerful voices on paper distracted readers from inconsistencies in the author's own platform.

Chapter 5

Faction and Periodical Publications

Our Church-Warden never goes to Church without . . . [an Observer] in his Pocket, partly as an Antidote against Whiggism, but chiefly to read if the Ministers should chance to be Dull.¹

This chapter will trace L'Estrange's career as it moves away from engagement with Whigs and Dissenters toward an engagement with religious moderates, where he experienced partial defeat. As with all his published ventures on behalf of the House of Stuart, L'Estrange's work in this arena depended on a network of writers, sellers and authorities, at the centre of which stood the Brome family (in this case Joanna and her son Charles). The editorship of the Observer, begun two weeks after the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament in early 1681, was L'Estrange's most influential position. It represents one of the last sustained press efforts on behalf of the House of Stuart, "the Only Weekly Paper, that . . . Stood at Mark . . . for almost Six Years together, without so much as One

¹Several Weighty Quaeries Concerning Heraclitus and the Observer (f. Matthew Burdidd, 1681) 2.

Discontinuance,"² running without interruption until its forced cancellation in 1687.³ The experience and reputation of two decades were dedicated to this project. L'Estrange's tenure as author of the Observer spanned a vital phase of the establishment of the public sphere and party politics in London. He helped develop Whig, Tory, and especially Trimmer in the pages of the Observer, a newsbook that formed part of the vanguard of the early periodical press. In critical terms, however, L'Estrange's Observer work (especially after 1683) represents more an impasse than a culmination. The 'defeat' of the Whigs forced L'Estrange to engage political moderates, who were enemies more threatening to his career and less susceptible to his rhetoric than any opposition group he had yet faced.

These battles took place in the pages of the periodical Observer. Modern studies in the history of journalism assume that newsbooks developed in England in the second half of the seventeenth century, experiencing their first flourish during the Civil Wars. Many assume, however, that this radically political origin had no lasting influence on the character of early newsbooks. According to these studies, only two characteristics mark the beginning of the genre: timeliness and periodicity.⁴ Once the press produced a paper at regular intervals which could be counted on to deal with contemporary events, these studies suggest, the newspaper was born. Periodicity demanded the ready availability of a supply of information and opinion; timeliness demanded that this information and opinion address

²Brief History (1687) [2].

³Narcissus Luttrell notes twice in early 1687 that L'Estrange "is commanded to write no more Observators" (Historical Relation [1969] 392, 396).

⁴Herd, March of Journalism (1952; Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1973) 12-13; Jeremy D. Popkin, News and Politics in the Age of Revolution: Jean Luzac's Gazette de Leyde (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989) 44; Shaaber, Forerunners (1966) 301.

current events. As the contents of the Thomason Tracts suggest, however, current events in mid-seventeenth-century England were political. Thus a political orientation or factionalism joins periodicity and timeliness as common characteristics of seventeenth-century newsbooks.

The press, and especially the periodical press, encouraged factionalism in politics. As they did in drama and dialogues, Restoration polemicists tended to essentialize ideological positions when writing in newsbooks:

when they have a mind to Blacken a man, 'tis not a Straw matter, for any Foundation of Fact, or History: But Paint him as like the Devil as they Can; and . . . make short Work on't.⁵

Along with reducing characters to one dimension, polarizing issues and positions, newsbooks adopted the length restrictions of polemical pamphlets and tightened them even further.

Finally, the reading habits of the coffee-house audience invited short, simple statements rather than long expositions.⁶ The generic marks of newsbooks thus encouraged writers to reiterate simple party platforms more often than the news encouraged them to do so.

Further, these enunciations had to be short, regular, and directed at an increasingly broad spectrum of readers.

The defeat of the Whigs after the Rye House Plot of 1683 disabled some of their most eloquent spokespersons. L'Estrange could not at once celebrate the defeat of the Whigs and continue to represent them as the greatest threat to the monarchical order. This in part

⁵The Observator in Dialogue vol. 1 (b. J. Bennet, f. W. Abington, 1684) [x^v].

⁶On the coffee-house audience see Steven Pincus, "'Coffee Politicians Does Create': Coffee Houses and Restoration Political Culture," The Journal of Modern History 67(1995) 807-34.

accounts for the new emphasis he places on the dangers of moderation; thus the hazards of Trimming were 'discovered':

The Papists are underfoot, The Violent Phanatiques, may be so when the Government pleases, if they will not be Quiet . . . : But the hermaphrodite Trimmer is the only thing we have to fear.⁷

Varieties of moderate, enlightened self-interest had existed throughout the Restoration. This self-interest could not easily be acknowledged, however, least of all by Royalists and other proponents of political deference. Trimmers espoused a kind of self-interest that threatened one of the foundations upon which L'Estrange had maintained his career--the contention that only through the subjection of the individual could the State be maintained intact.

Trimmers advocated moderate action based in rational reflection, claiming to elevate personal judgement over party ideology:

[N]ow the world is grown saucy, and expecteth Reasons, and good ones too, before they give up their own Opinions to other men's dictates, though never so magisterially delivered to them.⁸

These moderate arguments were potent. They infiltrated L'Estrange's programme in a way Whig or Dissenter arguments never could. By 1687, L'Estrange tried to define his own practice according to the principles and lexicon of Trimming. In the address "To Posterity"

⁷Observer 1.243 (18 November 1682). On trimming see Mark N. Brown, "Trimmers and Moderates in the Reign of Charles II," Huntington Library Quarterly 37 (1974) 311-36; Donald Benson "Halifax and the Trimmers," Huntington Library Quarterly 27(1964) 115-34; David Wykes and B.D. Glenslade "The Trimmer's Character: A Further Reply to Halifax," Huntington Library Quarterly 35 (1972) 205-19; Thomas C. Faulkner, "The Character of a Trimmer and L'Estrange's Attack on Trimmers in the Observer," Huntington Library Quarterly 37(1973) 71-81.

⁸George Savile, Marquis of Halifax, The Character of a Trimmer, The Works of George Savile Marquis of Halifax, ed. Mark N. Brown, 3 vols. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989) 1: 207.

which forms the long preface to the third and final volume of the collected Observers L'Estrange claims always to have struggled on behalf of a moderate constitutional settlement. Unfortunately, his defence manifests the habit of polarization which informed his thirty-years' work in print culture: "In One word," he announces, "All Extremes are Stark Naught, both in Divinity, and in Reason."⁹

This dissertation has maintained that the press served Tory as well as other group and individual interests and that the resources of print culture were exploited as actively and self-consciously by monarchical as by many other factions. Supporters of Charles II were as intimately involved in the production of newsbooks as they were in the production of other types of polemical literature. The interests that impelled them to write and to publish were professional as well as ideological. Roger North called L'Estrange a "Counter Writer" who was employed to respond to "every Libel [that] came out." He represented the Court in the early 1680s along with "Heraclitus, for a constancy, and others, with them, occasionally."¹⁰ The involvement of government in the nascent newsbook industry casts doubts on an important assumption in many histories of journalism: that in England the origins of the periodical press were free of ideological taint and that genuine news-reporting works independently of any factional allegiance. Habermas argues that newsbooks were first

⁹Brief History (1687) [3].

¹⁰Roger North, qtd. in Brown Works of George Savile Marquis of Halifax, 3 vols. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989) 1:14. Heraclitus Ridens, another newsbook commonly known to represent Court interests, ran from February 1681 to August 1682. Its publisher was Benjamin Tooke, and writers included Edward Rawlins and Thomas Flatman. See T.F.M. Newton, "The Mask of Heraclitus: a Problem in Restoration Journalism," Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature 16(1934) 145-60.

engaged in "pure news reporting" and only later evolved the "editorial function."¹¹ Another critic discounts papers that "circulated only in a single state," on the grounds that their resulting dependence on government "vitiat[ed] . . . even the pretence of independence." According to this view, there exists a rigid distinction between 'real' or independent newspapers and papers that maintain factional allegiances.¹² Scholars who are convinced of the objective ideal of news-reporting fail to note that, in seventeenth-century England, the development of both newsbooks and the public sphere coincide with the development of political party.

Journalism developed in conjunction with the widespread public and regular critique of the status quo. These two aspects of print culture were mutually dependent.¹³ On the one hand there "existed a press in the strict sense only once the regular supply of news became public." On the other, the "editorial function" crucial to the critical debate in the public sphere developed "as soon as individual authors availed themselves of the new instrument of the periodical press providing a hearing for their critical-rational reflections."¹⁴ The

¹¹Habermas Public Sphere (1991) 182.

¹²Popkin, News and Politics (1989) 44. Historians who argue for the pure origins of journalism usually count the Oxford/London Gazette as the only 'real' newspaper in Restoration England, and fail to allow for its Court connections.

¹³The alternative to this position is to argue (with Jeremy Popkin, for example) that the development of the periodical press "depended on a sufficiently large literate audience, with a strong interest in current affairs and the economic means to pay for the information it wanted" (News and Politics [1989] 34). In addition to neglecting the aural transmission of ephemera and its likely circulation *gratis*, this contention does not allow for a dialectical relationship between genre and audience. It implies that, rather than developing from existing genres, the periodical press was born fully formed into a community prepared for its themes and concerns.

¹⁴Habermas Public Sphere (1991) 16, 182.

periodical press depended on the existence of a public to consume its products; the development of that same politically-aware public sphere depended, however, on individuals working in the periodical press to provide issues and a forum for critical-rational debate. L'Estrange's place in the process of news evolution is usually viewed within a hierarchical model of government-press interaction, which denies that all parties vied for control of and access to the press. This model opposes the punitive forces of dominant factions to the brave truth-tellers of the oppressed. This dissertation has maintained, on the contrary, that the Royalist Surveyor of the Press was on the one hand intimately involved in print culture, and on the other hand "sore grieved at the Press . . . because he cannot hang his Padlock on it."¹⁵ L'Estrange's place in early newsbook development can most fruitfully be examined as an instance of the professionalization (and politicization) of the nascent periodical press.

Restoration readers accepted the political affiliations of their newsbooks as easily as they acknowledged the political nature of the playhouse. Although Tories ostensibly disapproved of public participation in politics, it was distinctively Tory to claim (with Samuel Butler) that an 'Intelligencer' or newsgatherer was one who

will undertake to unriddle a Government at first Sight, and tell what Plots She goes with, male or female; and discover . . . only by seeing the public Face of Affairs, what private Marks there are in the most secret parts of the Body politic. He is so ready at Reasons of State, that he has them, like a Lesson, by Rote; but . . . he makes all public Affairs conform to his own established Reason of State, and not his Reason.¹⁶

¹⁵The Observer Observ'd (f. T. Davies, 6 May 1681) #1.

¹⁶Samuel Butler, 1612-1680: Characters, ed. Charles W. Daves (Cleveland: P of Case Western Reserve U, 1970) 128.

The intelligencer does not have immediate access to the private thoughts or debates of the body politic, but works by inference, supposition, innuendo. Further, the intelligencer is motivated primarily by factional affiliation rather than independent critical-rational reflection. Both of these characteristics offer good reason to limit press access to only the most politically predictable writers.

But there are two sides to Butler's intelligencer. If Tories disapproved of wide access to the public sphere in theory, at an even more fundamental level, Butler recognized that an intelligencer is a political writer. The intelligencer is one who "will undertake to unriddle a government at first sight." The work of the newsbook writer is political and news is reported, in part, to influence the actions of its readership. A reading community characterized by the "habits of obliqueness and innuendo"¹⁷ is unlikely to abandon sophisticated habits of reading for the sake of the bare facts, even if an ideologically pure genre could be conceived. Nonetheless, modern American histories of journalism especially tend to hold to this myth of pure origins. Thus, journalism is born from an objective pursuit of the truth for its own sake or for the sake of the community. Writers indulge a "disinterested desire to serve the public interest,"¹⁸ or "a common desire for what is new,"¹⁹ or a desire to "titillate the reader's curiosity."²⁰ Each of these assumes that a predilection for current information is somehow a constituent part of all audiences. When journalism is not

¹⁷Zwicker "Representing the Revolution" (1992) 166.

¹⁸Shaaber Forerunners (1966) 7.

¹⁹Otto Groth, quoted approvingly by Popkin News and Politics (1989) 7.

²⁰Shaaber Forerunners (1966) 242.

assigned a pure origin, often it is supplied with an economic one. Writers or publishers thus served their own purely private will to free enterprise. They "were ready to publish whatever the public would buy."²¹ Early intelligencers possessed "spirit of enterprise."²² The public on behalf of whom these pioneer journalists hunted the news did not include "Men of position," because these "had private means of keeping informed which exempted them from all need of printed news."²³ The newspaper evolved to serve the interests, primarily, of classes who did not have direct access to important political debates or information. Papers were written by various economic groups for the sake of informing members of those groups. In most press histories, this burgeoning middle (or entrepreneurial) class is then set in opposition to the elite or ruling class.²⁴ No party ideologies were served in the production of early news (according to this account), and few professional affiliations were established or developed. The "subject in every case was timely information that it was presumed was in the recipient's interest to know."²⁵ Although "newspapers . . . contained political and

²¹Shaaber Forerunners (1966) 107.

²²Sutherland Restoration Newspaper (1986) 230.

²³Shaaber Forerunners (1966) 108.

²⁴The other major theory constructs a social class, which is then set to work mining the news on behalf of wealthy consumers. See Philip Gaunt, Choosing the News: The Profit Factor in News Selection (New York: Greenwood, 1990) 26. Historians who believe in the independent roots of journalism necessarily take party influences to be a later or peripheral addition to the periodical press. Charles E. Clark, one of the most recent historians of the press, equates news with 'facts,' and provides no criteria according to which this content is garnered, chosen, or invented. Clark simply assumes a 'soaring' public interest in international affairs up to 1694 and a growing economy as the prime moving force behind the establishment of newspapers in England (Charles E. Clark, The Public Prints: The Newspaper in Anglo-American Culture, 1665-1740 [New York: Oxford UP, 1994] 8, 15-16).

²⁵Clark Public Prints (1994) 18.

religious propaganda," and "slanted news," these remained subservient to the "straight, unvarnished" contents.²⁶

This myth of the pure origins of newsbooks begins to explain the righteous indignation with which modern histories of journalism excoriate L'Estrange's role as Surveyor of the Press and writer of the Observator. L'Estrange is clearly and unabashedly partisan. His self-proclaimed mandate was to "Encounter Seditious . . . Posi[t]ions . . . so soon as ever they took Air."²⁷ He inaugurated the Observator aware of the "Needfullness of some Popular Medium for the Rectifying of Vulgar Mistakes."²⁸ There is nothing objective about L'Estrange's work. L'Estrange, like other 'Counter Writers,' was rewarded for his work by the faction he supported. Thus, he was doubly bound: financially and ideologically. For someone like L'Estrange, who advocated self effacement and unquestioning loyalty, an accusation of financial motives was particularly damaging. L'Estrange has "no more Loyalty than what . . . [he is] paid for."²⁹ His reputation suffers when his enemies accuse him of writing for pay. The charge levelled by L'Estrange's inveterate enemy Robert Stephens was even more damning. Stephens claimed that L'Estrange wrote only because he was impecunious; that he fomented discontent in the pages of the Observator specifically to make up the income he lost when the post of Surveyor

²⁶Clark Public Prints (1994) 8.

²⁷Brief History (1687) [2].

²⁸Observator in Dialogue vol. 1 (1684) [x^v].

²⁹The Character of . . . Heraclitus and the Observator (f. E. Ryddal, 1681) 2.

expired with the Printing Act.³⁰ By far the most common contemporary accusation levelled against the Observer was that its author was motivated by his own professional interests. The "Religion" of the Observer is "INTEREST" claims the author of A New Dialogue, as early as November 1681, when the Observer had only been abroad for eight months.³¹ He writes for "the Charity of a Bookseller."³² When not motivated directly by financial remuneration, his critics charge, L'Estrange is engaged by "his pitiful personal peeks, and silly foppish, idle and impertinent squabbles, and brabbles about Goats Wool."³³ Whether for the sake of financial gain or personal revenge, L'Estrange is accused by his contemporaries of being motivated by the will to personal advancement.

Both L'Estrange's contemporaries and his modern critics judge him on the same grounds--motives--and ask of his career the same question: what impelled him to follow the path he did? Where L'Estrange's contemporaries claimed his work is unreliable because its author was motivated by personal interests, modern historians claim L'Estrange's work is unreliable because he was motivated by party interests, or that his work is unreliable owing to some fundamental moral degeneracy. Thus he is "notorious," and "fanatical," a "repellant personality,"³⁴ whose "moral duty" and "pleasure" it was "to hunt down heretical and

³⁰Stephens The Loyal Observer (1683) 11.

³¹A New Dialogue Between Some Body and No Body, or the Observer Observed (f. [Francis] E. Smith, 1681) # 1, 25 November 1681.

³²Character of . . . Heraclitus and the Observer (1681) 2.

³³Toryrorydammeeplothshamee Younkercrape, A Sermon Prepared to be Preach'd at the Interment of the Renowned Observer (p., s.b. Langley Curtis, 1682) 7.

³⁴Herd March of Journalism (1973) 28, 31-32.

seditionous publications."³⁵ The careers of Restoration newsbook writers put into question the speculations of modern historians about different ideals of public and private interest.

L'Estrange maintains a negative idea of self-interest, one which sees the will of the subject deferring to the will of the State ("When I can Obey . . . no longer for Love, I'll do't for Conscience").³⁶ Since L'Estrange places loyalty to the State above all other considerations, his contemporaries accuse him of betraying this position periodically throughout his career. Modern historians of Restoration journalism, however, assume that enlightened self-interest does not necessarily conflict with State interests or values. This enlightened self-interest, as Halifax described it in his Character of a Trimmer, was predicated on personal reason, on a belief that truth is accessible to "the more discerning part of mankind," regardless of personal or party interest.³⁷ The modern enlightened, economics-based self-interest that informs the American model of journalistic history of the Restoration at once assumes the objectivity (or disinterested economics-base) of the early party press, while denigrating, simplifying, or ignoring altogether other motives for periodical writing during the period.

L'Estrange faced more damaging accusations from his contemporaries. Accusations of self-interest could only be damaging to an individual who claimed not to be motivated by self-interest. L'Estrange was a prime target. By the time The Character of a Trimmer circulated in the early months of 1685 its narrator spoke to a readership that (unlike L'Estrange) took for granted that a political theory could be based in personal "Judgments

³⁵Sutherland Restoration Newspaper (1986) 1.

³⁶Observer 1.247 (25 November 1682).

³⁷Halifax Works (1989) 1:243.

and Opinions."³⁸ It is in part owing to L'Estrange's concerted efforts to marginalize moderates that "trimming" proponents of a political policy that openly advocated moderation and pragmatism (most famously Halifax) developed a voice in the public sphere. In fact, the literary character of Trimmer, from its origin in the Observer, grew into the embodiment of enlightened public political discourse. The struggle for the definition of "trimming" is an instance of the larger struggle for the allegiance of readers rendered sensitive to polemical strategies by the press activity since the expiration of the Printing Act in 1679. L'Estrange claimed that moderates lacked conviction or were motivated by self-interest. Moderates adopted and rehabilitated the term for themselves. In a "Kind of Vanity," hissed L'Estrange. Trimmer "took up that Appellation; as who should say, We are the Men that keep the Government Steady, and Even."³⁹ Trimming avoided the fate of words such as 'faction' or 'cant,' which had such pejorative meanings.

On 13 November 1682 L'Estrange introduced Trimmer into his Observer, signalling the end of the reign of Whig as the bête noire of Tory propaganda. The new term entered the political lexicon as a designation of abuse by the early months of 1683, and it gained even greater currency following the revelation of the Rye House conspiracy in July of that year. For two years 'trimming' was the locus of a vituperative ideological battle. Trimmer retained his place as Observer's respondent until the newsbook ceased circulation in 1687, but as early as February 1683 other more immediate threats also engaged L'Estrange's

³⁸Samuel Bolde, A Plea for Moderation towards Dissenters (f. R. Janeway, 1682) 30. Mark N. Brown claims that Halifax's manuscript circulated "for three years, until a copy was pirated for publication . . . some time in 1688" (Brown, The Works of George Savile).

³⁹Observer 1.293 (21 February 1683).

attention. From mid-1683 Trimmer was present but not central to the Observer, although he provided a familiar target during times of political uncertainty.

Whether trimming was perceived as an actual threat by conservative Tories or not, L'Estrange worked conscientiously to demonize moderates, just as he had conscientiously worked to demonize Presbyterians at the opening of the Restoration. Mark N. Brown first made the necessary distinction between the study of the 'trimmers' as an actual political faction (led by the Marquis of Halifax), and the "literary persona" of 'Trimmer', made popular by L'Estrange in the Observer and adopted as a term of opprobrium by many polemicists in 1682-1685.⁴⁰ "Strictly speaking," writes Brown, "a Trimmer was either a Tory sympathetic to the Whigs or an Anglican sympathetic to Protestant Dissenters."⁴¹ For L'Estrange at his most neutral Trimmers are persons "of Latitude, as well in Politiques as Divinity."⁴² But the polemicist's literary target was less consistent than this definition suggests. Unsurprisingly, considering his earlier career, L'Estrange singled out individuals, who ranged from religious moderates such as the Anglican William Smythies to his own personal enemies,⁴³ and labelled them trimmers. Often L'Estrange paid scant attention to the political principles of these 'trimmers'.

⁴⁰Brown, "Trimmers and Moderates" (1974) 311.

⁴¹Brown Works (1989) 1: 42. According to Halifax a trimmer understands the necessary tension between "Monarchy," which "leaveth men no Liberty," and wholly popular forms of government, which "alloweth them no quiet" (Character of a Trimmer, Works [1989] 1: 184).

⁴²Observer 2.177 (3 December 1684).

⁴³L'Estrange attacked Smythies in the Observer at the end of August 1684 on the grounds of a sermon the latter had preached suggesting that the 'burdens' of Dissenters ought to be lessened. See Smythies A Reply to the Observer (f. John Southby, 1684).

Moderates had existed well before their manifestation as trimmers in 1682. Richard Brathwaite's 1669 allegory The History of Moderation (f. T. Parkhurst; B4264)--in which the personification of the demure heroine "Moderation" is recruited to the side of political centralists and moderate Anglicans--was reissued in 1683 with the new title Trimmer: or the Life and Death of Moderation (f. Dorman Newman; B4278A).⁴⁴ However, this preoccupation with moderates--including a coinage on their behalf--points to their new prominence in the political sphere. In The Character of a Trimmer, Halifax asked why a political actor who earnestly wishes a balanced state should be the object of such derision. "This innocent word," he posits,

signifieth no more than this, that if men are together in a Boat, and one part of the Company would weigh it down on one side, another would make it lean as much to the contrary, it happneth there is a third Opinion, of those who conceive it would do as well, if the Boat went even, without endangering the Passengers.⁴⁵

The accent remains on "sitting even": on the practical navigation of the government, on the present, and on the need to weigh actions according to circumstance. Moderates mediate between various interests, including those of high-flying Tories such as L'Estrange.

Trimmers presented L'Estrange with new polemical challenges owing to the difficulty of essentializing the positions of moderate individuals, who tended to be difficult to draw into polemical debate on L'Estrange's terms. The suppression of the most active Whigs following the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament in March 1681, then the discovery of the

⁴⁴The History of Moderation (f. T. Parkhurst, 1669; B4264); Trimmer: or the Life and Death of Moderation (f. Dorman Newman, 1683; B4278A). On the pre-history of trimming see Nicholas von Maltzahn, "Republication in the Restoration: Some Trimming Pleas for Limited Monarchy, 1660/1680," The Huntington Library Quarterly 56(1993) 281-305.

⁴⁵Halifax Character of a Trimmer, in Works (1989) 1:179.

Rye House Plotters two years later, should have left the stage clear for Tory propagandists to celebrate the vindication of the rights of conservative monarchy and religious uniformity. On the contrary, the suppression of the more radical anti-monarchists emphasized the presence of moderate forces which were dangerous because they did not engage polemicists with the single-minded vituperation characteristic of more radical proponents of absolute monarchy, nor could their actions and ideology easily be associated with Interregnum antecedents.

L'Estrange's propaganda tactics, based as they were on controverting an easily-characterized enemy, proved largely ineffectual against so amorphous a political movement. Nevertheless, he sought again to use the strategy that had proved so successful at the Restoration.

L'Estrange's work (along with the modern study of the pre-history of trimming) is rendered more difficult by this tendency of most moderates to remain aloof from provocative attacks.

"It is manifest proof of your eminent Moderation" addressed the prolific Independent John Owen to his intended audience of "Moderate Divines and Laity," "that none of you hath set himself, either to examine the Accusations, or to eject the Insinuations" of absolutist propaganda.⁴⁶ In fact, despite L'Estrange's attempts to sustain the trimmer debate within the

⁴⁶John Owen, Moderation a Vertue: or, a Vindication of the Principles and Practices of the Moderate Divines and Laity (f. Jonathan Robinson, 1683) [A1^r]-[A2^r]. Owen is replying to a tract sometimes attributed to L'Estrange, Remarks upon the Growth and Progress of Non-Conformity (f. Walter Kettilby, 1682). L'Estrange probably did not write this text. It does apply familiar arguments to a limited extent: moderates include "Conforming Non-conformists . . . as interest and opportunity shall incline" (14). However, Kettilby is not L'Estrange's bookseller, and the text concerns itself with Church divisions and ecclesiastical nonconformity, including an extended parallel between the history of Presbyterians and Roman Catholics which L'Estrange would be unlikely to have written at this time.

political sphere, members of the dissolved Parliament and their secular supporters seem not to have been engaged.⁴⁷

L'Estrange's response to moderation is predictable. In his representations of Trimmer in the Observer L'Estrange shifts emphasis away from the ship/state analogy towards an examination of motives. What moderates call variously "Judgments and Opinions" or "principles and Opinions"⁴⁸ L'Estrange labels 'conscience,' thus building the first link between moderates and Dissenters. L'Estrange's Trimmer says "Every man . . . must . . . Live, and Act in Conformity to his own Conscience."⁴⁹ This "Conscience," L'Estrange then claims, is governed "by the Prospect of Lucre, and Safety."⁵⁰ Private interests impel Trimmer's quiescent political and religious vision. When moderates admit "being apt to take everything by the right Handle, and make the best construction of things," the emphasis is on conciliation, rationality, dispassionate observation. According to L'Estrange's view, however, if trimmers "take everything by the right Handle," they do it for their own advantage. Does Trimmer genuinely wish to "sitt upright, & not overturne the boate by

⁴⁷Since the taciturnity of political moderates obscures them from view, Anglican trimmers and latitudinarian proposals for religious toleration have remained the focus of modern commentary. For an overview of religious moderation proposals during this period see Richard Ashcraft, "Latitudinarianism and Toleration: Historical Myth versus Political History," Philosophy, Science and Religion in England, 1640-1700, eds. Richard Ashcraft and Perez Zagorin (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992) 151-77.

⁴⁸ Bolde Plea for Moderation (1682) 30; John Evans, Moderation Stated: in a Sermon . . . Octob. 22. 1682 (f. Walter Kettilby, 1682) 7.

⁴⁹Observer 1.294 (24 February 1683).

⁵⁰Observer 1.242 (16 November 1682).

swaying too much to either side"⁵¹ or does he not rather tend "to Lean to the Upper side:

And still to make the Best of Things"?⁵²

Trimmer's reliance on his 'conscience' ensures him a place in the radical genealogy extending from extremists sects of the Interregnum through Citty's reliance on 'conscience' in "that never to be forgotten Pamphlet."⁵³ Next, Tories charge trimmers with causing the death of Charles I. "Conscience . . . was the Warrant the Godly Party pretended to, for all our Late Calamities, and Desolations."⁵⁴ L'Estrange shifted blame for the rebellion from the Dissenters to the trimmers. "Who were they that Destroy'd the Last King?" L'Estrange asks: "Not his Enemyes in the Field, but his Lukewarm, Pretending Friends; The Trimmers, that kept off, and would not help him."⁵⁵ "Trimming the Source of Rebellion has been" chants the author of a propaganda ballad,⁵⁶ and Edmund Hiceringill, so often at violent odds with L'Estrange, agrees.⁵⁷ The fanaticism and religious 'conscience' of Citty and Bumpkin

⁵¹Sir William Coventry, qtd. in H. C. Foxcroft, ed. The Life and Letters of Sir George Savile, 2 vols. (1898: Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1973) 2:275.

⁵²Observer 1.240 (13 November 1682).

⁵³The Observer Observ'd (f. J. Gilford, 1681) #3.

⁵⁴Observer 1.293 (21 February 1683).

⁵⁵Observer 1.245 (22 November 1682). See also 1.269 (10 January 1683); 1.306 (21 March 1683).

⁵⁶"The Assembly of Moderate Divines" (n.p., n.d.) Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714, gen. ed. George de F. Lord, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1963-75) 2:326.

⁵⁷The Observer Prov'd a Trimmer (f. J. Allen, s.b. most Booksellers, 1685) 92.

are thus jostled offstage by the Trimmer's "carnal and . . . corrupted Reason."⁵⁸ *Observer* equates reason with conscience; reason (the basis of enlightened self-interest) is no more trustworthy than blind faith.

Trimmer strikes at the heart of extremist polemical strategy by refusing to employ the language and rhetorical strategies that had since the Interregnum bound polemicists from various factions to a common method of influencing current debates. "I wish, with all my heart," begins Trimmer upon his introduction to *Observer*, "that they would leave Writing on Both sides. It does but Enflame Differences, and beget Heats, and Animosities."⁵⁹ Trimmer waives the right to engage according to the rules refined in the past five decades by polemical writers. Propaganda he considers an unnecessary and destructive form of manipulation. Trimmer finds

no advantage to a Government to endeavour the suppressing all kind of right which may remain in the body of the people, or to imploy small authors in it, whose Officiousness or want of money may incourage them to write.⁶⁰

Allowing for the complexity of the relationship between self, individual reason and state authority, Trimmer denies the right of Court Tories (or of any other group, for that matter) to impose duties and allegiances on the subject. Trimmer singles out the "Wasps" which "fly up and down, buzze, and sting, to keep men unquiet" for particular consideration.⁶¹ He recognizes that the press is a medium controlled by writers equally professional and partisan.

⁵⁸Theophilus Rationalis [Harry Duke], *New News from Bedlam: Or More Work for Towzer* (f. the Author, pub. by Langley Curtis, 1682) 31.

⁵⁹*Observer* 1.240 (13 November 1682).

⁶⁰Halifax *Character of a Trimmer*, in *Works* (1989) 1:190.

⁶¹Halifax *Character of a Trimmer*, in *Works* (1989) 1:241.

The fears of extremism and civil war, which fueled the successes L'Estrange experienced with the Presbyterians at the Restoration, could not be attached to the moderates. Even L'Estrange had to admit the currency of moderation by 1687. In the preface to the third volume of Observators he cautions his readers to

have a care of Themselves too, as well as their Adversaries: For Bigottry is every jot as Dangerous, as Luke-warmness; and to be Over-Righteous, (according to the Text) on One side, is All-out as Bad, as to be Over-Scrupulous, on the Other; and much the fiercer Evil of the Two. Zeal must be Bounded by Knowledge: Nay, it must be Guided by it A Man may be too Zelous [sic] for a Good thing, as well as Against it; when That Zeal has more in it of heat, then of Light.⁶²

⁶²Brief History (1687) [3].

Conclusion

The Dissenter's Sayings

This dissertation has traced several patterns in writings of the later seventeenth century, most notably in the writings of Roger L'Estrange. It has concentrated primarily on the Restoration booktrades, the early public sphere, and the relationship between the individual and the state. A tension, first apparent early in 1660, existed between the role of counsellor/licenser that L'Estrange adopted from an earlier model of subject-state interaction, and the very active role he built for himself in the booktrades. This tension is represented, in L'Estrange's own oeuvre and in Restoration texts more widely, as a conflict between his various private and public interests. The development of the public sphere during this century influenced the shape of these public-private debates, and allowed the success of L'Estrange's career itself. By the beginning of the 1680s his reputation, enemies, rhetorical systems and professional allegiances, and his ideology, were well established. The Dissenter's Sayings, one of L'Estrange's most successful tracts, published in March 1681 like the first edition of the Observer, will form the focus of these final pages. By way of

conclusion to this dissertation, I will renew the themes I have followed in these pages, focusing my analysis on what was L'Estrange's most successful political pamphlet.

Each of L'Estrange's tracts, this dissertation has maintained, is impelled by specific tensions between his public and private interests. In the case of The Dissenter's Sayings L'Estrange needed, upon his return from exile, to re-establish his reputation among anti-tolerationists, and as spokesperson for the monarchist cause. He composed The Dissenter's Sayings in thirteen sections, each of which addresses a different aspect of contemporary political debates on toleration.¹ Each of these sections conforms to L'Estrange's early rhetorical method, where radical precepts are coupled with moderate proposals for reform. Chapter One of this dissertation demonstrated L'Estrange's propensity to connect the doctrine of Restoration Dissenters (especially Presbyterians) with the radical sectarian writings of the Interregnum. Once again, as he had done in the early Restoration, in The Dissenter's Sayings L'Estrange chooses his enemies from among the most radical sectaries of the Interregnum. The section entitled "The Fruits of Toleration," for example, relies heavily on the writings of Thomas Edwards, especially for his bilious anti-moderate, anti-Independent Gangræna. The quotations L'Estrange selects for this section range from radical exclamations to more moderate formulations of political and religious principles. In the radical camp Edwards is joined by the antinomian William Dell, John Saltmarsh (who, along with Dell, became a preacher in Fairfax's army), John Bastwick (a Presbyterian

¹These topics include, for example, "The Fruits of Toleration," "The Dissenters Behaviour Towards the Civil Government," and "Dissenters Liberty of Conscience."

controversialist who lost his ears with William Prynne) and the mystic Rhys Evans (known as "Arise Evans"). Alongside these extreme radicals L'Estrange ranges the Presbyterian Divines and members of the Westminster Assembly Robert Crosse, John Bond, Robert Baillie, Edmund Calamy, and Matthew Newcomen (the last two of whom had been among the authors of *Smectymnuus*). Thus The Dissenter's Sayings builds an equation between extreme radicals, political and religious centralists and moderates of the 1640s, and 1681 advocates of religious toleration. The ideological differences between moderate Presbyterians and extreme radicals, and the political and religious differences of a generation, both disappear in L'Estrange's efforts to homogenize advocates of toleration.

L'Estrange builds this connection between Interregnum radicals and 1681 Dissenters in order to encourage the process of polarization so important to anti-tolerationists. Along with fears of Catholic influence and the debate over the succession of James, the topic of "uniformity versus reconciliation in church affairs" was of central importance in the early 1680s.² L'Estrange, primarily concerned with the secular results of religious nonconformity, claims that Dissenters "have the Faculty of handling Religious Matters, in order to Political; as well as of hooking Temporal Matters, in order to Spirituals" (15). He is concerned that religious reforms "begin with Religion and end with Treason" (18) owing to his fundamental pessimism about what brings people together into communities. The success of broad-based religious toleration ("the very Bone of Contention" [4]) depends on maintaining a community, and communities are ephemeral by their very nature as alliances among

²Goldie, "Danby, the Bishops and the Whigs" (1990) 80.

contending private interests. Thus during the Interregnum the religious community of Presbyterians and Independents ended "So soon as the Presbyterians had gotten the Power into their hands" (8-9). At the foundation of all political alliances lies private interest, and private interests are bound to destabilize the status quo: "in Asking a Toleration, they Ask, what they judge Unsafe, and Unlawfull to allow. They Ask, what they Know, and Declare, will be our Undoing" (9).

L'Estrange's own private and professional interests were closely bound up with the publication of Dissenter's Sayings. As was the case so often in L'Estrange's career, he composed this work in rebuttal of another text. This time it was Mr. Roger Le Stranges Sayings, a stinging assault rendered doubly offensive by its success along L'Estrange's own rhetorical lines: decontextualized quotations supplemented by commentary. This tract circulated without an author's name and was published by Langley Curtis, one of London's first trade publishers.³ In fact, the majority of the satires that followed L'Estrange into hiding were either published by the trade publishers Langley Curtis or Richard Janeway, or circulated without a name 'down on the bottom'. It would seem that as much as writers enjoyed L'Estrange's discomfiture, few trusted that his absence from the London booktrades would last.

L'Estrange and Brome heralded L'Estrange's return from Holland in early 1681 by publishing The Dissenter's Sayings.⁴ The ex-Surveyor's reputation had suffered with his

³On Curtis as a trade publisher see Treadwell "Trade Publishers" (1982) 128.

⁴1680-1681 were the most active Restoration publishing years in the Brome-L'Estrange partnership. In 1680, the last year of Henry Brome's life, he published 10 first editions and 18 other editions of L'Estrange's work. Between them, in 1681 Henry and

non-appearance before Parliament the previous autumn, and the ignominious flight that ensued. "How?" mocks the author of Le Stranges Sayings:

A Licenser, and a Patentee and a Gazetter, and a Justice and the Devil and all, and yet want a Protection for the Shoulder?⁵

A flurry of insults had pursued L'Estrange into hiding. Le Stranges Sayings was "precisely the Seven and Thirty'th Civility of This Kind, that I have Received, within less than Two Months."⁶ L'Estrange responded to some ad hominem attacks in L'Estrange No Papist. In response to these proddings he also published The Dissenter's Sayings within a week of the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament at the end of March. The tract would prove to be (along with Citt and Bumpkin) his most popular and enduring work, circulating in at least five editions through 1685 and prompting a second part, published the same year as the first.

The digest form of The Dissenter's Sayings complemented the dramatic dialogue L'Estrange perfected in his other widely successful 1681 production, Citt and Bumpkin.⁷ Where Citt and Bumpkin satirized contemporary urban and rural Presbyterians, The Dissenter's Sayings, "Digested, and Dispos'd," is much broader in scope, purporting to address the motives and reputations of all Dissenters of the past thirty years. Where the dialogue depends on humour for its effects and would clearly translate well to oral transmission, The Dissenter's Sayings is a catalogue, intended to provide a resource for

Joanna Brome published 11 first editions by L'Estrange and 17 other editions.

⁵Mr. Roger Le Stranges Sayings With Brief Notes to Prevent Misapprehensions (f. Langley Curtis, 1681) 3.

⁶Dissenter's Sayings (1681) [A2^v]. Page references for quotations from this tract will appear in the text.

⁷This text too, circulated in five editions, and inspired a second part.

preachers of anti-tolerationist doctrine, where "the Reader shall find every Article of the Subject in Question" represented (A2^v). It is a serious tract, whose intent is not to introduce new or novel doctrine, rather to offer the most trenchant responses to any possible argument for toleration.

His authority to address the issue of Dissent in The Dissenter's Sayings is twofold. He claims first the authority inherent in print culture--the authority of citation, the proof of the very tracts he quotes. The Dissenters "Themselves shall be . . . their own Advocates" (A3^v). The authority of the text is, of course, highly questionable, since the ubiquitous practice of decontextualization renders the most simple phrase ambiguous. The author of Le Stranges Sayings had used this very rhetorical strategy against L'Estrange. Where L'Estrange had accused the Rump in 1659 of proceeding as though "A Citizens Skul is but a thing to try the temper of a Soldiers Sword upon," the author of Le Stranges Sayings quotes the anti-London sentiment as though it represented L'Estrange's own belief. The implication is that either L'Estrange resents the City and advocates army rule, or, if he does not, that the ex-Surveyor is guilty of character inconsistency. L'Estrange's own tracts often exploit ambiguity and the power of insinuations against enemies's reputations. This is not, however, the case with The Dissenter's Sayings. By the time he published this tract L'Estrange had established the reputation he needed to use his own name as the authority for his statements. No-one doubted that his actions were impelled by a complex blend of private, professional and public interests. Few readers would have been surprised that he chose all of his writings

in this tract from the Interregnum.⁸ Even the topics he chose to address would have been predictable to his readers. After a twenty-year career in the print trades with Henry Brome on behalf of the House of Stuart the polemicist had earned a reputation for engaging only a limited number of themes and issues, and engaging these armed with a limited number of rhetorical weapons. The coin that has predictability stamped on one face, however, has trustworthiness stamped on the other.

⁸The lack of reference to any contemporary tracts suggests that The Dissenter's Sayings was composed, at least in part, while L'Estrange was abroad.

Appendix

Propaganda, the Playhouse, and Published Drama

The stage, like old Rump-Pulpits, is become
 The Scene of News, a furious Party's Drum.
 Here Poets beat their brains for Volunteers,
 And take fast Hold of Asses by their Ears.¹

The author here, perhaps Thomas Shadwell, raises several points about the relationship between politics and its representation in cultural products. The Restoration stage is a political space, he claims, as political as the Interregnum pulpit. Like preachers, dramatists write from their allegiances, and like preachers they expect, especially during times of crisis, that their position will permit them to speak with authority on public issues. Some political dimensions of Restoration literature have been well explored, although (as Worden points out) some literary-critical paradigms still resist building connections between literature and social context.² Less clear is drama's relationship to other products of print

¹A Lenten Prologue Refus'd by the Players (n.p. [1683]).

²Blair Worden, "Milton, Samson Agonistes, and the Restoration," Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration, ed. Gerald Maclean (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995) 111.

culture such as the newsbooks and ephemeral pamphlets which form the focus of this dissertation. This chapter will explore the relationship between the representation of politics on the stage and in print, with special reference to propaganda plays and also to the controversy surrounding The Duke of Guise. During the later seventeenth century vigorous and engaged booktrades influenced the development of the public sphere, that public space dedicated to a sustained discussion of political culture. As writers formed new and flexible professional alliances to take advantage of this new public space, so too they developed new rhetorical rules of engagement and modified genres that had served as earlier vehicles for political commentary. The following two chapters place L'Estrange's polemical activities within a historical context and attend to some of the generic and rhetorical innovations that accompanied the spread of the ephemeral press during the period under consideration.

L'Estrange's writings demonstrate considerable mastery of genre. By manipulating existing genres he redefined his professional options when they seemed limited, as when he recontextualized his Interregnum activities with Brome in L'Estrange His Apology in 1660 or when he exploited his booktrade connections in Considerations and Proposals in Order to the Regulation of the Press in 1663. Both of these tracts recommend a new relationship between the writer, the booktrades, and government agencies. Genres were adapted to these new relationships. L'Estrange His Apology builds a coherent memoir largely from over twenty previously published broadsides and short tracts. This peculiar curriculum vitae functions primarily to advertise L'Estrange's aptitudes and allegiances and only secondarily to defend the new monarchy. Considerations and Proposals, comprised substantially of excerpts from oppositional texts, is an assault on Dissenter publishing, an exposé of L'Estrange's personal

enemies, a job description, and a commentary on the role of publishing in the public sphere. Both tracts combine genres in an innovative way, with a particular professional (and political) end in view. Competition was sharp for the attention of a large, socially heterogenous and politically engaged readership in a period when "he perhaps who has hardly wit enough to govern his own little Family, takes upon him to settle the affairs of Christendom."³ Writers pillaged all genres for structures and tropes capable of capturing both their spin on current events and their readership's allegiance.⁴

L'Estrange built and maintained his reputation in large part owing to his facility with written language. While he modified genres, his rhetoric is recognizably the product of the late seventeenth century, and his writings display the sophisticated awareness of rhetorical tradition typical of his age. A heightened consciousness about the means and effects of rhetorical persuasion sharpened the century's concern about motives and interests of orators and narrators. Restoration polemicists placed tremendous weight on the ethical author/narrator. Dramatists, similarly, populated the stage with protagonists whose "whole energy . . . is devoted to the effort to persuade, impress, outwit, cajole, coerce, [or] overcome" other characters.⁵ Both in drama and in polemics, writers used the vocabulary of interests, which reached maturation during the Restoration, to investigate the reputations of characters, authors and narrators. L'Estrange built a strong narrator, and he was a

³The Mischiefs and Unreasonableness (Dublin: b. Joseph Ray, f. Samuel He'sham, 1681) 5.

⁴Tim Harris argues that Stuart London did not maintain a "sharp divide between a politically aware elite, and the unpolitical and easily manipulated masses." See his London Crowds (1987) 35.

⁵Keeble Literary Culture of Nonconformity (1987) 217.

penetrating critic of the motives and character of other polemicists. Samuel Johnson could later claim of John Dryden that he had "the same cast as L'Estrange. Even his plays discover him to be a party man."⁶ In drama, as in polemics, building and maintaining a reputation often comprises the backbone of a protagonist's work, whether this protagonist is Dryden's and Lee's Henry III of France, Dryden himself, or the narrator of one of L'Estrange's many published defences. Counter-writers, like antagonists in drama, often took aim at the soft underbelly of reputation.

Attacks proliferated, since the public sphere and expanding print trade encouraged the participation of a wide range of individuals and gave voice to many conflicting interests. Generic innovations flourished. Polemical dialogue and drama already shared a concern with rhetoric, plots, motives, and relationships. Each also tended to be topical. Never before the Restoration, however, were these forms presented to a public so systematically habituated to innuendo and deceit. And never before were the relationships among writers, patrons, publishers and a wider public so intimate.

Since Restoration writers were sophisticated rhetoricians, the characters that inhabit their dramatic creations often reflect an appreciation of the values of brilliant oratory. This applies equally to most talented writers of the period, whether these writers wrote drama or polemics or both. Writers shared a self-consciousness about the methods and purposes of persuasion. In short "Popular passions," announced L'Estrange, "are mov'd by popular

⁶Literary Magazine 1758, p. 197. qtd. in Kitchin Sir Roger L'Estrange (1913) 380n.

Discourses, as the Waves of the Sea are by the Power of the Winds."⁷ Tracts such as newsbooks, dialogues and broadsides, among the "popular Discourses" mentioned by L'Estrange, can often be classified as propaganda, because they employ written rhetoric on behalf of political faction. Contemporary drama also explored the central political issues of government, although the sophistication of these explorations varied. Drama historically functioned as commentary on political events. Some obviously polemical drama of the Restoration shared more rhetorical strategies with propaganda pamphlets than with other plays. More complex examples, such as Thomas Otway's Venice Preserv'd, at once invite and shield themselves from application to contemporary events. This kind of rhetoric invites more open or multiple readings.⁸ These texts can no more profitably be read wholly as propaganda than they can as texts that entirely transcend contemporary issues: they examine and they provoke; they persuade and they interrogate. Finally, texts such as John Dryden's and Nathaniel Lee's collaborative The Duke of Guise, and the polemical debate it provoked, occupy junctures of history, contemporary politics, and aesthetics that strongly resist classification as one or another genre.⁹ Dryden's and Lee's drama hit the mark, if its success can be gauged according to the comprehensiveness and copiousness of responses the

⁷Roger L'Estrange, L'Estrange His Appeal Humbly Submitted (f. Henry Brome, 1681) 24.

⁸Phillip Harth provides an overview of contending readings of the drama in his "Political Interpretations of Venice Preserv'd," Modern Philology 85(1987): 361-2.

⁹The most famous example of a text from this period that resists generic classification is probably Dryden's Absalom and Achitophel. In his Vindication Dryden claims that he took up Lee's invitation to collaborate on The Duke of Guise "just upon the finishing of a Poem, when I would have been glad of a little respite before the undertaking of a second Task" (Works [1992] 14:310-11). The poem in question was likely Absalom and Achitophel, published around the end of November, 1681 (Works [1992] 14:478n).

play provoked. The debates around the origins and interpretations of Dryden's and Lee's political intrigue take place in the public sphere, which is the concrete space of the printed page and the psychic space between the directly political and the obviously personal. The debate reveals its place in this new sphere by its subject matter and by the generic mutations encouraged by this new and potent arena.

The years 1678-81--the period that has come to be known as the Exclusion Crisis--experienced widespread instability. It was caused in part by the legislative attempts to bar the Catholic Duke of York from the succession, but several other long-term as well as contemporary issues combined to threaten civil war in a way that recalled the experience of the previous generation. The activities of the Earl of Shaftesbury were of concern; the place of the Protestant Dissenters from the Church of England in the political and ecclesiastical system was no clearer than when L'Estrange engaged them at the Restoration. Distrust between Court and 'Country' factions and debates over the constitutional power of the monarchy were exacerbated by the short-term anxieties of 1678-83. Of more immediate concern was the Popish Plot, coupled with a weakness of Court representation in Parliament. The lapse of the Printing Act in May or June 1679 encouraged a broad range of social groups to participate in printed exchanges. Political awareness was further encouraged by the unprecedented three parliamentary elections between 1679-81.¹⁰

The Restoration playhouse was strongly influenced by political currents. The Lord Chamberlain often felt compelled to ban plays, whether before or after their initial

¹⁰For an overview of the events of this period, see Knights Politics and Opinion (1994) 16-28.

performance. From 1674 to 1685 the post was filled by Henry Bennett, Earl of Arlington, a strong Royalist who had been a member of Charles II's council from early in the Restoration.¹¹ During the Exclusion Crisis he prohibited The Duke of Guise, Crowne's City Politiques, Lee's Massacre at Paris, and Banks's Cyrus the Great, The Innocent Usurper, and The Island Queens. Lee's Lucius Junius Brutus, Tate's Richard II, and Crowne's Henry VI, The First Part were banned after performance.¹²

It has further become customary to assume that dramatic and literary texts produced in the unstable atmosphere of Exclusion Crisis England were strongly affected not only by the direct intervention of the Lord Chamberlain, but more obliquely by the activities and fortunes of various key political figures, especially Charles, James, Monmouth and Shaftesbury. In an overview of the period, J. Douglas Canfield characterizes it as "royalism's last dramatic stand."¹³ Like others, Canfield argues that the products of this period are, owing to the active and passive interference of Court authority and patronage, thinly-veiled attempts to bolster a troubled monarchy before an elite audience through moral allegory and caricature of the monarchy's enemies.¹⁴ The stage certainly addressed topical

¹¹Seaward Cavalier Parliament (1988) 14-15.

¹²Arthur F. White, "The Office of Revels and Dramatic Censorship during the Restoration Period," The Western Reserve University Bulletin, 34 (1931): 30-43.

¹³J. Douglas Canfield, "Royalism's Last Dramatic Stand: English Political Tragedy, 1679-89." Modern Philology 82(1985): 234.

¹⁴Other modern studies of the connections between politics and literature include Rose A. Zimbardo, "At Zero Point: Discourse, Politics, and Satire in Restoration England," ELH 59 (1992): 785-98; Harry P. Solomon, "The Rhetoric of 'Redressing Grievances': Court Propaganda as the Hermeneutical Key to Venice Preserv'd," ELH 53 (1986): 289-310; Ronald Berman "Nature in Venice Preserv'd," ELH 36 (1969): 523-35.

issues, most obviously by means of parallels of character and situation, but these parallels were of varying applicability and complexity.¹⁵ And playwrights who openly aligned themselves with the House of Stuart were allowed to be more active than strong political dissenters during this period.¹⁶ However, the various allegiances among dramatists, patrons and authorities complicate the matter beyond any simple polarization of Whig and Tory ideologies. Nor can Restoration dramas entirely be examined as part of a history of genre independent of the social context which produced them and to which they contributed.¹⁷

On the surface, it would seem that drama's slight influence on contemporary events does not warrant close critical scrutiny. Whether published or performed, drama reached only a very small segment of the population. It is difficult to sustain the argument that drama itself affected more than a coterie audience, and even less defensible to suggest that it was "the dominant literary form" of the period.¹⁸ Coterie drama itself did not exert a strong

¹⁵On parallels see Roper in Dryden Works 14:501-4. See also Alan Roper, "Drawing Parallels and Making Applications in Restoration Literature," Politics as Reflected in Literature, eds. Richard Ashcraft and Alan Roper (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1989) 31-65; and John M. Wallace, "Examples are Best Precepts: Readers and Meanings in Seventeenth-Century Poetry," Critical Inquiry I(1974): 273-90.

¹⁶George Whiting was the first to note that by 1682 "no new Whig plays were produced." See his "The Condition of the London Theatres, 1679-83: A Reflection of the Political Situation," Modern Philology 25(1927): 205n.

¹⁷Laura Brown, for example, places the drama of this period within the "reigning hierarchy of formal choices" divorced from social context, and opts for "pathos" as the only rhetorical choice left dramatists who wish to elicit sympathy from an audience (English Dramatic Form [New Haven: Yale UP, 1981] 86, 73).

¹⁸This important point is made by Keeble, Literary Culture of Nonconformity (1987) 139. Harold Love argues that the Restoration playhouse "belonged" to aristocratic audiences, but only inasmuch as they "might exercise a direct influence on management, casting, and repertoire" (39). On the composition of the Restoration dramatic audience see his "Who Were the Restoration Audience?" Yearbook of English Studies 10(1980): 21-44.

influence in the public sphere, although most of the drama produced during the Popish Plot addressed contemporary issues despite dramatists' claims that their plays had no function in public debates about politics. Dryden wrote that

'Tis the business of factious men [not playwrights] to stir up the Populace. Sir Edmond on Horseback, attended by a Swindging Pope in Effigie, and forty thousand true Protestants for his Guard to Execution, are a Show more proper for that design, than a thousand Stage-Plays [sic].¹⁹

The pope-burning processions are the popular drama of the early 1680s, Dryden claims. He distinguishes "Stage-Plays" (including his own Duke Of Guise) from the amusements of the general population. Dryden here resorts to the same rhetorical defensive move Otway had used in his prologue to Venice Preserv'd. They claim that drama is removed from the religio-political sphere ("our Poets Preach, whilst Church-men Plot") and the popular sphere ("factious men [not playwrights] . . . stir up the Populace"). Thus the playwrights protect themselves from accusations of political commentary, although such accusations were strongly invited by the plays and poems themselves, as well as by contemporary habits of dramatic reception.

If (as Dryden too contends), the plays of 1679 to 1683 were not immensely and broadly popular, they did reflect national politics, and they felt the pressures of direct censorship as surely as did other contributions to political culture. If these plays reached only a coterie audience and had little or no direct consequence on affairs of state, then what influence could such a self-styled marginal genre have on political discourse or the evolution

¹⁹Vindication in Works (1992) 14:321.

of the public sphere? Patterson claims that according to the "unwritten rules" of the playhouse, a drama's effect depended on

the local concerns being just visible enough to audiences already partly in the know. The intended reaction would have been talk--the kind of talk that had been suspended in Parliament and could both consolidate the Opposition, and conceivably, lead to some change in government policy.²⁰

Patterson is here discussing the hermeneutic rules that applied to a play-going group who were intimate with political personalities, among whom alliances could directly affect government policy. As she has demonstrated, drama could influence such groups. Drama also inspired public groups less intimately bound up with Parliamentary affairs, however, ones which had no direct access to Parliament yet which had access to a shared body of knowledge and opinion about their governments. First of all, dramatic form had a profound impact on the form of polemical tracts, from the Interregnum on, but especially during the period under consideration. Coterie drama's generic offspring exerted a direct influence on published debates. Secondly, the work of the period's more talented dramatists embraces the rhetorical indirection and innuendo that characterizes so many Restoration tracts, but talented dramatists use indirection more effectively and with greater sophistication than any other group of writers. In fact "Matters of State are canvassed on the Stage," wrote Dryden in his defence of The Duke of Guise, "and things of Gravest Concernment there managed."²¹

²⁰Annabel Patterson, "The Country Gentleman: Howard, Marvell, and Dryden in the Theatre of Politics," Studies in English Literature 25(1985) 506.

²¹John Dryden, The Vindication . . . [of] the Play Called The Duke of Guise, The Works of John Dryden, eds. Vinton A. Dearing and Alan Roper (Berkeley: U of California P, 1992) 14:312.

Modern critics agree about the difficulty of defining the boundaries between genres in the products of the Restoration. One might argue, with Nancy Maguire, that an absence of strongly established "generic identity," one of the results of the hiatus in dramatic writing during the Interregnum, encouraged in Restoration genres a malleability, a permeability, they might otherwise have lacked.²² The period witnessed "slippage from one genre to another"²³ as the "pressure" of "new political reality" made itself felt in the growing print and artistic trades.²⁴ The weakening of generic boundaries is marked by the disintegration of the hierarchical valuation of 'literary' and 'non-literary' texts. Two of the practices which most vividly exemplify this disintegration are the widespread use of the language of plots and intrigue and of the rhetorical strategies of the polemical dialogue.²⁵ Plots and dialogue are characteristic, of course, of drama and political discourse alike. The years 1678-83 (along with 1688-89) witnessed an explosion of interest in the representation of political and personal deception. Writers describing the relationships among individuals and factions

²²Nancy Klein Maguire, "The 'Whole Truth' of Restoration Tragicomedy," Renaissance Tragicomedy (New York: AMS, 1987) 224.

²³J. Douglas Canfield, The Rhetorics of Order, eds. J. Douglas Canfield and J. Paul Hunter (Toronto: Associated UP, 1989) 14.

²⁴Maguire "The 'Whole Truth'" (1987) 227.

²⁵For the philosophical basis of dialogue and its practice in the early Renaissance see Virginia Cox, The Renaissance Dialogue: Literary Dialogue in its Social and Political Contexts, Castiglione to Galileo (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992) 4-7 and passim. Early studies of polemical dialogues in the Restoration include Eugene R. Purpus, "The Plain, Easy, and Familiar Way," Journal Of English Literary History 17(1950): 47-58. For an overview of the practice see D.F. McKenzie, "Speech-Manuscript-Print," The Library Chronicle of the University of Texas at Austin 20(1990): 87-110. See also Timothy Dykstal, "Conversation and Political Controversy," in Kevin L. Cope, ed., Compendious Conversations: The Method of Dialogue in the Early Enlightenment (New York: Peter Lang, 1992): 306-20.

exploited the vocabulary of deceit, plotting, and intrigue. Many dramatists had first-hand experience in writing propaganda. When such dramatists adopted pamphleteers' strategies of polemical dialogue, this led to plays that tended to simplify and polarize complicated arguments. While the language of plots and intrigue provided an idiom for the discussion of political and other relationships, the dialogue presented a commodious, familiar and malleable rhetorical framework in which writers could approach and phrase contentious political issues in terms guaranteed to be familiar to their audiences.

In the Restoration world of competing narratives, faced with a changing religio-political hierarchy of authority, propagandists augmented the traditional method of visual propaganda with written persuasive discourse. Events such as the pope-burning processions often worked in conjunction with printed propaganda, since "manipulating public perceptions through the printed word was especially effective, and therefore perilous."²⁶ Dramatic prologues and epilogues experienced a significant rise in publication as broadsides in the 1681-1683 period. They now commented on more than the activity on the stage; they provided a bridge between writer and audience, between the plots being represented on the stage and those being acted in the larger political arena.²⁷ In other tracts the ubiquitous preface, sometimes vying in complexity of argument and length with the writing it

²⁶Jeffrey K. Sawyer, Printed Poison: Pamphlet Propaganda, Faction Politics, and the Public Sphere in Early Seventeenth-Century France (Berkeley: U of California P, 1990) 16-17.

²⁷Danchin Prologues and Epilogues (1981-4) 3:16-20.

introduced, served as a bridge as well, establishing a relationship between the polemicist, his or her faction, and the audience which was to be influenced by the work.²⁸

Writers betrayed their self-conscious reliance on rhetoric by foregrounding the relationship between texts and the audiences they addressed. To render explicit the assumptions underlying the act of communication suggests that the act itself has been rendered problematic.²⁹ In a tract published to compete with other narratives of the plot, L'Estrange examines the theoretical basis of persuasion by asking "what is a NARRATIVE?" In response he sets up an opposition which acknowledges that written texts are judged not by their relationship to truth so much as by their style: a narrative can equally be, he writes, a "Relation of something that may be seen, felt, heard, or understood" or "a Relation of something that Can neither be seen, felt, heard nor understood." The contemporary belief that persuasion alone is the basis for a tract's success has encouraged the elision of fact and fiction: what he calls "the Popping of Catt and Dogs Flesh upon us, for Cony, and Venison."³⁰

Restoration playwrights exploited their traditional roles as public commentators, and encouraged the identification of drama and politics.³¹ Often providing the subject matter for prologues, in 1679 the Popish Plot rendered the boundaries between the world and the stage

²⁸The practice of using prologues as a bridge would evolve, for example, into Jonathan Swift's brilliant and satiric manipulation of the conventions of the genre in A Tale of a Tub.

²⁹Cox Renaissance Dialogue (1992) 7.

³⁰L'Estrange's Narrative of the Plot (b. J.B., f. Henry Brome, 7 July, 1680) 1.

³¹Dryden wrote that his audiences "turn Players on the Worlds great Stage,/ And Act your selves the Farce of your own Age" (prologue, The Loyal General, by Nahum Tate [f. Henry Bonwicke, 1680] [a2]).

even more porous. Thomas Shadwell described popular polemic and boasted of its impact on the public interpretations of political events and characters. The prologue to The Woman-Captain (September 1679) described the intrigue lurking in "Each Coffee-house . . . fill'd with subtle folk,/ Who wisely talk, and politickly smoke."³² Playwrights accused politicians of the most elaborate machinations. Otway's anarchic Venice Preserv'd; or a Plot Discovered closely compares playwright to plotter:

IN these unseetl'd Times, when each man dreads
The Bloudy Stratagems of buisy Heads,
.....
What made our Poet meddle with a Plot?
Was't that he fanci'd, for the very sake
And name of PLOT, his trifling Play might take?³³

This prologue both acknowledges the play's debt to political plot narratives and questions the propriety of playwrights meddling with plots. The traditional role of the poet, Otway disingenuously claims, is to create fancy or trifles. This role has been usurped by the politician. The plot of Venice Preserv'd is innocent claims Otway, in ways that plots outside the playhouse are not. But if the plot on stage and the one outside the playhouse are not identical, does this necessarily mean that plays have no application to contemporary political circumstance? Nahum Tate assumes an even closer interdependence between playhouse and political stage, and between the writer and the politician. "Poets must take the Churches Teaching Trade,/ Since Priests their Province of Intrigue invade." More than simply sharing a familiarity with various literary genres, the function of the poet, to

³²Pierre Danchin, ed., The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration, 1660-1700, 4 vols. (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1981-84) 3:193.

³³Prologue to a New Play, Called Venice Preserv'd (f. A Banks, 1682).

"Intrigue," has been usurped by the "Church-men." Won by default, the poets' new function is to "Teach" or to place contemporary issues in a broader, usually historical, perspective. Tate claims that playwrights "the worst in this Exchange have got," and fears the demise of the playhouse, once the boundaries between the playhouse and the outside world disintegrate. The rhetoric of the poet cannot compete with the greater attraction of "real" intrigue: "In vain our Poets Preach, whilst Church-men Plot."³⁴

Writers plotted; they constructed dramatic plots; they wrote dramas about plots; and they wrote some of these dramas as their contribution to plot narratives. They plotted because they were conscious of the fictional or at least highly provisional authority of the narratives they wrote and circulated in their attempts to control one another's perceptions and those of their other audiences. Propagandists invented, hatched, revealed, debunked and exploited real and imagined activities. They plundered the texts of their enemies for evidence of secret motives. During the panic of the alleged Popish Plot the revelation (or fabrication) of a large-scale, sophisticated, Catholic conspiracy to assassinate Charles II led to acrimonious debate in Parliament and held the imaginations of pamphleteers and dramatists. The art of written accusation and counter-accusation developed within the next eighteen months to the extent that L'Estrange could boast that "there are [now] as many sorts of Plots as there are of Narratives."

Since the practice of intrigue was common to all factions, it did not possess inherently negative connotations. In fact, L'Estrange contends that plotting is endemic not simply to political life, but to all aspects of social interaction. Not the exclusive purview of the Court,

³⁴Danchin Prologues and Epilogues (1981-4) 3:271.

plots can be personal (what he calls "Plots of Passion") or "Plots of Interest", whether "Publick" or "Private." Intrigues of state can be both "Forreign and Domestick," "Ecclesiasticall and Civill." From the standpoint of this monarchical propagandist, plotters attempt either "to Undermine Governments, [or] . . . to Support them." The practice of literary deception does not necessarily undermine the political or ecclesiastical status quo. Plotting, intrigue and equivocation are integral parts of Restoration culture. The words possess multivalent connotations and have not yet developed their strictly pejorative twentieth-century colouring. Moreover, when propagandists use the lexicon of intrigue, the defence of ideology does not depend on any underlying truth claim. There are "Plots to make Plots; and Plots to Spoil Plots; Plots to give Credit to Sham-Plots; and Plots again to Baffle, and Discountenance Reall Ones."³⁵ The tendency to represent the world as a series of plots has broad implications. 'Fact' and 'fiction' intertwined in press and in Parliamentary committee as witnesses and sceptics attempted either to prove the existence of one plot or to replace it with another. The propaganda genre of the 'plot narrative' developed as individual writers attempted to gain credence in a marketplace filled with competing narratives. The Popish Plot and related intrigues represented and contributed to a prevailing unease over the infiltration of French Catholic and absolutist principles into English politics and society, and had practical consequences, not the least of which, in the case of the Popish Plot, was the execution of five innocent men.

The subject matter of the serious drama of the late 1670s and early 1680s bore an extraordinary resemblance to the plots concocted, discovered, and debunked in the

³⁵L'Estrange Narrative (1680) 1.

propaganda of the same period. Few serious dramas attempted the stage without at least one political intrigue. Many original dramas were constructed around a series of deceptions--Otway's Venice Preserv'd and Caius Marius, Tate's Loyal General, Lee's Lucius Junius Brutus, Dryden's and Lee's The Duke of Guise.³⁶ When dramatists interpreted and adapted earlier dramas a political plot might be added; this is the case with Dryden's and Lee's 1678 Oedipus, and Settle's The Female Prelate.³⁷ Those which lack the focus of a political plot most often include either a secondary or a central intrigue for the physical or spiritual possession of a woman, as in Lee's Caesar Borgia, Tate's The Loyal General, and Otway's The Orphan.³⁸

The lack of ultimate authority, which led to the neutralization of the moral implications of deception and plotting, led to practical problems in the writing of drama and especially of Restoration tragedy, since the actions of the hero could not be compared favourably or unfavourably with a transcendent pattern. Dramatic tragedy is convincing

³⁶Thomas Otway's Venice Preserv'd; or, A Plot Discovered was first performed 9 February 1682, and his Caius Marius was probably performed in October 1679; Nahum Tate's The Loyal General was probably performed in December or January 1679-80; Lee's Lucius Junius Brutus was first performed on 8 December 1680 (William van Lennep, ed., The London Stage, 1660-1800 [Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1965] 1:281-306).

³⁷Dryden's and Lee's Oedipus was performed in September 1678; Elkanah Settle's The Female Prelate was performed in late May and early June 1680 (Van Lennep London Stage [1965] 1:273, 286).

³⁸Lee's Caesar Borgia was performed in late spring or early summer 1679; Otway's The Orphan was produced in late February 1680 (Van Lennep London Stage [1965] 1:266-67, 283).

only if there is an underwriting Word, a Supreme being that punished those that break their words--their pledges of allegiance and coronation oaths, their vows of marital fidelity, their promises, their judicial oaths.³⁹

Owing to the contemporary absence of a sense of inevitability against which the actions of the hero might be judged, the serious drama shares with ephemeral tracts the desire to move or affect the audience by means of extreme rhetoric and polarized or 'heightened' opposition. Dryden wrote of Lee that the latter "made every Man and Woman . . . in his Plays stark raging mad: there was not a sober person to be had for love or money."⁴⁰ Contemporary dramatic theory privileged the rhetoric of persuasion over the delineation of characters or of psychology.⁴¹ Essentialized characters in implausible situations subordinate subtlety of argument to effect on the audience. "The end of Tragedies or serious Playes" suggests Dryden's *Lisideius*, "is to beget admiration, compassion, or concernment."⁴² Contemporary definitions of tragedy acknowledge the influence of rhetorical theory: "the assumption of an essential didactic function, the idea of an exalted subject matter, and especially the concern with the response evoked in the spectator."⁴³ Serious drama accomplishes this didactic purpose more often through characters and language than through the fable or plot. "The

³⁹J. Douglas Canfield, "Poetical Justice in Some Neglected Masterpieces of Restoration Drama," Rhetorics of Order/Ordering Rhetorics (1989) 39.

⁴⁰John Dryden, De Arte Graphica, The Works of John Dryden, ed. Wallace Maurer (Berkeley: U of California P, 1989) 20: 65.

⁴¹Keeble Literary Culture of Nonconformity (1987) 217.

⁴²Of Dramatic Poesie, An Essay, Works, vol. 14, eds. Samuel Holt Monk, et. al. (Berkeley: U of California P, 1971) 35.

⁴³Robert D. Hume, The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 51.

Fable is not the greatest Master-Piece of a Tragedy" Dryden proclaims, "for a Fable never so Movingly contriv'd . . . will operate nothing in our Affections, except the Characters, Manners, Thoughts and Words are suitable."⁴⁴ The unstable political environment in which the serious writer produced his or her texts encouraged the expression of relationships in the idiom of intrigue and hidden motive. Accusations could not depend solely on an unstable political and religious hierarchy as a source of authority.

The precarious position of the monarchy in the early 1660s encouraged the production of pamphlet dialogues, which reproduce a monologic relationship between writer and reader in that between its fictional characters.⁴⁵ The sharp increase once again in the number of dialogues produced during the Exclusion Crisis points to both the inescapability of differing opinions and the desire to subsume them.⁴⁶ Some early and some more subtle dialogues--such as Dryden's Essay of Dramatic Poesy, as well as Dryden's, Otway's and

⁴⁴'Heads' xvii.185; quoted in Hume Development of English Drama (1976) 155.

⁴⁵Dialogue flourished not only during the Exclusion Crisis, but during other periods of attempted or successful revolution in the seventeenth century as well. According to calculations carried out on Donald Wing's Short Title Catalogue the period 1641-1700 saw the publication of over 3,000 anonymous dialogic pamphlets (McKenzie "Speech-Manuscript-Print" [1990] 103). Steven Zwicker claims that "the Restoration did not begin with an open acknowledgement of pluralism; it began, in fact, with strenuous efforts to deny faction and dissent" ("Lines of Authority: Politics and Literary Culture in the Restoration," Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England, eds. Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker [Berkeley: U of California P, 1987] 231).

⁴⁶The concept of 'dialogue' here encompasses many generic variants. Along with the dramatic dialogues populated by fictional characters (such as Citt and Bumpkin [1680] or Zekiel and Ephraim [1680]), tracts with dialogic form include responses to specific authors (such as A Whipp for the Schismaticall Animadverter [1662]), and answers to particular tracts (or groups of tracts), whether that response was interlinear (as in the Answer to the Appeal [1679]) or less systematic (as in the Account of the Growth of Knavery [1679]) where the entire tract to be controverted is not quoted line for line.

Lee's best drama--complicate the relationship between persuasion, representation, and authority. The vast majority of dialogues produced 1678-83, however, whether on stage or in print, encouraged a closed or monologic reading. Ephemeral dialogue, the most widely available form of print culture, exerted a broad influence on the representation of political events.⁴⁷ These works sought at once to reinforce the support of adherents while criticizing and refuting arguments in support of opposing groups. The most effective, because unanswerable, pattern of attack involved allegations of plotting.⁴⁸ Because these centred on multiple or secret motives for actions, L'Estrange admitted, they could seldom be verified. "We have no Windows into our Breasts, and there's no proving or disproving a Thought."⁴⁹

Dryden admits that the characters in his Essay of Dramatic Poesy "differ'd in their opinions . . . : neither do I take it upon me to reconcile, but to relate them . . . without Passion or Interest."⁵⁰ The preface, rather than serving as a guide, abandons the reader to the text's different interpretive possibilities. Another, very popular and more typical fictional dialogue of the period, written by L'Estrange, states that its author has "endeavour'd to paint Truth it self to the Life, without any Prepossessions of Malevolence against either Parties, or Persons." The dialogue, Citt and Bumpkin.....[2nd part], is, the narrator admits, an entirely

⁴⁷This point is also made by N.H. Keeble The Literary Culture of Nonconformity (1987) 139. For a description of the various forms of available printed propaganda see Knights Politics and Opinion (1994) 168-84.

⁴⁸Jacques Ellul suggests that the realm of intentions is "the realm of the lie, but it is exactly here that it cannot be detected . . . [N]o proof can be furnished where motivations or intentions are concerned" (57). See his Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes, trans. Konrad Keller and Jean Lerner (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1969) 57.

⁴⁹Citt and Bumpkin . . . The Second Part. (1680) 20.

⁵⁰Of Dramatic Poesie, An Essay in Works (1971) 17:6.

fictitious exchange between two Dissenters. While it acknowledges its debt to fiction, however, Citt and Bumpkin claims to reveal the truth by example or illustration, in L'Estrange's words, by "laying open the Rocks and Sands that we perisht upon before."⁵¹ The pedagogical relationship has the writer informing the reader of the proper interpretation of the text. The dialogue employs a fictional "Method," concludes the narrator, "that is . . . Familiar, and Entertaining"⁵² to represent a "Prospect" which is "Clear, Distinct, and Impartial."⁵³ Its dialogue form disguises the monologic force of the text which was introduced by the preface.

According to the instructions laid out in Citt and Bumpkin, then, dialogue acknowledges diversity of opinion only in order to subsume it under a dominant reading. A dialogic structure of this type imposes

a pedagogic relationship between master and pupil, text and reader, in which language is . . . mobilized in order to teach by force a truth already found, a truth whose free discovery by another results in fact from the manipulation of discursive force.⁵⁴

The conventional preface in tracts of this period almost always introduce this pedagogical relationship between author and reader. The dialogue's purpose is to "convince you of your

⁵¹L'Estrange Citt and Bumpkin . . . The Second Part (1680) [A3^v]. The two parts of Citt and Bumpkin were among L'Estrange's most popular productions. The first part was reissued five times, and second four times. They were also reproduced in his Collection of Several Tracts in Quarto of 1684.

⁵²Observer 1.470 (9 January 1684). Here he writes further that the familiarity of the dialogue is "as a kind of Composition betwixt Mee and the Multitude; For that which is Serious, and Necessary will not go down without it."

⁵³Toleration Discuss'd 3rd ed. (f. Henry Brome, 1681) [A3^v].

⁵⁴Daniel Brewer, "The Philosophical Dialogue and the Forcing of Truth," Modern Language Notes 98(1983) 1240.

Error, by Argument, in those things . . . that are disagreeing with truth, common Justice and honesty."⁵⁵ The structure of the dialogue reinforces the 'dominant' reading introduced in the prefatory material. Dryden's premise in the Essay of Dramatic Poesy that dialogue reflects an 'honest' or disinterested exchange of opinions (whether or not this exchange leads to a consensual notion of truth) depends on a disinterested or 'naive' reading of his text. A written dialogue, according to this view, evokes the energy of minds exploring either a territory where consensus is unnecessary or, most commonly, in the words of one of Henry Neville's protagonists, one where "gentlemen and men of sense" can "discover and find out truth."⁵⁶ However, these open interpretations depend on the naive reading. If Restoration writers inherited a tradition of the dialogue which acknowledged the distinction between an open and a closed text, many (L'Estrange among them) assumed that the latter served to encourage epistemological certainty.⁵⁷

In spite of their apparent simplicity, ephemeral dialogues borrowed heavily from other genres, including philosophical dialogue, catechism, the Theophrastan character, historical narratives, and drama. Conversely, obviously 'literary' artifacts shared concerns and

⁵⁵The Trimmer Catechised: or, A Serious discourse between Truman and Trimmer (b. George Croom, 1683) 1.

⁵⁶Henry Neville, Plato Redivivus: or, A Dialogue Concerning Government (f. S.I., s.b. R. Dew, 1681); reproduced in Two Republican Tracts, ed. Caroline Robbins (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1969) 77.

⁵⁷Descartes wrote that "Chaque fois que sur le même sujet deux [hommes] sont d'un avis différent, il est certain que l'un des deux au moins se trompe; et même aucun d'eux, semble-t-il, ne possède la science: car, si les raisons de l'un étaient certaines et évidentes, il pourrait les exposer à l'autre de telle manière qu'il finirait par le convaincre à son tour" ("Règles pour la direction de l'esprit" 40; quoted in Brewer "Philosophical Dialogue" [1983] 1247).

language with their 'low' relations. Political propaganda in dramatic form is populated by simplified characters whose dialogues mimic those from the ephemeral counterparts. This tendency can be observed in the dramas written to exploit contemporary francophobia, for example, both in its political manifestation as absolutism and in its religious guise of Catholicism.

One example of a self-conscious hybrid of Popish Plot narrative and dramatic text is The Excommunicated Prince: or, The False Relique . . . Being the Popish Plot in a Play. The text functions primarily as a piece of political propaganda.⁵⁸ Normal generic boundaries between dramatic and political documents do not apply to this piece. Although it resembles published dramatic texts in its length, dramatis personae, act divisions and stage directions, the structure of The Excommunicated Prince recalls the pedagogical structure of the political dialogues among which it circulated. The play was never staged, nor was it, as the title page claims, by "Capt. William Bedloe" at all, despite Bedloe's active involvement in the discovery of the Popish Plot.⁵⁹ Bedloe's name on the title page serves the same function as a factional imprint: any reader familiar with Bedloe's allegiances would immediately understand the proper manner in which the text should be interpreted. The advertisement of the play, on its title page, as "A Tragedy. As it was Acted by his holines's Servants" consciously underlines the parallel between the Jesuit plotters outside the drama and

⁵⁸William Bedloe, The Excommunicated Prince: Or, The False Relique . . . Being the Popish Plot in a Play (f. Thomas Parkhurst, D. Newman, Thomas Cockerill, and Thomas Simmons, 1679).

⁵⁹Bedloe also lent his name to A Narrative and Impartial Discovery (1679) which accused the papists of starting the fires in London in 1666.

'Bedloe's' fictional plot. In The Excommunicated Prince characters and dialogues address the complex religious and political issues underlying the Popish Plot in simple and polarized terms: Protestant liberty versus Catholic domination.

The dialogue between the dramatist 'Bedloe' and the reader is reproduced in the dialogue between Miletas the spy-hero and the good Prince Teimuraziz. A choice between the idea of Catholicism (with the arbitrary government which attends it) and that of Protestantism (toleration, property, moderation) is presented in the form of a choice between characters. The possibility of compromise, of being convinced or of introducing new conflict into the argument--the possibility of difference or dialogism, in short--is precluded by the pedagogical function of the propaganda.

'Bedloe's' text is not unusual in its reductive and propagandistic approach both to English politics and to the art of the dramatist. The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, a "popular chronicle" performed "to great applause" at Bartholomew and Southwark Fairs in the autumn of 1680, offers a nostalgic vision of Tudor England, long before the Civil War, when all ranks of a still hierarchical English society banded together for the same monarchical and Protestant ideals--when "loyalty to the Crown was [still] the badge of true Protestant Englishmen."⁶⁰ Tim the Tinker and Brush the Cooper pummel the crypto-Catholic Honeysuckle into obedience and burn the pope, while Queen Elizabeth clears her Court of any vestiges of French presence and on the seas defeats "Spain and France with their United

⁶⁰Mark Goldie, "Priestcraft and the Birth of Whiggism," Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain, eds. Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) 215; J.D., The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, with the Restauration of the Protestant Religion: or, the Downfal of the Pope (f. Ben. Harris, 1680).

Powers." Elkanah Settle's The Female Prelate, performed by the King's Company in 1680, fulfils what Bedloe's text lacks in terms of dramatic criteria: Settle was an established playwright, the play was performed as drama, and it is marginally more complex than The Excommunicated Prince.⁶¹ In spite of this, Settle's text functions, like polemical works, both to construct a dichotomy between the loyal and good Duke of Saxony and the intriguing, violent, and lecherous epitome of Catholicism--Pope Joan, whose incontrovertible duplicity is represented by her sexuality--and to present the audience with an unequivocal choice between the ideology of "true Protestant liberty" and that of duplicitous Catholic slavery.

'Bedloe' and the authors of The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth wrote plays clearly on behalf of faction. Less overtly political dramas, however, also essentialize relationships. Thomas Shadwell's interpretation of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens dates from early in this period.⁶² It does not refer explicitly to the Popish Plot yet betrays tendencies similar to those in the propaganda plays. If the polarized structure of the dialogues in The Excommunicated Prince reflects its author's inability or unwillingness to acknowledge the complexity of political events, the polarity of the characters in Shadwell's Timon impairs their capacity for communication. The difference of course lies in the different functions of the two texts. The two extremes in 'Bedloe's' drama do not need to communicate. On the contrary, for Shadwell's Timon to succeed as drama, the sense of inevitable tragedy which gives the genre

⁶¹Elkanah Settle, The Female Prelate: Being the History of the Life and Death of Pope Joan (f. William Cademan, 1680).

⁶²It was licensed by L'Estrange on 18 February 1679.

its power should arise in the characters or situation, not from a strained plot. One modern analysis of Shakespeare's Timon claims that Shadwell's adaptation

does him little credit. Even if he could be excused for giving Timon both a faithful mistress, Evandra, and an unfaithful one, Melissa, with the consequent triteness of plot, he can hardly be pardoned for the triteness of his language, so inadequate to the tragic theme.⁶³

The addition of the two lovers to Shakespeare's texts 'pollutes' the tragic genre. Evandra's and Melissa's relationships with Timon present a structural problem. The dialogue between Evandra (the faithful) and Timon conforms to the model of many two-character exchanges in the serious drama of these years. Her eloquent plea fails to convince her betrayer. Once she abandons her plea, Timon changes his mind (temporarily), but there is no sense that he is convinced by the force of her argument or by the rhetoric she employs, nor does Timon's decision mark any change in character. As is the case both with the political dialogues and with 'Bedloe's' drama, Timon and Evandra both lack the ability to persuade or induce a change in behaviour. Evandra serves no identifiable purpose in the plot--her presence does present Timon with a conflict, but he is structurally incapable of resolving it--hence the critique that these characters 'debase' the tragic plot. Tate abandons the psychological complexity that characterizes Shakespeare's play and formed the foundation of its 'tragic theme.' Further, in order to adapt the earlier play to the taste of a playgoing audience steeped in the political machinations of 1679, he adds another plot.

These dramas can be imagined to inhabit a continuum, in which an ideal of 'pure' propaganda lies at one end and one of drama that is completely disengaged from its social

⁶³H.J. Oliver, "Timon of Athens on the London Stage," Timon of Athens, ed. H.J. Oliver (London: Methuen, 1959) 152.

context inhabits the other. The position of any play on this scale is determined by its generic characteristics (including its function). Dryden claimed that pope-burning processions, which were dumb shows only broadly orchestrated and without published scripts, belong with other factional writing, categorically distinct from art.⁶⁴ The Excommunicated Prince and The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth also function as propaganda, although both imitate the published form of a less embattled genre. If they were performed at all, however, it was not in the playhouse. The Female Prelate, though simplistic and didactic, was a serious drama by a serious playwright, actually performed.⁶⁵ John Dryden's and Nathaniel Lee's The Duke of Guise is a dramatic text which complicates the distinctions among genres in much more sophisticated ways than propaganda that borrows the form of drama. On the other hand, the drama needs also to be read in its political context. If The Duke of Guise was successful as coterie drama in the playhouse, if (as Dryden maintained) the play was immune to political application due to its venue, the Duke of Guise that circulated *in print* presents an entirely different case. Publishing the play placed it firmly in the public sphere. To analyze the play as a public document, though, the text must be imagined as part of a larger conversation--one that encompassed not only the issues addressed in the play but also the

⁶⁴The Lord Mayor's Day processions also functioned as propaganda, to build what one critic calls the "ideology of consensus" (John Patrick Montañó, "The Quest for Consensus: The Lord Mayor's Day Shows in the 1670s," Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration, ed. Gerald Maclean (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995) 32.

⁶⁵The third night of performance of The Female Prelate on 2 June 1680 was the locus of a snub of Settle by Charles' mistress the Duchess of Portsmouth, who on that night "to disoblige Mr. Settle the Poet carryed all the Court with her to the Dukes house to see Macbeth" (John Harold Wilson, "Theatre Notes from the Newdigate Newsletters," Theatre Notes 15(1960) 80.

responses and defenses provoked by the drama. Originally ready for the stage in July 1682, the play was banned by order of the Lord Chamberlain on the 18th of that month. The ban was lifted three months later, and the play enjoyed a run of four days.⁶⁶ The text was published within ten weeks of production, the prologue and epilogues having been published separately within days of the play's premiere.⁶⁷ Several polemical attacks on the play--including the anonymous True History of the Duke of Guise,⁶⁸ Thomas Hunt's A Defence of the . . . Charter . . . of London,⁶⁹ and a text probably written by Thomas Shadwell and a co-author, entitled Some Reflections upon the Pretended Parallel⁷⁰--prompted Dryden to publish a lengthy Vindication.⁷¹ The Duke of Guise consequently serves as a good example of a text which is defined both by its literary and by its political milieu. The drama itself must be distinguished from the texts that surround it. The political commentary embodied in the drama and the dialogue that takes place between the authors and their polemical antagonists can be studied separately. With its auxiliary texts, the play belongs among the public debates of the Exclusion Crisis. Examined together, the two threads permit a study of the generic mutations of the period when drama functioned equally effectively on the stage

⁶⁶Van Lennep London Stage (1965) 1:310, 317.

⁶⁷Luttrell dates his copy 4 December 1682.

⁶⁸The True History of the Duke of Guise (p. sb. R. Baldwin, 1683).

⁶⁹Thomas Hunt, A Defence of the Charter, and Municipal Rights of the City of London (p. sb. Richard Baldwin, 1683).

⁷⁰[Thomas Shadwell], Some Reflections upon the Pretended Parallel in the Play Called The Duke of Guise. In a Letter to a Friend (f. Francis Smith, 1683).

⁷¹Vindication in Works (1992) 14:307-57.

and in political debate. The Duke of Guise itself explores the themes of kingship, allegiance, the relevance and function of historical parallel and finally the very relationship between a political drama and its audience.

The Duke of Guise is a political play, to the extent that it admits in its prologue to being "a Parallel." During the course of the play a faction of noblemen and clerics (the Guises) use a suspiciously Whig political idiom to argue for the exclusion of the brother of the French King Henry III from the succession, using the same grounds for these arguments that the English Parliament had used to argue against the succession of the Duke of York. In his place they insist upon the election of the popular Duke of Guise. The King's refusal to be manipulated sparks civil unrest. The Commons attempt to introduce a bill of exclusion, in response to which the King calls a special session of the States General to be held at Blois, outside Paris. Henry III finally vanquishes the usurpers, reveals the plots, and executes the Duke of Guise. If examined in isolation of its political context, the drama can, along with most of the serious drama of this period, be read (as Ronald Berman does Venice Preserv'd) as "a tragic view of human nature which transcends the distinctions between Whig and Tory."⁷² On the other hand, playgoers and politically literate readers of 1682 could not avoid the obvious parallels between Navar and James, the Guise faction and the Whigs, between the Duke of Guise himself and the Duke of Monmouth, between Henry III of France and Charles II of England, between the Blois and Oxford Parliaments.

⁷²Berman "Nature" (1969) 536.

Although Lee wrote half of the drama, most contentious political issues are broached by Dryden in the first scene of the play and in its fourth act,⁷³ and his manipulation of the themes of plotting and motive and of the political vocabulary of the contending factions provide an excellent theoretical and polemical guide to the Exclusion Crisis. King Henry is represented, in Shadwell's rather extravagant words,⁷⁴ as a "Fearful, Weak, Wicked, Bloody, Perfidious, . . . Hypocritical . . . [and] fawning" monarch, obsequious to his enemies and unfair to the noble and loyal Grillon, who is forced at last to warn Henry that "If you'l be a Royalist your self, there are Millions of honest Men will fight for you but if you wo'n not, there are few will hang for you."⁷⁵ In the words of the Queen Mother Henry has lost "The Reverence due to Kings."⁷⁶ He does not rule by divine right in this system; right devolves from power, and Henry lacks the charisma of the Duke, as well as being handicapped by a tendency to vacillate and by a weakness for the beautiful Marmoutier.

If the plots against Henry III depend upon the tragic incompatibility of kingship with particular and immediately recognizable brands of human weakness, the representation of the Guises was as particular and immediately recognizable. They are the villains, and their evil stems both from their intrigue and from the linguistic associations drawn between them and various oppositional groups. Like the Covenanters during the Civil War they talk of

⁷³In his Vindication Dryden writes that "to me [belongs] only the First Scene of the Play; the whole Fourth Act, and the first half, or somewhat more of the Fifth" (Works [1992] 14:311).

⁷⁴Some Reflections Upon the Pretended Parallel in Dryden Works (1992) 14:615.

⁷⁵Duke of Guise in Works (1992) 14:287-88.

⁷⁶Duke of Guise in Works (1992) 14:277.

preserving "the King, his Pow'r and Person"; they believe that "the Conscience of the People is their Power"⁷⁷; and they respond to "Godly Exhortation."⁷⁸ The villains of the Interregnum are elided with the Whigs of 1680, who cherish their "Charter,"⁷⁹ support "the Duke of Guise and Property," and chant "Up with Religion and the Cause, and down with those Arbitrary Rogues."⁸⁰ The Guises employ the ubiquitous Restoration strategy of political defamation of allegiance and personal defamation of character, and from retaliation they understandably fear "Calumnies, and Slanders,/ Much urg'd but never prov'd."⁸¹ They profess the most radical republican political philosophy, that "The King's included in the Punishment,/ In case he rebel against the People."⁸² Dryden's representation of the Guises engages the principles, themes, and political language of all factions participating in current national debate but the parallel equates the Guises with the Whigs. Finally the choice between Navar and the Guise, between "Heresy . . . entail'd upon the Throne" and "Confusion, Wars and Slaughters," reflects the precariousness of the Court's political and religious position. It is not a choice between good and evil, but in the words of Henry III, it is a choice between "Contingent" and "Certain" disaster.⁸³ This equivocal portrait of both

⁷⁷Duke of Guise in Works (1992) 14:218.

⁷⁸Duke of Guise in Works (1992) 14:270.

⁷⁹Duke of Guise in Works (1992) 14:220.

⁸⁰Duke of Guise in Works (1992) 14:273.

⁸¹Duke of Guise in Works (1992) 14:257.

⁸²Duke of Guise in Works (1992) 14:218.

⁸³Duke of Guise in Works (1992) 14:286.

the Guise and the Court subverts an unvarnished Tory interpretation of the drama. The examination of the personalities and motives both of Charles and Monmouth and of the political parties which support them is made up of unsteady analogies, undermining a narrow historical interpretation. If any reading can be taken as certain, it is simply that plots and revolution are somehow endemic to political culture, no matter which faction is temporarily ascendant. Thus plotting and deceit are the condition of life itself. The effectiveness of The Duke of Guise stems from its reception simultaneously as interrogation and as political propaganda.

If the play itself questions the rights of monarchy, the brilliance of Dryden's portrayal of contemporary issues cut short the Whig responses. To show the connections in detail, to render explicit the extent of Dryden's denunciation, would involve an acknowledgement by the Whigs that the parallel was justified. In Dryden's words, "either [the Whigs] . . . must avow the wickedness of their designs, or disown the likeness" between Charles and Henry.⁸⁴ The writers who engaged in the heated polemical debate which followed the performance of the play were constrained to ignore the play's sophistication in favour of simplified, reductive attacks. In short, they treated the play as propaganda, and ignored the authentically subversive in favour of a strictly partisan reading. Thomas Shadwell, a politically moderate playwright with Whig sympathies and an intensifying personal animosity for Dryden, writes "'Tis a Fine Age, when mercenary Poets shall become Politicians, and their Plays business of State."⁸⁵ The anonymous author of The True History of the Duke of Guise supposed

⁸⁴Vindication in Works (1992) 14:355.

⁸⁵Some Reflections upon the Pretended Parallel in Dryden Works (1992) 14:622.

passionately if improbably that Dryden wrote anti-monarchical propaganda, that he was testing "how far the limits of Poetica Licentia might extend. Whether it might be lawful for a Man to give us an ill Character of his Sovereign in Verse . . . because it is a hanging matter to do it in Prose."⁸⁶ The Whig lawyer Thomas Hunt, in his written defence of the charter of London, suggested that Dryden was attempting "to try what he can do toward making the Charter forfeitable" by undertaking to have the sheriffs "kicked three or four times a Week about the Stage to the Gallows."⁸⁷ Hunt treated The Duke of Guise as a political and not a literary text by including this digression in a text otherwise devoted to political polemic. Shadwell, similarly, chose to distinguish it from drama, ending his attack by suggesting Dryden "did not intend it for a Diversion, but for a Direction and Advice what was to be done."⁸⁸ Propagandists read the play as a interrogation and as an indictment, as literature and as propaganda. However, they confined their attacks to the most superficial of readings. Dryden's problematization is shielded by his parallel, while remaining dependent upon it.

Dryden himself identified the double nature of his play as coterie drama and as propaganda in the printed material that supported The Duke of Guise. In his Vindication Dryden decontextualizes the play's antagonists' charges of libel and slander, since he can no more acknowledge the complexity or double nature of his text in its defence than can the Whigs in their attacks. This method, like dialogue, allows Dryden to interpret the offending

⁸⁶The True History of the Duke of Guise (1683) [A3[?].

⁸⁷A Defence of the Charter in Dryden Works (1992) 14:607.

⁸⁸Some Reflections Upon the Pretended Parallel in Dryden Works (1992) 14:622.

arguments as he wills, while claiming to remain unbiased. In response to Hunt's contention that the play is inflammatory propaganda, Dryden concentrates on the composition of the audience, arguing the "Audience of a Play-house . . . which are generally Persons of Honour, Noblemen and Ladies are unlikely candidates for the Rabble of Mr. Hunt."⁸⁹ In response to Shadwell's accusation of libel against Charles II Dryden categorically denies even a hint of his blatant interrogation of kingship. In Dryden's words, "I answer . . . a bare Negative to a bare Affirmative."⁹⁰ In fact, Dryden makes a point of attacking moderates, the very audience most likely to be sympathetic to the problems represented by the drama, branding each of them a "Twilight Animal; true to neither Cause."⁹¹ He defends the activity of the playwright, suggesting that he dwells both in the centre and at the periphery of political culture. While he can defend, interpret, and interrogate the social order, Dryden argues that he cannot provide the immediate effect of political theatre on a grand scale: "'Tis the business of factious men [not playwrights] to stir up the Populace." The playhouse might represent political culture, but Dryden concludes that the theatre to which propagandists should direct their attention is that to which they already contribute. Events such as the pope-burning processions and the Lord Mayor's Day processions move from representation of political action to the embodiment of it.

The Duke of Guise, like most writing of the period 1678-83, depends upon the language of political and personal plots and deception. It rises above strongly partisan

⁸⁹Vindication in Works (1992) 14:320.

⁹⁰Vindication in Works (1992) 14:349.

⁹¹Danchin Prologues and Epilogues (1981-84) 3:438.

propaganda plays such as The Excommunicated Prince in its complication of all sides of political debate. Its function as propaganda is signalled, in part, by the reductive strategies counter-writers were forced to employ in their responses to The Duke of Guise. Dryden's rhetoric forced them in to defensive positions in order to protect themselves from counter allegations stemming from the play's parallels. The Duke of Guise is the product of a political crisis, and at once functions as non-partisan and partisan writing--as coterie drama and as highly effective propaganda.

Restoration writers self-consciously manipulated genres to write tracts that would attract the attention of their audiences and capture the colour of changing relationships among government, individuals and the public sphere which brought them together. If there remained a social distance between the playhouse and the public sphere, published versions of plays, along with the textual debates they engendered, were as political and public as the polemical dialogues that borrowed the form of artistic drama and took to the street as propaganda pageants. Moreover, talented playwrights brought to the stage, and to the press, some of the period's most sophisticated rhetoric. Although L'Estrange licensed drama in his capacity as Surveyor, he did not engage systematically with dramatic writers. He did not, for example, contribute directly to the debate surrounding The Duke of Guise. He did advertise the text for sale in the Observer of 13 February 1683. Moreover, the attack on Trimmers that forms the subject of Dryden's second (November 1682) epilogue to The Duke of Guise is a continuation of L'Estrange's attack in his 13 November edition of the Observer. L'Estrange also singled out Hunt, the lawyer who was numbered among the controversialists who had first attacked Dryden. L'Estrange rebutted Hunt's tract in his

Observer and in The Lawyer Outlaw'd. He discredited Hunt on the grounds that the lawyer wrote for reward, that his motives were based in private interest, and that he gave up the pursuit of the law hoping to benefit from government connections. "I need not give any other Character of him," announces L'Estrange,

but that some three years ago he writ a Book in vindication of the Bishops Right of Judicature in Parliament; and for this piece of service expected no less than to be made Lord-Chief-Baron of the Exchequer in Ireland.⁹²

By the time L'Estrange uses this particular ad hominem rhetorical strategy against Hunt, it was very familiar to his Restoration readership.

⁹²The Lawyer Outlaw'd (b. N.T., f. the Author, 1683) 1.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

Place of publication is London unless otherwise noted. Entries that appear in the Wing Short-Title Catalogue . . . 1641-1700 will include their Wing number. Those that occur only in the Thomason collection will include their LT numbers.

The Answer to the Appeal, Expounded. n.p., 1680. A3385.

B., H. A True Copy of a Letter (Intercepted). f. H.B., 10 February 1681. B80.

Bacon, Francis. Letter of Advice. f R.H. and H.B., 1661. B302.

-----. The Works of Francis Bacon. 1857-74. Eds. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis and Douglas Denton Heath. 14 vols. New York: Garrett, 1968.

[Bagshawe, Edward]. The Great Question Concerning Things Indifferent. Oxford, n.p., 15 September 1660. B413.

-----. A True and Perfect Narrative of the Differences Between Mr. Busby and Mr. Bagshaw. b. A.M., 6 May 1659. B426

Bedloe, William. The Excommunicated Prince: Or, The False Relique f. Thomas Parkhurst, D. Newman, Thomas Cockerill, and Thomas Simmons, 1679. B1676.

Blount, Charles. Reasons Humbly Offered for the Liberty of Unlicens'd Printing. n.p., 1693. B3313.

Blount, Thomas. Boscobel: Or, The History of His Sacred Majesties Most Miraculous Preservation after the Battle of Worcester. 1st. ed. f. Henry Seile, 1660. B3329. 2nd. ed. f. Henry Seile, 1660. B3330. 3rd. ed. f. A. Seile, 1662. B3328. 4th. ed. b. M. Clark, s.b. Henry Brome and Charles Harper, 1680. B3331.

[Bold, Henry]. Anniversary to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty. f. Henry Brome, 1661. B3469.

-----. Poems Lyrique Macaronique Heroique. f. Henry Brome, 1664. B3473.

Bolde, Samuel. A Plea for Moderation Towards Dissenters. f. R. Janeway, 1682. B3484.

Brome, Alexander. Poems. Ed. Roman R. Dubinski. 2 vols. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1982.

[---], ed. Rump: Or an Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times. f. Henry Brome and Henry Marsh, 1662. B4851.

-----, Songs and Other Poems. 1st ed. f. Henry Brome, 1661. B4852. 2nd ed. f. Henry Brome, 1664. B4853. 3rd ed. f. Henry Brome, 1668. B4854.

Brome, Richard. The Queenes Exchange. f. Henry Brome, 1657. B4882.

Bullokar, John. An English Expositour. b. John Field, 1667. B5431.

Butler, Samuel. Samuel Butler, 1612-1618: Characters. Ed. Charles W. Daves. Cleveland: P of Case Western Reserve U, 1970.

Calamy, Edmund. A Sermon Preached at Aldermanberry-Church, Dec. 28. 1662. Oxford: n.p., 1663. C267.

The Censure of the Rota. b. Paul Giddy, 1660. H808.

The Character of a Whig, Under Several Denominations. s.b. booksellers of London and Westminster, 1700. C2001.

The Character of the Rump. n.p., 17 March 1660. C2027.

The Character of . . . Heraclitus and the Observer. f. E. Ryddal, 1681. C2029.

[Charpentier, Francois]. A Treatise Touching the East-Indian Trade. b. Thomas Mabb, f. Henry Brome, 1664. C3714.

Cicero. Tully's Offices. In Three Books. Trans. Roger L'Estrange. f. Henry Brome, 1680. C4309.

Citizens of London. The Representation of Divers Citizens of London and Others Well-Affected to the Peace of the Commonwealth. b. John Clowes, 6 December 1659. LT 669.f.22.(17).

Clarendon, Edward Hyde, first Earl of. The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. 8 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1826.

[---]. Second Thoughts; Or the Case of a Limited Toleration. n.p., n.d.. C4425.

Corbet, John. The Interest of England in the Matter of Religion. The First and Second Parts. 2nd ed. f. George Thomason, 1661. C6256.

[Cotton, Charles]. The Compleat Angler.... Part II. f. Richard Marriot and Henry Brome, 1676. C6381.

---. A Panegyrick to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty. b. Thomas Newcombe, 1660. C6387.

---. The Poems of Charles Cotton. Ed. John Buxton. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958.

---. Charles Cotton: Selected Poems. Ed. Ken Robinson. Manchester: Carcanet New Press, 1983.

D., C. A Seasonable Letter of Advice Delivered to the Mayor of London. n.p., 27 December 1659. D9.

D., J. The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, with the Restauration of the Protestant Religion: or, the Downfal of the Pope. f. Ben. Harris, 1680. D31.

D., M. The Subject's Desire to See Our Gracious King. f. H. B., 1660. D65.

D., N. A Letter Intercepted. n.p., 23 March 1660. D67.

Danchin, Pierre, ed. The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration, 1660-1700. Vol. 3. Nancy: PU de Nancy, 1981-84. 4 vols.

A Declaration of the Parliament Assembled at Westminster. b. John Streater and John Macock, 23 January 1660. E1491.

A Dialogue Betwixt H.B.'s Ghost, and His Dear Author R.L.S. f. J.M. 20 May 1681. D1350.

Dialogue Upon Dialogue: Or L'Estrange No Papist nor Jesuit. f. H.B., 1681. D1370.

Dryden, John. Works of John Dryden. 20 vols. Eds. Samuel Holt Monk, et. al. Berkeley: U of California P, 1956-

[Duncombe, Giles]. Scutum Regale. The Royal Buckler. n.p., 1660. B3557.

Dunton, John. The Life and Errors of John Dunton. New York: Burt Franklin, 1969.

E., D. [Edward Bagshawe]. A Second Letter . . . Containing Some Farther Animadversions. n.p., 6 February 1662. B423.

England. Committee of Safety. Proclamation. b. Henry Hills and John Field, [1 December 1659]. E744.

- . Council of State. [Proclamation]. b. Abel Roper and Thomas Collins, 17 March 1660. E782.
- . ---. [Proclamation]. b. Abel Roper and Thomas Collins, 28 March 1660. E784.
- Englands Faiths Defender Vindicated. f. Charles King, 15 March 1660. E2964.
- Evans, John. Moderation Stated. f. Walter Kettilby, 1682. E3450.
- An Exact Narrative of the Tryal and Condemnation of John Twyn. b. Thomas Mabb, f. Henry Brome, 1664. E3668.
- Fell, John. The Life of . . . Thomas Fuller. f. J.W., H. B., and H. M., 1661. F616.
- Fortunate Rising; or, the Rump Upward. f. Henry James, 20 January 1660. F1618.
- [Glanvill, Joseph]. An Essay Concerning Preaching: Written for the Direction of a Young Divine. b. A.C., f. Henry Brome, 1678. G808.
- Griffith, Matthew. The Fear of God and the King. f. Thomas Johnson, 25 March 1660. G2012.
- Hickeringill, Edmund. Gregory, Father Greybeard. b. Robin Hood, s.b. Nathaniel Brooke, 1673. H1808.
- Hobbes, Thomas. The Art of Rhetoric, with a Discourse of the Laws of England. f. William Crook, 1681. H2212.
- H[owell], J[ames]. A Cordial for the Cavaliers. s.b. Henry Marsh, 1661. H3058A.
- Hunt, Thomas. A Defence of the Charter, and Municipal Rights of the City of London. p. sb. Richard Baldwin, 1683. H3750.
- Jordan, Thomas. A Royal Arbor of Loyal Poesie. b. R.W., f. Elizabeth Andrews, 1663. J1058.
- [---]. Speech to . . . Monck. f. Henry Brome, 1660. J1061C.
- L., N. A Letter Sent from Portsmouth. n.p., 20 December 1659. L47.
- [L'Estrange, Roger]. An Account of the Growth of Knavery. b. H.H., f. Henry Brome, 1678. L1193.

- [---]. Be Merry and Wise; or, A Seasonable Word to the Nation. n.p., 13 March 1660. B1555.
- [---]. A Brief History of the Times. b. J. Bennet, f. Charles Brome, 1687. L1203A.
- [---]. A Caveat to the Cavaliers. 1st ed. f. Henry Brome, 1661. L1211. 3rd ed. f. Henry Brome, 21 August 1661. L1213.
- [---]. Citt and Bumpkin. f. Henry Brome, 1680. L1216.
- [---]. Citt and Bumpkin. Or, A Learned Discourse upon Swearing and Lying . . . The Second Part. f. Henry Brome, 1680. L1221.
- . Considerations and Proposals in Order to the Regulation of the Press. f. H. Brome, 1663. L1229.
- [---]. Considerations Upon a Printed Sheet, Entituled the Speech of the Late Lord Russel. b. T.B., f. Joanna Brome, 1683. L1230.
- [---]. "The Declaration of the City, to the Men at Westminster" in L'Estrange his Apology (1660) 40-41.
- . Discovery Upon Discovery. f. Henry Brome, 1680. L1238.
- . The Dissenter's Sayings. f. Henry Brome, 1681. L1240.
- [---]. Double Your Guards. n.p., 5 April 1660. L1246A.
- [---]. The Engagement and Remonstrance of the City of London. n.p., 12 December 1659. L1246B.
- [---]. The Fanatique Powder-Plot. n.p., 24 March 1660. L1247A.
- [---]. The Final Protest, and Sense of the Citie [and] The Engagement. n.p., 19 December 1659. L1247B.
- [---]. The Free-Born Subject. f. Henry Brome, 1679. L1248.
- [---]. A Free Parliament Proposed by the City to the Nation. n.p., 3 January 1660. L1250B.
- [---]. A Further Discovery of the Plot, Drawn from . . . Oates. f. Henry Brome, 23 January 1680. L1251.

- [---]. A Further Discovery of the Plot: Dedicated to . . . Oates. f. Henry Brome, 10 February 1680. L1252.
- [---]. The History of the Plot. f. Henry Brome and Richard Tonson, 1679. L1258.
- . Interest Mistaken. 1st ed. f. Henry Brome, 1661. L1261. 2nd ed. f. Henry Brome, 1661. L1262.
- . L'Estrange His Apology. f. Henry Brome, [6 June] 1660. L1200.
- . L'Estrange His Appeal Humbly Submitted. f. Henry Brome, 1681. L1202.
- . L'Estrange's Case in a Civil Dialogue Betwixt 'Zekiel and Ephraim. 2nd ed. f. Henry Brome, 1680. L1205.
- . L'Estrange His Vindication, From the Calumnies of a Malitious Party in Kent. n.p., 1649. L1324.
- . L'Estrange no Papist. b. T.B., f. Henry Brome, 1681. L1267.
- . L'Estrange's Narrative of the Plot. b. J.B., f. Henry Brome, 1680. L1275.
- . A Memento: Directed to All Those That Truly Reverence the Memory of King Charles the Martyr. . . . The First Part. f. Henry Brome, 11 April 1662. L1270.
- . A Memento: Treating the Rise, Progress, and Remedies of Seditions. f. Joanna Brome, MDCLXXXII. L1271.
- [---]. A Necessary and Seasonable Caution. n.p., 24 March 1660. L1277A.
- [---]. No Blinde Guides. f. Henry Brome, 20 April 1660. L1279.
- [---]. No Droll But a Rationall Account. f. Henry Brome, 30 January 1660. N1175.
- [---]. No Fool to the Old Fool. n.p., 16 March 1660. L1279A.
- . The Observator in Dialogue. 3 vols. Vol. 1 b. J. Bennet f. W. Abington. Vol. 2-3 b. J. Bennet f. Charles Brome, 1681-1687.
- [---]. Physician Cure Thy Self. f. H. B., 23 April 1660. L1284B.
- . "A Plain Case" in L'Estrange His Apology. (1660) 55-57.
- [---]. Plain English to . . . Monck. n.p., 4 April 1660. P2359.

- [---]. The Reformed Catholique: Or, The True Protestant. f. Henry Brome, 1679. L1289.
- . The Relaps'd Apostate. f. Henry Brome, 14 November 1661. L1293.
- [---]. The Resolve of the Citie. n.p., 23 December 1659. L1299.
- [---]. Rump Enough; or, Quaere for Quaere. n.p., 14 March 1660. L1300.
- [---]. A Seasonable Memorial. f. Henry Brome, 1680. L1301.
- . A Short View. f. Henry Brome, 1660. L1308.
- . State-Divinity; Or a Supplement to The Relaps'd Apostate. f. Henry Brome, 1661. L1310.
- . Toleration Discuss'd. 3rd ed. f. Henry Brome, 1681. L1318.
- [---]. Treason Arraigned, in Answer to Plain English. n.p., 2 April 1660. L1318A.
- [---]. Tyranny and Popery. f. Henry Brome, 1678. L1321.
- [---]. A Word in Season to General Monk [sic]. the Hague [London], f. S.B., 18 February 1660. L1328A.
- A Letter Out of Scotland, from Mr. R.L.S. f. N.F., 1681. L1269.
- The Life of Boetius. p., s.b. W. Davis, 1683. L2024.
- Locke, John. Political Writings. Ed. David Wootton. New York: Penguin Books, 1993.
- . Two Tracts on Government. Ed. Philip Abrams. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967.
- London. Apprentices. The Further Petition and Remonstrance of the Freemen and Prentices of the City of London. n.p., 13 December 1659. LT 669.f.22.(19).
- . Petition and Address of Divers Young Men and Apprentices. n.p., 5 December 1659. LT 669.f.22.(14).
- . The Remonstrance of the Apprentices in and about London. n.p., 15 November 1659. R997.
- London. Common Council. [Defence of Mayor]. n.p., [20 December 1659]. L2852.

- The Loyal Subjects Teares, for the Sufferings and Absence of Their Sovereign, Charles II. f. Charles King, 21 March 1660. L3374.
- Luttrell, Narcissus. A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714. 1877. n.p.: Gregg International, 1969.
- . Popish Plot Catalogues. Ed. F.C. Francis. Oxford: Luttrell Society, 1956.
- Machiavil's Advice to His Son. Trans. Roger L'Estrange. f. T. Burrell, 1681. M132.
- Milton, John. The Complete Prose Works of John Milton. 8 vols. Ed. Robert W. Ayers. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953-1982.
- Milward, John. The Diary of John Milward. Ed. Caroline Robbins. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1938.
- The Mischiefs and Unreasonableness of Endeavouring to Deprive his Majesty of the Affections of his Subjects. Dublin: b. Joseph Ray, f. Samuel Helsham, 24 May 1681. M2238.
- N., D. [Roger L'Estrange]. Sir Politique Uncased. or. A Sober Answer to a Juggling Pamphlet Entitled A Letter Intercepted. n.p., 27 March 1660. L1308A.
- N., N. The Heu and Cry: or, A Relation of the Travels of the Devil and Towzer. f. Roger Catflogger, [1682]. N36.
- [Nalson, John]. England Bought and Sold. f. T.O., 1681. N101.
- [Nedham, Marchamont]. Interest will not Lie. Or, A View of England's True Interest. b. Thomas Newcomb, [17 August] 1659. N392.
- [---]. Newes from Brussels. n.p., 10 March 1660. N398A.
- [---]. A Pacquet of Advices and Animadversions . . . to the Men of Shaftsbury. n.p., 1676. N400.
- A New Dialogue Between Some Body and No Body, or the Observator Observed. f. Francis Smith, 25 November-19 December 1681. L1278.
- A New-Years-Gift for Towzer. f. E. Harrison, 1682. N813.
- Neville, Henry. Plato Redivivus: or, A Dialogue Concerning Government. f. S.I., s.b. R. Dew, 1681; reproduced in Two Republican Tracts. Ed. Caroline Robbins. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1969.

- No New Parliament. n.p., 12 March 1660. N1183.
- Observer Observ'd. f. T, Davies 6 May 1681; f. J. Guilford, 1681.
- Observer Prov'd a Trimmer. f. John Allen, s.b. most booksellers, 1685. 0111.
- Owen, John. Moderation a Vertue. f. Jonathan Robinson, 1683. 0772.
- [Pallavicino, Ferrante]. The Whores Rhetorick. f. George Shell, 1683. P213.
- [Parker, Samuel]. A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie. f. John Martyn, 1670. P459.
- Pepys, Samuel. The Diary of Samuel Pepys. Eds. Robert Latham and William Matthews. 11 Vols. Berkeley: U of California P, 1970-1983.
- Phillips, Edward. The New World of English Words. b. E. Tyler, f. Nathaniel Brooke, 1662. P2069.
- Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714. Ed. George de F. Lord. 7 vols. New Haven: Yale UP, 1963-1975.
- Prance, Miles. L'Estrange a Papist. f. Richard Baldwin, 1681. P3174.
- [Prynne, William]. The Petition and Address of the Sea-Men and Water-Men about London. n.p., 12 December 1659. T1642B.
- [---]. Six Important Quaeres, Propounded to the Re-sitting Rump of the Long Parliament. n.p., 30 December 1659. P4083.
- Rapin, René. Reflections upon the Eloquence of these Times. f. Richard Preston, 1672. R274.
- Rationalis, Theophilis [Harry Duke]. New News from Bedlam. f. the author, pub. by Langley Curtis, 1682. N685.
- Remarks on the Growth and Progress of Nonconformity. f. Walter Kettilby, 1682. L1296.
- Rugg, Thomas. The Diurnall of Thomas Rugg, 1659-1661. Ed. William L. Sachse. Royal Historical Society, 1961.
- S., W. True and Good News from Brussels. n.p., 20 March 1660. S205.

- Savile, George, Marquis of Halifax. The Character of a Trimmer. The Works of George Savile Marquis of Halifax. Ed. Mark N. Brown. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989. 3 Vols.
- Settle, Elkanah. The Female Prelate. Being the History of the Life and Death of Pope Joan. f. W. Cademan, 1680. S284.
- Several Weighty Quaeries Concerning Heraclitus and the Observer. f. Mathew Burdid, 1681. S2816.
- [Shadwell, Thomas]. Some Reflections upon the Pretended Parallel in the Play Called The Duke of Guise. In a Letter to a Friend. f. Francis Smith, 1683. S2873.
- Smith, John. The Myserie of Rhetorique Unvail'd. b. E. Cotes f. George Eversden, 1657. S4116A.
- Sprat, Thomas. The History of the Royal-Society of London. b. T.R., f. J. Martyn, J. Allestry, 1667. S5032.
- [Stephens, Robert]. The Loyal Observer: Or, Historical Memoirs of . . . Roger the Fidler. f. William Hammond, 1683. L3356.
- Strange's Case, Strangly Altered [sic]. n.p., n.d. S5924.
- T., B. Policy, No Policy. n.p., 16 March 1660. T1.
- [Thompson, Nathaniel]. A Collection of 86 Loyal Poems . . . Upon the Two Late Plots. b. N.T., 1685. T1005.
- The Tories Confession, Or, a Merry Song in Answer to the Whigs Exaltation. f. T.H., MDCLXXXII. T1910.
- Travels of the Devel and Towser. f. Roger Catflogger, 1682?. N36.
- The Trimmer Catechised: or, A Serious discourse between Truman and Trimmer b. George Croom, 1683. T2277.
- The True History of the Duke of Guise. p. sb. R. Baldwin, 1683. T2703.
- W., B. [William Bedloe]. An Additional Discovery of Mr. Roger L'Estrange His Further Discovery. n.p., 1680. W3.
- Walton, Izaak. The Lives of Dr. John Donne. 4th ed. b. Thomas Roycroft, f. Richard Marriot, s.b. 'most Booksellers', 1675. W672.

Wilson, Thomas. The Arte of Rhetorique. Intro. Robert Hood Bowers. Delmas, N.Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1977.

Younkercape, Toryrorydammeeploshammee. A Sermon Prepared to be Preach'd. p., s.b. Langley Curtis, 1682. L1305.

Secondary Sources

Achinstein, Sharon. "The Politics of Babel in the English Revolution." Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution. Ed. James Holstun. London: Frank Cass, 1992. 14-44.

Aldridge, A.O. "The Pleasures of Pity." ELH 16 (1949): 76-88.

Ashcraft, Richard. "The Language of Political Conflict in Restoration Literature." Politics as Reflected in Literature. Eds. Richard Ashcraft and Alan Roper. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1989.

-----, "Latitudinarianism and Toleration: Historical Myth versus Political History." Philosophy, Science and Religion in England, 1640-1700. Eds. Richard Kroll, Richard Ashcraft and Perez Zagorin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. 151-77.

-----, Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986.

Bell, Maureen. "Elizabeth Calvert and the Confederates." Publishing History 32(1992): 5-49.

-----, "Hannah Allen and the Development of a Puritan Publishing Business, 1646-51." Publishing History 26(1989): 5-66.

Benson, Donald. "Halifax and the Trimmers." Huntington Library Quarterly 27(1964): 115-34.

Berman, Ronald. "Nature in Venice Preserv'd" ELH 36(1969): 523-35.

Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg. Introduction. The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present. Boston: St. Martin's, 1990: 1-37.

Blagden, Cyprian. The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403-1959. London: Allen, 1960.

Bosher, R.S. The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649-1662. 1951. Westminster: Dacre, 1957.

- Brewer, Daniel. "The Philosophical Dialogue and the Forcing of Truth." Modern Language Notes 98(1983): 1234-47.
- Brown, Laura. English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760: An Essay in Generic History. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981.
- Brown, Mark N. "Trimmers and Moderates in the Reign of Charles II." Huntington Library Quarterly 37(1974): 311-36.
- Burke, Kenneth. A Rhetoric of Motives. 1950. Berkeley: U of California P, 1969.
- Butler, Martin. Theatre and Crisis 1632-1642. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Bywaters, David. "Venice, it's Senate, and it's Plot in Otway's Venice Preserv'd." Modern Philology 80(1983): 256-63.
- Canfield, J. Douglas. "Poetical Justice in Some Neglected Masterpieces of Restoration Drama." Rhetorics of Order/Ordering Rhetorics in Neoclassical Literature. Eds. J. Douglas Canfield and J. Paul Hunter. Toronto: Associated UP, 1989: 23-45.
- . Introduction. Rhetorics of Order/Ordering Rhetorics in English Neoclassical Literature. Eds. J. Douglas Canfield and J. Paul Hunter. Toronto: Associated UP, 1989.
- . "Royalism's Last Dramatic Stand: English Political Tragedy, 1679-89." Modern Philology 82(1985): 234-63.
- Chernaik, Warren L. "The Heroic Occasional Poem: Panegyric and Satire in the Restoration." Modern Language Quarterly 26(1965): 523-35.
- Clark, Charles E. The Public Prints: The Newspaper in Anglo-American Culture, 1665-1740. New York: Oxford UP, 1994.
- Cogswell, Thomas. "The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I and The People in the 1620s." Journal of British Studies 29(1990): 187-215.
- Cox, Virginia. The Renaissance Dialogue: Literary Dialogue in Its Social and Political Contexts, Castiglione to Galileo. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Crist, Timothy. "Government Control of the Press after the Expiration of the Printing Act in 1679." Publishing History 5(1979): 49-77.
- Cust, Richard. "News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England." Past and Present 112(1986): 60-90.

- Daly, J.W. Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1979.
- Danchin, Pierre. Introduction. The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration, 1660-1700. Vol. 3. Nancy: PU de Nancy, 1981-84. 4 vols. xi-xxxv.
- Davies, Godfrey. The Restoration of Charles II, 1658-1660. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1955.
- Davis, Lennard. Factual Fictions: The Origins of the English Novel. New York: Columbia UP, 1983.
- Dykstal, Timothy. "Conversation and Political Controversy." Compendious Conversations: The Method of Dialogue in the Early Enlightenment. Ed. Kevin L. Cope. New York: Peter Lang, 1992.
- Edie, C. "The Popular Idea of Monarchy on the Eve of the Stuart Restoration." Huntington Library Quarterly 39(1975-76): 344-63.
- Ellul, Jacques. Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes. Trans. Konrad Keller and Jean Lerner. New York: Knopf, 1969.
- Eyre, G.E. Briscoe, H.R. Plomer and C.R. Rivington. A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers from 1640 to 1708[1709]. 3 vols. 1913-14. New York: Peter Smith, 1950.
- Faulkner, Thomas C. "The Character of a Trimmer and L'Estrange's Attack on Trimmers in the Observator." The Huntington Library Quarterly 37(1973): 71-82.
- Feather, John. "The Commerce of Letters: The Study of the Eighteenth-Century Book Trade." Eighteenth-Century Studies 17(1984): 405-24.
- A History of British Publishing. London: Croom Helm, 1988.
- Feiling, Keith. A History of the Tory Party 1640-1714. Oxford: Clarendon, 1924.
- Figgis, J.N. The Divine Right of Kings. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.
- Foxcroft, H.C. The Life and Letters of Sir George Savile. 2 vols. 1898. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1973.
- Franklin, Julian H. "Sovereignty and the Mixed Constitution: Bodin and his Critics." The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700. Eds. J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991: 298-328.

- Gaunt, Philip. Choosing the News: The Profit Factor in News Selection. New York: Greenwood, 1990.
- Geduld, H. Prince of Publishers: A Study of the Work and Career of Jacob Tonson. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1969.
- Goldie, Mark. "Danby, the Bishops and the Whigs." The Politics of Religion in Restoration England. Eds. Tim Harris, Paul Seaward, and Mark Goldie. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990: 75-105.
- , "John Locke and Anglican Royalism." Political Studies 31(1983): 61-85.
- , "The Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution." The Revolutions of 1688. Ed. Robert Beddard. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991: 102-36.
- , "Priestcraft and the Birth of Whiggism." Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain. Eds. Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993: 209-31.
- , "The Reception of Hobbes." The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700. Eds. J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991: 589-615.
- , "The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument: An Essay and an Annotated Bibliography of Pamphlets on the Allegiance Controversy." Bulletin of Research in the Humanities 83 (1980): 473-564.
- Greaves, Richard. Enemies Under His Feet. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1980.
- Gunn, J.A.W. Politics and the Public Interest in the Seventeenth Century. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1969.
- Habermas, Jürgen. The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. Trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge: MIT P, 1991.
- Harris, Michael. London Newspapers in the Age of Walpole. Toronto: Associated UP, 1987.
- Harris, Tim. London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.
- , "Tories and the Rule of Law in the Reign of Charles II." The Seventeenth Century 8 (1993): 9-27.

- Harth, Phillip. "Political Interpretations of Venice Preserv'd." Modern Philology 85(1987-88): 345-62.
- Hathaway, Baxter. "The Lucretian 'Return Upon Ourselves' in Eighteenth-Century Theories of Tragedy." PMLA 62 (1947): 672-89.
- Havinghurst, A.F. "The Judiciary and Politics in the Reign of Charles II." The Law Quarterly Review 66(1950): 62-78, 229-252.
- Herd, Harold. The March of Journalism: The Story of the British Press from 1622 to the Present Day. 1952. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1973.
- Hobman, D.L. Cromwell's Master Spy: A Study of John Thurloe. London: Chapman & Hall, 1961.
- Howell, Wilbur Samuel. Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1956.
- Hume, Robert D. The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- Hutton, Ronald. Charles the Second, King of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.
- , The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- Irwin, Will. Propaganda and the News: Or, What Makes You Think So? New York: McGraw, 1936.
- Jones, J. "Booth's Rising of 1659." The Bulletin of the John Rylands Institute 39 (1956-7): 416-43.
- Keeble, N.H. The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England. Leicester: Leicester UP, 1987.
- Kitchin, George. Sir Roger L'Estrange: A Contribution to the History of the Press in the Seventeenth Century. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner Co., Ltd., 1913.
- Knights, Mark. Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Koller, Katherine. "The Puritan Preacher's Contribution to Fiction." Huntington Library Quarterly 11(1948): 321-40.

- Lamont, William M. Marginal Prynne, 1600-1669. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1963.
- Laslett, Peter. Introduction. Two Treatises of Government. By John Locke. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988: 3-133.
- Lewalski, Barbara K. "Milton: Political Beliefs and Polemical Methods, 1659-60." PMLA 74(1959): 191-202.
- Loftis, John. The Politics of Drama in Augustan England. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1963.
- Love, Harold. "Preacher and Publisher: Oliver Heywood and Thomas Parkhurst." Studies in Bibliography 31(1978): 227-35.
- . Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.
- . "Who Were the Restoration Audience?" Yearbook of English Studies 10(1980): 21-44.
- Lynch, Kathleen. Jacob Tonson, Kit-Cat Publisher. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1971.
- Maclean, Gerald. "Literature, Culture, and Society in Restoration England." Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration. Ed. Gerald Maclean. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995: 3-27.
- Maguire, Nancy Klein. "The 'Whole Truth' of Restoration Tragicomedy." Renaissance Tragicomedy: Explorations in Genre and Politics. Ed. N. K. Maguire. New York: AMS, 1987: 217-41.
- Marshall, John. "The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-Men 1660-1689: Stillingfleet, Tillotson and 'Hobbism'." Journal of Ecclesiastical History 36 (1985): 407-27.
- . John Locke: Resistance, Religion and Responsibility. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Mason, W.G. "The Annual Output of Wing-Listed Titles, 1649-1684." The Library 5th ser. 29 (1974): 219-220.
- Mayer, R. "Nathaniel Crouch, Bookseller and Historian: Popular Historiography and Cultural Power in Late Seventeenth Century England." Eighteenth-Century Studies 27(1994): 391-419.
- McKenzie, D.F. The London Book Trade in the Later Seventeenth Century (Sandars Lectures). Cambridge: privately printed, 1976.

- . "Speech-Manuscript-Print." The Library Chronicle of the University of Texas at Austin 20(1990): 87-110.
- . Stationers' Company Apprentices, 1641-1700. Oxford: Oxford Bibliographical Society, 1974.
- Miner, Earl. The Cavalier Mode from Jonson to Cotton. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971.
- Montaño, John Patrick. "The Quest for Consensus: The Lord Mayor's Day Shows in the 1670s." Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration. Ed. Gerald Maclean. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995: 31-51.
- Morrison, Paul G. An Index of the Printers, Publishers and Booksellers in Donald Wing's Short Title Catalogue.... Charlottesville, VA: U of Virginia P, 1955.
- Muddiman, J.G. The King's Journalist: Studies in the Reign of Charles II. London: John Lane, 1923.
- Nelson, Carolyn and Matthew Seccombe. British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1641-1700. New York: MLA, 1987.
- Newton, T.F.M. "The Mask of Heraclitus: a Problem in Restoration Journalism." Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature 16(1934): 145-60.
- Ogg, David. England in the Reign of Charles II. Oxford: Clarendon, 1934.
- Oliver, H.J. "Timon of Athens on the London Stage." Timon of Athens. Ed. H.J. Oliver. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1959.
- Ollard, Richard. The Escape of Charles II After the Battle of Worcester. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1966.
- Palermo, Dolores. "The Halcyon Moments of Stillness in Royalist Poetry." Huntington Library Quarterly 44 (1981): 205-21.
- Parker, Gerald. "The Image of Rebellion in Thomas Otway's Venice Preserv'd and Edward Young's Busiris" Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900 21(1981): 389-407.
- Patterson, Annabel. "The Country Gentleman: Howard, Marvell, and Dryden in the Theatre of Politics." Studies in English Literature 25(1985): 491-510.
- Peerbooms, G.M. Nathaniel Thompson: Tory Printer, Ballad Monger and Propagandist. Nijmegen: Katholieke Universiteit, 1983.

- Pincus, Steven. "'Coffee Politicians Does Create': Coffee Houses and Restoration Political Culture." The Journal of Modern History 67(1995): 807-34.
- Pinkus, Philip. Grub Street Stripped Bare. Hamden CT: Archon Books, 1968.
- Plomer, H.R. A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667. 1907. Oxford: The Bibliographical Society, 1968.
- , A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers Who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725. Oxford: The Bibliographical Society, 1968.
- Pocock, J.G.A. The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.
- , The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975.
- Popkin, Jeremy D. News and Politics in the Age of Revolution: Jean Luzac's Gazette de Leyde. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989.
- Potter, Lois. Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.
- Purpus, Eugene R. "'The Plain, Easy, and Familiar Way': The Dialogue in English Literature, 1660-1725." Journal of English Literary History 17(1950): 47-58.
- Rahn, Beverly Jean. "The Pen and the Plot: Pamphlets of Sir Roger L'Estrange, 1678-1681." Diss. Columbia University, 1975.
- Ratcliffe, E.C. "The Savoy Conference and the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer." From Uniformity to Unity. Eds. Geoffrey F. Nuttall and Owen Chadwick. London: S.P.C.K., 1962: 89-148.
- Roper, Alan. "Drawing Parallels and Making Applications in Restoration Literature." Politics as Reflected in Literature. Eds. Richard Ashcraft and Alan Roper. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1989. 31-65.
- Rostenberg, Leona. Literary, Political, Scientific, Religious, and Legal Publishing, Printing, and Bookselling in England, 1551-1700. 2 vols. New York: Burt Franklin, 1965.
- , "Subversion and Repression: Robert Stephens, Messenger of the Press." Literary, Political, Scientific, Religious and Legal Publishing, Printing and Bookselling in England, 1551-1700: Twelve Studies. New York: Burt Franklin, 1965. 345-67.

- Sawyer, Jeffrey K. Printed Poison: Pamphlet Propaganda, Faction Politics, and the Public Sphere in Early Seventeenth-Century France. Berkeley: U of California P, 1990.
- Schochet, Gordon J. "Between Lambeth and Leviathan: Samuel Parker on the Church of England and Political Order." Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain. Eds. Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993: 189-208.
- Schwoerer, Lois. "No Standing Armies!" The Antiarmy Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1974.
- , "Press and Parliament in the Revolution of 1689." The Historical Journal 20 (1977): 545-67.
- Scott, Jonathan. Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677-1683. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Seaward, Paul. The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.
- Shaaber, M.A.. Some Forerunners of the Newspaper in England 1476-1622. 1929. New York: Octagon, 1966.
- Shaw, Catherine. Richard Brome. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1980.
- Shuger, Debora K. Sacred Rhetoric: The Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988.
- Siebert, F.S. Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776: The Rise and Decline of Government Control. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1965.
- Skinner, Quentin. "The Context of Hobbes's Theory of Political Obligation." Hobbes and Rousseau: A Collection of Critical Essays. Eds. M. Cranston and R.S. Peters. New York: Anchor Books, 1972: 109-42.
- , "Moral Ambiguity and the Renaissance Art of Eloquence." Essays in Criticism 44(1994): 267-292.
- Sloane, Thomas O. Donne, Milton, and the End of Humanist Rhetoric. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985.
- Solomon, Harry P. "The Rhetoric of 'Redressing Grievances': Court Propaganda as the Hermeneutical Key to Venice Preserv'd." ELH 53(1986): 289-310.

- Sommerville, J.P. "Absolutism and Royalism." The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700. Eds. J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991: 347-373.
- Spurr, John. The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689. New Haven: Yale UP, 1991.
- The Stationers' Company Archive: An Account of the Records, 1554-1984. Ed. Robin Myers. Detroit: Omnigraphics, 1990.
- Stewart, Stanley. "Milton Revises The Readie and Easie Way." Milton Studies 20(1984): 205-224.
- Sutherland, James. The Restoration Newspaper and its Development. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.
- Thompson, E.P. "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century." Past and Present 50(1971): 76-136.
- Treadwell, Michael. "London Trade Publishers 1675-1750." The Library, 6th ser. 4 (1982):99-134.
- "On False and Misleading Imprints in the London Booktrade 1660-1750." Fakes and Frauds: Varieties of Deception in Print and Manuscript. Eds. Robin Myers and Michael Harris. Detroit: Omnigraphics, Inc., 1989: 29-46.
- van Lennep, William, ed. The London Stage, 1660-1800. 5 vols. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1965.
- von Maltzahn, Nicholas. "Henry Neville and the Art of the Possible: a Republican Letter Sent to General Monck." Seventeenth Century 7(1992): 41-52.
- Milton's History of Britain: Republican Historiography in the English Revolution. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.
- "Republication in the Restoration: Some Trimming Pleas for Limited Monarchy, 1660/1680." The Huntington Library Quarterly 56(1993): 281-305.
- Wagner, Russell H. "Thomas Wilson's Arte of Rhetorique." Speech Monographs 27 (1960): 1-32.
- Walker, J. "The Censorship of the Press During the Reign of Charles II." History 25(1950): 219-38.

- Wallace, John M. "Examples are Best Precepts: Readers and Meanings in Seventeenth-Century Poetry." Critical Inquiry 1(1974): 273-90.
- "Otway's Caius Marius and the Exclusion Crisis." Modern Philology 85(1987-88): 363-72.
- Wasserman, Earl R. "The Pleasures of Tragedy." ELH 14 (1947): 283-307.
- Weintraub, Karl J. "Autobiography and Historical Consciousness." Critical Inquiry 1(1974): 821-44.
- Weston, Corinne Comstock. "England: Ancient Constitution and Common Law." The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700. Eds. J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991: 374-411.
- , and Janelle Renfrow Greenberg. Subjects and Sovereigns: The Grand Controversy Over Legal Sovereignty in Stuart England. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.
- White, Arthur F. "The Office of Revels and Dramatic Censorship during the Restoration Period." Western Reserve University Bulletin 34.13 (1931): 30-43.
- Whiting, George W. "The Condition of the London Theatres, 1679-83: A Reflection of the Political Situation." Modern Philology 25(1927): 195-206.
- Williams, Franklin B. "Commendatory Verses: The Rise of the Art of Puffing." Studies in Bibliography 19(1966): 1-15.
- Williams, Keith. The English Newspaper: An Illustrated History to 1900. London: Springwood Books, 1977.
- Wilson, John Harold. "Theatre Notes from the Newdigate Newsletters." Theatre Notes 15(1960): 79-83.
- Wing, Donald et al. Short-Title Catalogue . . . 1641-1700. 2nd ed., 2 vols. New York: MLA, 1972-1986.
- Woolrych, Austin. "Dating Milton's History of Britain." The Historical Journal 36(1993): 929-943.
- , Historical Introduction. The Complete Prose Works of John Milton. Ed. Robert W. Ayers. Rev. ed. Vol. 7. New Haven: Yale UP, 1980: 1-228.

- Worden, Blair. "Classical Republicanism and the Puritan Revolution." History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper. Eds. Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl, and Blair Worden. London: Duckworth, 1981: 182-200.
- , "English Republicanism." The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700. Eds. J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991: 443-475.
- , "The Beginnings of Modern Republicanism, 1649-1683." Unpublished essay.
- , "Milton, Samson Agonistes, and the Restoration." Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration. Ed. Gerald Maclean. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995: 111-136.
- , "Toleration and the Cromwellian Protectorate." Persecution and Toleration. Ed. W.J. Sheils. London: Basil Blackwell, 1984: 199-233.
- , "'Wit in a Roundhead': The Dilemma of Marchamont Nedham." Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England. Eds. Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995: 301-37.
- Wykes, David, and B.D. Greenslade. "The Trimmer's Character: A Further Reply to Halifax." The Huntington Library Quarterly 35(1972): 205-19.
- Zaret, David. "Religion, Science, and Printing in the Public Spheres in Seventeenth-Century England." Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1992. 212-35.
- Zimbaro, Rose A. "At Zero Point: Discourse, Politics, and Satire in Restoration England." ELH 59(1992): 785-98.
- Zwicker, Steven N. "Language as Disguise: Politics and Poetry in the Later Seventeenth Century." Annals of Scholarship 1.3(1980): 47-68.
- , "Lines of Authority: Politics and Literary Culture in the Restoration." Politics of Discourse: the Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England. Eds. Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker. Berkeley: U of California P, 1987: 230-70.
- , "Representing the Revolution: Politics and High Culture in 1689." The Revolutions of 1688-89: Changing Perspectives. Ed. Lois G. Schworer. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992: 165-83.