# "The Day Which Will Fix My Future Destiny": Courtship, Marriage, and the Companionate Ideal in Early Republican America

Rachel Walker
Ithaca College

In 1782, Sarah Fisher contemplated a friend's marriage and asserted, "how much Caution does this important step require, as it 'Cast the Die' for the remainder of our lives!"[1] Acknowledging that matrimony could indelibly alter a woman's existence, Fisher recognized that the choice of a suitor could either secure or preclude her felicity, and illustrated the gravity with which young women viewed courtship in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Far from being a transitory period in which they moved from childhood reliance to marital submission, courtship was a transforming and potentially angst-ridden period for many young women. Though relegated to dependence on male patriarchs throughout their lives, during courtship, women wielded a uniquely gendered power. Attaining a wife could effectively establish a man's place as an efficient patriarch in society, making marriage a vital element of male mastery.[2] Unsurprisingly, then, men exhibited deference, while women held considerable sway in the formation of their suitors' identities.[3] Furthermore, with the rise of the companionate marriage ideal, women increasingly sought to fulfill their own interests in matrimony. Female contentment became a legitimate concern. Accordingly, courtship became a short, yet immensely important, time in which a woman chose the man in whom she would place her future happiness. It was a unique and transformative period in which she made significant choices that would ultimately shape, if not change, the character of her future dependence.

Many historians have debated the meaning of masculinity in the early republic, addressing the experience of young men in an attempt to discover how they made the transition from

---

[1] Sarah Fisher Dawes to Sally Fisher Corbit, March 30, 1782, in The Norris-Fisher Correspondence: A Circle of Friends, 1779-1782, North American Women's Letters and Diaries, http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009), hereafter cited as NAWLD.

[2] In her examination of masculinity in the South, Lorri Glover illustrates that men, "who would wield great legal, economic, and physical power once married," actually yielded immensely to their female suitors during courtship. See Lorri Glover, *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 137. For an examination of gendered power in courtship, see Timothy Kenslea, *The Sedgwicks in Love: Courtship Engagement, and Marriage in the Early Republic* (Boston, Northeastern University Press, 2006), 49-50.

[3] Kathleen Brown has illustrated that despite the intensely male-dominated and patriarchal construction of Southern society in the colonial period, courtship represented an "unusual time in which the balance of power tipped briefly in favor of young women." See Kathleen M. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches & Anxious Patriarchs* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 249.

childhood dependence to patriarchal mastery. Both Lorri Glover and John McCurdy, for example, have highlighted the bachelor experience. They argue that as bachelors, men were forced to assert mastery and establish their position as legitimate wielders of patriarchal authority. Pointing out the uniqueness of bachelorhood as an identity, they framed it as a distinct period of autonomy for young men and argued that young women lacked a comparable experience, due to their continued dependence on male patriarchs.[4] On the other hand, women's historians have emphasized the experience of married women in their examinations of early republican femininity.[5] As most women did, in fact, marry in the early republican period, historians have understandably debated the ways in which women negotiated their political identities and social roles as wives and mothers, while placing less emphasis on how young women prepared for these roles during adolescence. Though not discounting the experience of young men or married women, this paper examines the experiences of young, single women in detail, discerning the ways in which they experienced and grappled with issues of gendered power in the early national period.

Primarily, this paper focuses on women of the elite class. As members of the upper echelons of society, they were more likely to experience a significant period of semi-dependence in the years before marriage. Freed from household duties and responsibilities, many elite young women were able to attend balls, entertain numerous suitors, and immerse themselves in the social

---

[4] For a discussion of early republican masculinity and how it related to courtship and marriage, see Glover, *Southern Sons,* 116-146; John McCurdy, *Citizen Bachelors: Manhood and the Creation of the United States* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), 87-101. For a discussion of changing conceptions of masculinity in the early republic, see Glover, "An Education in Southern Masculinity: The Ball Family of South Carolina in the New Republic," *The Journal of Southern History* 69, no. 1 (February 2003): 40-44, http://jstor.org (accessed November 17, 2009).

[5] On the social and political position of women in the early republic, particularly concerning the construct of republican motherhood, see Kerber, *Women of the Republic;* Norton, *Liberty's Daughters;* and Lewis, "The Republican Wife: Virtue and Seduction in the Early Republic." Kierner also highlighted women's marital and domestic roles in her examination of the Revolution's impact on notions of Southern femininity. See Cynthia A. Kierner, *Beyond the Household: Women's Place in the Early South, 1700-1835* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 27-35, 71-.144, 211.  Similarly, Rosemarie Zagarri highlighted the conservative backlash that pushed women back into domesticity. After the Revolution, she argues that society began emphasizing women's roles as mothers, rather than political beings. See Rosemarie Zagarri, *Revolutionary Backlash: Women and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007). Laurel Thatcher Ulrich also examined the social roles of early republican women in her microhistory on Martha Ballard. See Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *A Midwife's Tale: The Life of Martha Mallard, Based on Her Diary, 1785-1812* (New York: Vintage Books, 1990).

rituals of courtship. Further, as upper class households were equipped with the financial resources to educate their daughters, elite young women were also more likely to be literate, and as a result, leave substantial records behind.[6] A close examination of these writings demonstrates the numerous complexities that characterized young women's courtship experiences, as well as the ways in which women used these experiences to challenge—yet ultimately accept—the hierarchical nature of marital relationships.

In her examination of the courtships of Laura Wirt, Anya Jabour explores this notion, demonstrating that early republican women were forced to confront the challenge their own self-development posed to ideals of femininity. Oftentimes, they were instructed to develop their own faculties, but only for the sake of their husbands and society. While women expected to find self-fulfillment in marriage, they often found dependence.[7] Similarly, Nicole Eustace examines the issue of gendered power in courtship, showing that while women held a degree of power in the process, they often recognized its ephemeral nature and sought to cloak their influence in diffidence, in order to achieve the approbation of their male suitors.[8] Women realized their power was far from absolute. Men assumed a position of deference in the courtship process, but they would ultimately assume the role of a dominant male patriarch in marriage, thus, asserting their mastery in stark opposition to their wives' dependence. Though men often pursued their sweethearts with lengthy displays of love and dedication, these ploys were ultimately a strategy by which they could accomplish a vital element in the process of male mastery: attaining a wife.

---

[6] Catherine Kerrison argued that literacy in early America conveyed social status, race, and gender; it was used, primarily by elites, as an illustration of power. In the early seventeenth century, female literacy rates were below twenty percent, rising to only fifty percent, even by 1850. Further, elite women were far more likely to attain literacy than their counterparts in both the middling and lower classes. See Kerrison, *Claiming the Pen: Women and Intellectual Life in the Early American South* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 11-17.

[7] Anya Jabour, "It Will Not Do For Me to Be Married," *Journal of the Early Republic* 17, no. 2 (Summer, 1997), 207-213, http://jstor.org (accessed October 24, 2009).

[8] Nicole Eustace, "'The Cornerstone of a Copious Work': Love and Power in Eighteenth-Century Courtship," *Volume of Social History* 34, no.3 (February 2003): 517-546, http://jstor.org (accessed September 29, 2009).

Women held the power of refusal, but oftentimes, they were ultimately dependent on men in the courtship experience.[9]

In a letter to Sally Fisher Corbit, for instance, Deborah Norris illustrated her passivity in the search for a male companion. She wrote, "Indeed my dear it seems to me that we shall neither of us marry; but for reasons rather differant, thee from not having an offer thee approves, I, from having no offers to disapprove [*sic*]."[10] Unable to initiate a courtship without a male pursuer, Norris demonstrated her utter passivity in the process. Though Norris later asserted her willingness to take up the honorable existence of an "Old Maid," she quickly abandoned the scheme when finally receiving a suitor's attention, and married just a year later. By highlighting the honorable nature of a spinster's lifestyle, Norris attempted to come to terms with the discomfiting prospect she faced: marriage was an unattainable ideal without a male pursuer or proposal.[11] Courtship was simply another arena in which men could illustrate their own autonomy, even as they cloaked it in deferential language.

Once male suitors achieved their goal to secure a wife, their expressions of deference disappeared and they took their place as dominant heads of household. As Lorri Glover illustrated in Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation, many men actually viewed their courtship experiences as metaphors of conquest and mastery.[12] Men compared romantic pursuits to military sieges, framing them as obstacles to be overcome. A young man's advice to his friend illustrated the tendency to equate romance with conquest. "Commence a severe cannonade of compliments, flatteries, sweet and loving glances," he insisted, "Do not accept any conditions. The Capitulation

---

[9] McCurdy, 136. See also Eustace, 531-532

[10] Deborah Norris Logan to Sally Fisher Corbit, May 6, 1780, in The Norris-Fisher Correspondence: A Circle of Friends, 1779-1782, North American Women's Letters and Diaries, http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009), (hereafter cited as NAWLD).

[11] Ibid.

[12] Lorri Glover, 139.

you must insist to be unconditional."[13] In his work on the Sedgwick family in New York and Massachusetts, Timothy Kenslea illustrates a similar trend in the correspondence of young men in the North. Kenslea includes a letter in which Harry Sedgwick lambasts his brother for failing to actively pursue a romantic interest. Sedgewick wrote, "When adversity comes like a ploughshare, you will be cut down like a solitary reed."[14] Reminding him, "You are desirous of acquisition," Harry encouraged his brother to aggressively persist in his romantic endeavors.[15]   A man's passivity signified his failure to adhere to ideals of masculinity. Thus, a successful "siege" during courtship was merely part of male mastery, and for many young boys, a victorious pursuit affirmed their identity as men.

Yet, young women occupied a position of power during the courtship, and through their rebuffs, could have seriously detrimental effects on a man's reputation. Women were often acutely aware of their temporary influence, and in stark contrast to the marital deference they would later show their husbands, some openly criticized their potential suitors.[16] In a letter to her friend Elizabeth Bordley, for example, Eleanor Parke Custis, the granddaughter of George and Martha Washington, derided the dogged persistence of one of Elizabeth's suitors. Calling him a "mad Beau," Custis mocked the suitor's inability to secure either Elizabeth's attention or affection. Custis asserted, "They say every person is like some animal. If so he resembles a Spaniel -- for the more ill treatment he receives the more attentive & ridiculously troublesome he is."[17] She later belittled another suitor, calling him a "conceited, disagreeable fop." As a young woman enmeshed in the courtship process, Custis unhesitatingly criticized those men who vied for her attention.

---

[13] Alfred Beckley to George Washington Love, 2 April 1820, James Young Love and Thomas Love Papers, FHS, quoted in: Glover, *Southern Sons,* 139. See also: Eustace, 527.

[14] Harry Dwight Sedgwick to Theodore Sedgwick II, 12/2/1806, Sedgwick V Papers, quoted in: Kenslea*,* 49.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid., 89-99.

[17] Eleanor Parke Custis to Elizabeth Bordley, April 24, 1797, in George Washington's Beautiful Nelly: The Letters of Eleanor Parke Custis Lewis to Elizabeth Bordley, NAWLD.

Similarly, in a letter to her sister, Rachel Huntington criticized a young man who had "indeed play'd the coquette at a high rate for five or six months," engaging the affections of her cousin as well as another young women.[18] In her letter, Huntington asserted that her cousin should "pay him in his own coin for jilting her" as it was "amply in her power" to do so. In advocating that this young woman directly confront her dishonest lover, Huntington's claims illustrate that women were, in fact, willing to challenge ideals of feminine passivity in the period of courtship.[19] Far from being submissive recipients of male attention, women actively judged and evaluated the men who vied for their attention, consciously wielding immense influence in forming the masculine identity of their suitors.

Writers of conduct literature in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century likewise recognized the immense influence of young women in courtship and actively sought to curb it. In the widely printed and influential publication, *A Father's Legacy to His Daughters,* Dr. Gregory castigates the young women who willfully exploited their temporary power, using it to keep their suitors in a state of miserable suspense. It is "the deepest and most artful coquetry," he said, for women "to engage and fix the heart of a man whom the world, and whom they themselves esteem, although they are firmly determined never to marry him."[20] Similarly, numerous authors assert the importance of female passivity and timorousness in the courtship process. Author Thomas Gisborne sharply reproaches those women who deviated from "feminine diffidence" and "Christian humility," illustrating a desire to curb female impudence and reinforce prevailing standards of femininity.[21]

---

[18] Rachel Huntington Tracy to Anne Huntington, May 15, 1797, in The Huntington Letters in the Possession of Julia Chester Wells, NAWLD.

[19] Ibid.

[20] John Gregory, "Friendship, Love, and Marriage," in *A Father's Legacy to His Daughters* (London: H.D. Symonds, Pater noster Row, 1793), 103, 107-109, *The Gerritsen Collection of Aletta H. Jacobs* Cornell University Library, 7 Nov. 2007. <http://gerritsen.chadwyck.com> (hereafter cited as *The Gerritsen Collection).*

[21] Thomas Gisborne, *An enquiry into the duties of the female sex* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1797), 103, *The Gerritsen Collection.* Similarly, in a published letter to his sister, a young man attempted to speak for all men, saying if women only knew "how much we prefer your amiable diffidence, your blushing timidity, they would endeavor to be

Many women absorbed the messages of these advice booklets, empathizing with men in the angst-ridden courtship period. Both Deborah Norris and Eliza Southgate assumed the culpability of girls who willfully strung their suitors along, showing sympathy for the men who were forced to anxiously contemplate the affections of their female suitors and recognizing the powerful position of women in the courtship process. At the end of one letter, for instance, Deborah Norris inquired, "how is poor Michael? (Oh what transitions I make!) really I pity him, how unfortunate it is to fix the affections on an object if it cannot make a return."[22] Similarly, in referencing a scorned lover, a young Eliza Southgate complained that her cousin had "lugged off his heart and left the remainder here."[23] Calling the young woman a "selfish creature," she reproached the girl's self-indulgence. In denouncing those who utilized this unique period of female power to their advantage, both Deborah Norris and Eliza Southgate illustrate an adherence to the notion of feminine passivity advanced by the conduct literature of the time.[24] The women consciously adhere to feminine ideals, asserting the proper nature of female dependence, even when these assertions belied reality.

Men, too, recognized that their position within the sphere of masculine autonomy rested heavily on their ability to secure a successful match and effectively navigate the realm of courtship.[25] As a result, men yielded to their female suitors, but only in an effort to establish their own mastery. Through lengthy and verbose declarations of their love, devotion, and

---

like you." See Anonymous. "A from a young gentleman to his sister," in *Letters on courtship and marriage* (Trenton: Daniel Fenton and James Wilson, 1813), 202, *The Gerritsen Collection.*

[22] Deborah Norris Logan to Sally Fisher Corbit, 1780[?], NAWLD.

[23] Eliza Southgate Bowne, "Diary of Eliza Southgate Bowne," June 12, 1800, in A Girl's Life Eighty Years Ago: Selections from the Letter of Eliza Southgate Bowne, NAWLD.

[24] Young women often illustrated their view that women should assume diffidence in modesty in courtship. When describing a friend in a letter to Sarah Fisher, for example, Deborah Norris stated, "She has thousand good qualities, with the most becoming diffidence and modesty." Deborah Norris Logan to Sally Fisher Corbit, 1780? NAWLD; Deborah Norris Logan to Sally Fisher Corbit, December, 1779, NAWLD. Similarly, Patty Rogers agonizes over her forwardness and breech of feminine modesty by taking a lover's arm without being asked. She later fretted over a suitor whose feelings she had hurt. Though she did not love him, she asserted, "bobbing about my follish heart all day—I was afraid I had offended him [*sic*]." Patty Rogers, "Diary of Patty Rogers," 1785, Mss. Dept., Octavo vols. "R" Misc. mss. boxes "R" Rogers Family Papers, 1731-1804, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester (hereafter cited as AAS).

[25] Glover, *Southern Sons,* 139. Similarly, Kathleen Brown illustrates that in the colonial period, courtship was an intense period in which a man's personality, family, fortune, and reputation endured close scrutiny. Like in the early republican period, the process could be a trying one. Brown, 249.

powerlessness, men attempted to gain the affections of their romantic counterparts. In the process, however, suitors merely illustrated their own capabilities for romantic conquest. In contrast to the guarded and reticent replies of their female counterparts, male suitors made public and grandiose claims intended to win the affections of their sweethearts.[26] Even advice literature acknowledged that young men were often "indiscriminate flatterers" who praised their female suitors "without inward approbation."[27] Although superficially deferential, masculine efforts to secure a wife actually asserted male autonomy, illustrating men's ability to emerge victorious in the quest to successfully woo a suitor.

By examining the letters and diaries of young men, it becomes clear that they were very aware of their own power and influence in the courtship process, despite the anxiety it could incur. In a proposal from an unidentified suitor to Grace Goddard in 1800, a young man illustrated his position of superiority, while simultaneously proclaiming his deference and dedication. In the letter, he uses grammatical terms and Latin verb tenses to convey his meaning. This, in itself, is an illustration of his superior education; most women were not afforded the opportunity to learn Latin. In his letter, Goddard's suitor asserts that he was "too Masculine" to remain single and illustrates his wish that Grace would not be "impeditive" in his pursuit, pointing out that she had refused at least three men before him.[28] Like advice literature of the time, he asserts that she would attain happiness through passivity. "Be you but supine & I will be Deponent," Goddard's suitor stated, illustrating a clever manipulation of grammatical terms. A deponent verb is one that appears passive, but in reality, has an active meaning. Similarly, he uses the word "genitive," a Latin grammar expression used to indicate possession. Goddard's suitor clearly recognized his powerful

---

[26] Eustace, 519. See also Glover, *Southern Sons,* 145; and Kenslea, 49.

[27] Gisborne*,* 104. See also *Letters on Courtship and Marriage,* 39-40.

[28] Anonymous, "From a Schoolmaster to A Lady of His Affections," 1800?, Mss. Dept., Misc. mss. boxes "G," folder 2, Goddard Family Papers, AAS.

position and expected to establish his mastery in marriage. While ending the letter, "your most obsequious Adorer," this young man illustrates that he expects his suitor to submit to his will.[29]

Courtship did provide power and influence for young women as well, and many female "belles" reveled in the social opportunities and exhilarating freedom it engendered. In the early stages of courtship, young women engaged in casual flirtation with numerous suitors. As they began formulating lasting attachments and meaningful relationships, however, a decidedly more serious tone developed. It is crucial to make the distinction between the ways in which women came to grips with their powerful role in courtship, while also accepting their future subordination in marriage. Specifically in the South, elite young women's societal roles as "belles" allowed them to attend balls, dance with numerous suitors, and interact with men in an arena that lacked the seriousness of conventional courtship. For example, the correspondence of Eleanor Parke Custis illustrates the informal nature that characterizes the romantic experiences of single women in the South. In 1796, she announced "I am now Miss Custis, & as you may suppose not a little proud of the title," a proclamation that indicated her coming out as a "belle" in society.[30] In her new societal position, Custis began entertaining male admirers, though she did not seriously commit herself until formulating an attachment to a young man named Lawrence Lewis, in 1798.[31]

Before choosing a suitor, Custis engaged in the rituals of flirtation and interacted with numerous young men. In one letter, she claims that although she danced the entire evening with the same partner, it by no means indicated a meaningful or lasting companionship. Instead, Custis states, "it is, & always has been the custom in Maryland and Virginia to dance all the evening at the *Assemblies* with the same partner."[32] Commenting openly on his appearance and charm, Custis nevertheless admitted, "I can give you very little information with respect to the *intrinsic merit* of

---

[29] Ibid.
[30] Eleanor Parke Custis Lewis to Elizabeth Bordley, May 30, 1797, NAWLD.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Ibid.

the *happy youth,* as I was only introduced to him the morning of the Ball." Custis then assured her

friend Elizabeth Bordley, that secrecy was not necessary as her attachment with him was merely a

casual one. Still, Custis insists, "When I *have* any thing to impart I shall rely upon your secrecy,"

making a crucial distinction: flirtation allowed women to explore their options and engage the

affections of several suitors without making a commitment. [33] Once women pledged themselves to

a suitor, however, they recognized the seriousness of the matter as well as its implications for their

futures.

Unlike men, who made public declarations of their love and affection during courtship,

women typically valued secrecy, in an attempt to protect their brief and passing independence.

Flirtation was exhilarating and carefree, yet serious courtship led to marriage, and marriage

entailed responsibilities that effectively ended the excitement and independence of youthful

romance.[34] As a result, women often sought secrecy, because when a courtship came into the open,

community members expected a proposal would soon follow. This prospect limited women's

ability to exercise agency in choosing a suitor, because a rumored engagement infringed upon a

young woman's right to utilize her most powerful weapon: the right of refusal. If courting girls

rejected too many suitors or demonstrated their power too brazenly, they ran the risk of being

condemned as "coquettes." Courtship was thus a dangerous time for young women, one in which

they sought to maintain their own reputations as diffident, humble, and obliging women, while

simultaneously utilizing their power to explore their options and find a worthy suitor. As a result,

---

[33] Ibid.

[34] As Anya Jabour illustrates in her discussion of the marriage between Elizabeth and William Wirt, marriage engendered domesticity and domesticity meant *work.* Anya Jabour, *Marriage in the Early Republic: Elizabeth and William Wirt and the Companionate Ideal* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 36-45. Similarly, Cynthia Kierner states, "Men, not women, sentimentalized domesticity because men alone identified the domestic sphere with leisure and seclusion from the trials of life." Cynthia A. Kierner, *Beyond the Household: Women's Place in the Early South, 1700-1835* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 170. See also Nancy Cott, *The Bonds of Womanhood: "Women's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), 52-53.

girls often concealed their courtships, telling only those whom they could securely trust, while

fervently denying rumors of their attachments to others.[35]

In an effort to assuage the anxiety of her friend, Eleanor Parke Custis assured her, "I have,

as you requested, contradicted positively the report of your engagement with Mr. Holker wherever

I have heard it mentioned."[36] Custis then attempted to dispel a circulating rumor of her *own*

romantic involvement with a man named Mr. Carrol.[37] Similarly, in describing her relationship

with a new suitor, Sally Fisher writes, "let me beg no eye but thy own may peruse this—as it is a

matter I wish to remain in a state of secrecy, as no good effect can arise from a knowledge of it, to

any person."[38] As she did not expect the relationship to result in marriage, Fisher asserts, "there is

nothing materal [*sic*] in the matter." Later, she reiterates, "believe me there is nothing in it."[39] By

seeking to ensure the privacy of their romantic affairs, young women sought to continue their

explorations in courtship, extending their own autonomy and influence, even if only temporarily.

As long as they entertained numerous admirers, courting girls could prolong their influence.

Ultimately, however, most young women accepted that they would occupy a subordinate position

in marriage and used courtship to come to terms with that reality.

Advice literature only further reminded women of the ephemeral nature of their power,

typically assuming that once a woman made her choice, her dependence in marriage precluded any

opportunity to shape her future happiness. Thomas Gisborne encouraged women to choose a

husband wisely for "if she marries a person without having sufficient reason to be satisfied. . . the

fault surely is her own."[40]  The power women wielded in courtship contrasted immensely with the

---

[35] Eustace, 529. See also Kenslea, 114. Anya Jabour also illustrates the pressure that young women faced once society assumed their engagement. There was no "honorable escape" for a young woman that encouraged a suitor, only to reject him. These women were viewed as "coquettes" and disparaged by society. See Jabour, "It Will Never Do For Me to Be Married," 225-226.

[36] Eleanor Parke Custis to Elizabeth Bordley, May 14, 1798, NAWLD.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Sarah Fisher Dawes to Sally Fisher Corbit, December 16, 1781, NAWLD.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Gisborne, *232-237.*

dependence to which they would soon submit.[41] Whereas men's experience in courtship affirmed their mastery and logically resulted in an assumption of patriarchal power, women had to negotiate between two distinct and conflicting periods: courtship and marriage.

In *Citizen Bachelors: Manhood and the Creation of the United States,* John McCurdy asserts that the "bachelor" held a distinctly unique identity, clearly distinguishable from other stages of manhood.[42] McCurdy claims that in the late eighteenth century, bachelorhood "changed from an undefined and uncomfortable transitional period to a purposefully liminal time of self-definition and autonomy."[43] Stating that single women never experienced the autonomy and active self-examination that bachelorhood incurred, McCurdy illustrates the distinctive experience of single men and the potency of "bachelorhood" as an identity.[44] In doing so, however, he highlights the passivity of women and portrays courtship as a transforming period for men, but merely a transitory stage for women.[45] In this, McCurdy ignores that both women and society viewed a woman's courtship experience as a distinct and transformative period in which she actively shaped her future.

As women grappled with issues of dependence and power, most experienced a significant period between adolescent dependence on and marital submission to male masters.[46] Though many women ultimately failed to assert total independence from male patriarchs during courtship, they were forced to contemplate their future happiness and make decisions to ensure it. Accordingly, most women recognized that their choice of a husband was the most important decision they would make in their lives. This was especially true with the rise of the companionate ideal in the latter

---

[41] Theophilus Moore, *Marriage customs, modes of courtship, and singular propensities of the various nations of the universe : with remarks on the condition of women* (London: printed for John Bumpus, Holburn, near Middle Row, 1814), 360, *The Gerritsen Collection.*

[42] McCurdy 199-202.

[43] Ibid., 162

[44] Ibid., 156.

[45] Ibid., 136, 139.

[46] Not all women expected to marry; several did choose to become spinsters. This paper, however, is primarily concerned with young women who experienced the transforming period between childhood dependence and marriage. For a discussion of how women viewed spinsterhood in colonial Philadelphia, see Karin Wulf, *Not All Wives: Women of Colonial Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 28-42.

part of the eighteenth century. Rather than a social institution that upheld the patriarchal order in society, marriage became a loving match that promoted the shared felicity of both sexes.[47] Advice authors generally assent that marriage should resemble "a mutual contract between the sexes; the end or design of which is, or should be, their joint happiness."[48] But authors also tied a woman's happiness inextricably to marriage, while simultaneously asserting that once married, a woman could not, in any way, shape her own existence. Thus, it was the reality of female dependence in marriage that, ironically, made female power in courtship so significant.

Courtship was a unique period in which a woman was forced to evaluate her future, while anticipating and averting potential misery. As conduct literature asserts, a woman's duty in courtship was to "prevent, while prevention is still in her power."[49] In recognizing that female power ended abruptly on a young woman's wedding day, advice booklets urged their female readers to utilize courtship wisely. Though a woman's influence was ultimately fleeting, her assertion of it was vital in the formation of her future marital existence. Women would soon embrace dependence again, but the decisions they made within courtship played a critical role in shaping the nature of that dependence.

The latter half of the eighteenth century saw a rise in the ideals of male and female companionship, allowing women to actively consider their own happiness within marriage. During the early colonial period, Anglo-American theorists universally concurred that hierarchy was essential to social and political stability and that wifely subordination was "the foundation of the

---

[47] Jabour, *Marriage in the Early Republic,* 9, 46. See also Catherine Kerrison, *Claiming the Pen: Women and Intellectual Life in the Early American South* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 127. On female role in marriage in the colonial period, see Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American Society,* 288-335; Ulrich, *Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Northern New England Women, 1650-1750,* 117-121, 179-185, 238.

[48] *Letters on Courtship and Marriage,* 59. See also Moore, 342. In this booklet, the author portrays marriage as a harmonious union and the seat of domestic bliss.

[49] Hester Chapone, *Letters on the improvement of the mind : addressed to a young lady* (London: H. Hughes, 1773), 190, *The Gerritsen Collection.*

family unit and thus of society itself."[50] The rise of the companionate marriage ideal did not dismantle these conceptions of rightful feminine dependence. As Catherine Kerrison illustrates, increasing acceptance of the companionate marriage ideal did not engender a fundamental reassessment of gendered hierarchies.[51] Even conduct literature of the period acknowledged the superficiality that pervaded claims of equal partnership and mutuality. In an advice pamphlet to young men, for example, a female author asserts, "That your own superiority should always be seen, but never felt, seems an excellent general rule."[52] In essence, the companionate ideal was merely a rhetorical device intended to shroud the true implications of gendered power in marriage.

Still, women internalized these messages and expected to fulfill their own objectives and achieve felicity through matrimony. When informing her friend that she made the decision to marry, for example, Eleanor Parke Custis illustrated the degree to which women truly intertwined their own happiness with marriage. She describes her wedding day as "the day which will fix my future destiny," insisting that although previously resolved to become a spinster, she had since become "perfectly reconciled" to the notion of a married existence.[53] Yet, Custis' language also illustrates that by voluntarily succumbing to the pursuits of her admirer, she tacitly acknowledged and accepted her future state of dependence. Though Custis did so willingly, she recognized that she would now be "obliged to submit and bind myself to become that old fashioned thing called a Wife."[54] Though women could make a conscious decision to move from single to married, men ultimately held the reigns of gendered power in courtship. By using terms like "succumb" and "submit," Custis illustrates her acknowledgement of her future dependence. In the end, it was she who was forced to yield and he who achieved mastery.

---

[50] Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers*, 62. For a discussion of gender relations in colonial Virginia, particularly concerning marriage as the foundation for the patriarchal and societal order, see also: Brown, 86, 91-104.

[51] Kerrison, 127-128. See also: Jabour, *Marriage in the Early Republic,* 10.

[52] Mrs. Piozzi, "A Letter to a Young Gentleman on His Marriage," in *Letters on courtship and marriage* (Trenton: Daniel Fenton and James Wilson, 1813), 188, *The Gerritsen Collection.*

[53] Eleanor Parke Custis Lewis to Elizabeth Bordley, February 3, 1799, NAWLD.

[54] Ibid.

Recognizing that their future state would be dictated by the whims of the men they attached themselves to, women focused heavily on the intrinsic moral character and virtue of their male suitors during courtship, and actively evaluated the honor and virtue of the men who courted them. In describing her future husband, Eleanor Parke Custis optimistically insisted, "The Man I have chosen to watch over my future happiness is in every respect calculated to ensure it."[55] She highlighted his virtue, rationality, and societal esteem, assuring her friend that she was "confident of his sincere and unalterable attachment."[56] Clearly, women expected a marriage of mutual esteem and companionship. Many invariably linked their own satisfaction to that of their husband's, thus, internalizing the prescriptions of advice literature.[57] While Custis cheerfully predicted her own marital bliss, she also consciously acknowledged her decision to devote her life to her new husband, and in doing so, made his happiness a paramount concern of her own life.[58]

The pervading theme in conduct literature of the period was one that tied female happiness to marriage, while tying marital bliss to male, not female, contentment. In the late-eighteenth century, "happy, proper marriages rested upon the twin pillars of husbands' exercising patriarchal power and wives' internalizing the belief that they were the ones responsible for marital harmony."[59] A woman's paramount goal was to assure her husband's felicity, thus, ensuring the viability of her marriage and, by extension, her own happiness. Marriage resulted in a mutual esteem and tenderness, but only if both men and women "attended to the duties of their station."[60] A woman was expected to invest all of her faculties in obliging the interests of her husband. As author Theophilus Moore asserts, a good wife "makes it her business to serve, and her pleasure to oblige her husband: conscious that everything that promotes his happiness must in the end

---

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid.

[57] For examples of advice literature that propagated these messages, see Chapone, 192. See also Gisborne. 237.

[58] Eleanor Parke Custis Lewis to Elizabeth Bordley, February 3, 1799, NAWLD.

[59] Clare A. Lyons, *Sex among the Rabble: An Intimate History of Gender & Power in the Age of Revolution, Philadelphia, 1730-1830* (Chapel Hill: North Carolina Press, 2006), 171.

[60] Moore, 360.

contribute to her own."[61] By insisting that the only way a woman could achieve the ideals of femininity was through marriage, and by subsequently linking marital bliss to male felicity, authors skillfully enmeshed women's happiness with their dependence.

Framing volitional compliance as a feminine virtue, society attempted to uphold the existing patriarchal order, while simultaneously asserting notions of companionship, marital harmony, and mutuality. Though wielding considerable power in courtship, women forfeited what influence they had when they solidified their marriage vows. From that point forward, society afforded women little sway in the shaping of their husbands; instead, demanding willful obedience and cheerful submission.[62] Just as it was in the early colonial period, the reality of female dependence was palpable in the late eighteenth century and the early republican decades. The difference came in the ways in which society justified female subordination. As Clare Lyons illustrates in *Sex Among the Rabble: An Intimate History of Gender and Power in the Age of Revolution*, the tumultuous period of the Enlightenment challenged established gender conventions.[63] Women's subordination had previously been based on the "natural hierarchy" that governed all social relations. In this system, men were the natural leaders and protectors of their subordinates. The Enlightenment, however, challenged the foundations of the existing gender hierarchy by insisting that humans were rational agents, capable of shaping their own destiny.[64]

In particular, the rise of the companionate ideal illustrated an adoption of Enlightenment views on human rationalism and agency. As Clare Lyons illustrated, by the 1760s, "almanac ditties" began making the crucial distinction between love and lust. While lust was rooted in the "fleeting effects of passion," love was based on affection and esteem between partners. The

---

[61] Moore, 360.

[62] Eustace, 523. Though instructing young men in how to "cultivate" agreeable wives, advice literature directed at women stressed ways in which a woman might shape her own behavior in an effort to better please her husband. For a further illustration of how advice literature portrayed female dependence, see: *Gregory, A Father's Legacy to His Daughters* and Moore, *Marriage Customs, Modes of Courtship, and Singular Propensities of the Various Nations of the Universe: With Remarks on the Condition of Women.*

[63] Lyons, 1-5, 58, 183-185. For a further discussion of gendered power in colonial America, see Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers.*

[64] Ibid.

Enlightenment philosophy stressed careful and rational deliberation for both men and women.[65] This ideology carried into the courtship process easily, encouraging women to actively deliberate their prospects in marriage and make a calculated decision to ensure their future happiness. Exhorting women to subordinate their passions to rationality, one author warns, "a blind, a sudden, and intoxicated passion has a natural tendency to occasion unhappy marriages."[66] These prescriptions encouraged women to employ their own rationality in the courtship process and emphasized the significance their decisions would have on their future happiness.

In a letter to her future husband, John Symmes, Susan Livingston illustrated the simultaneous prevalence of the companionate marriage ideal and the continued expectation of female submission in courtship and marriage. While lauding matches founded on love and affection, her correspondence illustrated her deferential position in the courtship process. Insisting, "I never would give my hand where I was not attached upon any consideration," Livingston highlighted the importance she placed on love and esteem in choosing a suitor.[67] Still, in attempting to allay her future husband's concerns about her own devotion to him, she immediately took up a deferential tone. Livingston assumed responsibility for her suitor's inability to discern the meaning of her previous letter, and made his approbation her paramount objective. Though admitting that his assumption of her distrust "wounded my feelings more than ever I expected they would have been by you," she was primarily concerned that her own letter had offended him. Accordingly, she took full responsibility for his interpretation of its contents, despite her intentions. While insisting, "I am with esteem & affection Your friend," Susan Livingston portrayed herself as John's inferior, obliging his interests and assuring him of her devotion.[68]

---

[65] Lyons, 169-171. Catherine Kerrison also shows how women deliberated their marital prospects and attempted to build marriages based on rational love, virtue and esteem. See Kerrison, 131-133.

[66] *Letters on Courtship and Marriage,* 28. See also: Chapone*,* 190-191; Gisborne*,* 232.

[67] Susan Livingston Symmes to John Cleves Symmes, February 10, 1794, in The Intimate Letters of John Cleves Symmes and His Family Including Those of His Daughter Mrs. William Henry Harrison, Wife of the Ninth President of the United States, NAWLD.

[68] Ibid.

Like the Enlightenment, the American Revolution challenged conceptions of a divinely sanctioned order based on "natural" hierarchies. Though it did not result in a drastic reevaluation of gender ideologies or feminine roles in society, it did provide opportunities for women to demand increased opportunities in marriage and education. The political framework of the fledgling republic was based on the notion of a "consensual union of equals," and this new, political egalitarianism soon influenced the male-female power dynamic within marriage.[69] The Revolution explicitly challenged the patriarchal system with an emphasis on equality, mutuality, and friendship. Admonishing patriarchal domination within the home, as "the chief obstacle to a happy and virtuous marriage," Americans extended republican ideology to marriage, lauding companionship and consent, rather than imperious male dominance.[70]

Yet, conduct literature continued to assert the necessity of voluntary wifely subordination and encouraged women to oblige the interests of their husbands. "To preserve this union, and render the harmony of the married state more complete," insists Moore, "a mutual esteem and tenderness, a mutual deference and forbearance, a mutual authority and assistance, must be kept up."[71] Immediately following this assertion of companionship, Moore made it clear that "mutual deference" truly meant willful female subordination. "There need be no disputes about power, nor will there be any," he said. "They have no opposite or separate interests, therefore, there can be no opposition of conduct."[72] In essence, Moore defined mutual companionship by female submission.

---

[69] Susan Branson, *These Fiery Frenchified Dames: Women and Political Culture in Early National Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 13.

[70] In her article on women in the early republic, Jan Lewis has illustrated the connection between marital unions based on consensual agreement between husband and wife and the new republican political system. She states, "In the republic envisioned by American writers, citizens were to be bound together not by patriarchy's duty or liberalism's self-interest, but by affection, and it was, they believed, marriage, more than any other institution, that trained citizens in this virtue." See Jan Lewis, "The Republican Wife: Virtue and Seduction in the Early Republic," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (October 1987): 689, http://jstor.org (accessed September 2, 2009).

[71] Moore, 342.

[72] Ibid.

Only by domestic obedience could a woman ensure "mutual esteem and tenderness" in her marriage.[73]

The revolutionary rhetoric allowed society to increasingly value the female role within marriage, while still expecting female deference and dependence. Heralding marriage and motherhood as every woman's ultimate goal, society branded domesticity as the only way in which a woman could attain the ideals of femininity and ensure her own happiness.[74] Further, by inextricably linking female happiness and marital bliss, advice literature of the time asserted that women were ultimately responsible for the success of their marriages. Women were instructed to achieve lasting and loving companionships through their own deference, reticence, and amiability, characteristics that would garner respect from their husbands, but were ultimately unable to foster feminine achievement or self-esteem.

Nevertheless, this new appreciation of women's domestic roles prompted men to become increasingly aware of female happiness within marriage. Women, too, increasingly valued their own self-improvement and personal fulfillment. As Mary Kelley has illustrated in her scholarship on female academies and seminaries in the early republic, historians have placed too much emphasis on societal prescriptions for female behavior, and in the process, have ignored that women exercised their personal autonomy to actively shape both their education and their futures.[75] Many young women also developed close female friendships at academies, allowing them to experience companionships truly rooted in affection and equality. Women modeled their

---

[73] Ibid.

[74] As Linda Kerber has illustrated in her path breaking work on women in the early national period, the new concept of the "republican mother" afforded women a politically significant *and* insignificant role. She claimed that society framed motherhood "almost as if it were a fourth branch of government, a device that ensured social control in the gentlest possible way." See Kerber, 200. On sentimentalizing domesticity, see Wulf, 41; Norton, *Liberty's Daughters,* 34-35, 38, 155; Jabour, *Marriage in the Early Republic,* 36-47; Kierner, *Beyond the Household,* 167-170; and Jabour, "It will not do for me to be married," 211. As Kierner points out in her study of elite women in the early republican South, however, it was men and not women who sentimentalized domesticity. While men conceptualized the home as a "separate sphere and seat of virtuous bliss," women associated the home with mundane responsibilities and invariable nature that defined their existence.

[75] Mary Kelley, "Reading Women/Women Reading:The Making of Learned Women in Antebellum America," *The Journal of American History* 83, no. 2 (September 1996), 415.

future courtships after these female friendships, coming to expect true mutuality and fulfillment from their relationships with men. As a result, women became increasingly cognizant of the hierarchal nature of marital relationships, but also increasingly sought to fulfill their own felicity through matrimony.[76]

In order to assure their personal happiness, numerous women emphasized the importance of finding a "worthy" husband, capable of achieving this goal. When speaking of a courtship experience of a friend, Deborah Norris asserts, "And I hope she will not dignify him with her Choice Without he is worthy."[77] Similarly, when speaking of Deborah Norris's courtship, Sarah Fisher illustrated her desire that Norris would find her new husband to be deserving of affection and esteem. She hopefully states, "I approve of it much, it will be a union of Worthies."[78] These women fully expected their suitors to fulfill their expectations, and imbibing the proclamations of advice writers, they agreed that their happiness rested in their ability to find a worthy, virtuous man.

The choice of a husband was a significant one, for women knew that marriage could either mean perpetual bliss or inescapable misery. Just as women internalized ideals of mutual companionship and marital equality, many recognized the potentiality of a miserable and inescapable union. In a letter highlighting the merits of spinsterhood, Grace Goddard insists that an unmarried existence was preferable because a single woman cannot be "wounded by the

---

[76] Steven Stowe, "'The Thing Not Its Vision': A Woman's Courtship and Her Sphere in the Southern Planter Class," *Feminist Studies* 19, no. 1 (Spring, 1983), 115-118. See also Jabour, "It Will Never Do For Me to Be Married," 193-196, 206-210; Kerrison, 127; and Jabour, *Marriage in the Early Republic,* 34, 206-210. For primary sources that illustrate women's increasing focus on their own contentment, see Letter from Grace Goddard to Anonymous Friend, 1800, Goddard Family Papers, AAS; Letter from Deborah Norris Logan to Sally Fisher Corbit, May 6, 1780, NAWLD; and Letter from Eleanor Parke Custis Lewis to Elizabeth Bordley, Febraury 3, 1799, NAWLD.
[77] Deborah Norris Logan to Sally Fisher Corbit, December 1780[?], NAWLD.
[78] Sarah Fisher Dawes to Sally Fisher Corbit, March 30, 1782, NAWLD. Similarly, Charity White Goddard similarly expressed her desire that marriage would bring her sister-in-law contentment. In a letter to Grace Goddard Drury, she stated, "You have chosen a partner for life since I saw you and one I hope that adds greatly to your happiness." Charity White Goddard to Grace Goddard Drury, April 20, 1802, Goddard Family Papers, AAS.

reproaches of an imperious husband."[79] Similarly, when speaking of her friend Mrs. Thurston, Patty Rogers says, "She told me that Mr. T had grieved her and treated her with *indignity*."[80] Later, in a diary entry on March 6, 1785, Rogers states that she entered Mrs. Thurston's house to find her in tears.[81] On another instance, Rogers noted how men often abandoned their deferential entreaties after courtship, soon becoming unbearable husbands. "How differently persons will appear when we first see them from what they do after we get acquainted," she lamented.[82] Like Patty Rogers, young women must have been surrounded by examples of unhappy marriages, recognizing that if they made a poor choice in courtship, their futures could also be miserable.

Some women were actually forced to confront the despondence of marital dependence. In her unhappy state as a married woman, Nancy Shippen agonized over her choice in courtship. In despair, she writes, "Why did I believe him when he swore so often he loved me, & that he wou'd make me eternally happy?"[83] In this, Shippen illustrated her failure to accurately judge the character of her future husband. For women in the late-eighteenth century, choosing a husband could be an angst-ridden process in which a woman was forced to weigh the advice of her parents against her own experiences and feelings, while simultaneously attempting to determine the sincerity of her suitor. Essentially, in choosing a husband, a young woman was making an active choice, one that directly shaped her future, even if it merely defined the nature of her future dependence. As women became increasingly aware of their own desires and expectations in matrimony, courtship became an important period of deliberation. The companionate ideal had legitimized women's concerns for their own happiness, and through marriage, they sought to fulfill their own goals and ambitions. The companionate ideal, however, was just that: an ideal. During

---

[79] Grace Goddard to Anonymous Friend, 1800, Mss. Dept., Misc. mss. boxes "G," folder 2, Goddard Family Papers, AAS. For a discussion of how women viewed spinsterhood in colonial Philadelphia, see Wulf, 28-42.
[80] Diary of Patty Rogers, January 7, 1785, AAS.
[81] Ibid., March 6, 1785, AAS.
[82] Ibid., August 4, 1785, AAS.
[83] Diary of Anne Hume Shippen Livingston, April 1782, NAWLD.

courtship, women were forced to address the reality of female dependence and attempt, as best as they could, to cope with their position.

Though female dependence in marriage changed very little in the early republican decades, women began to expect more from marriage. As they expanded their educational possibilities, young women learned to value their own self-improvement and actualization, often finding models for mutual companionship in their relationships with other young women. Just as bachelors were forced to develop autonomy, establish mastery, and successfully navigate their way through courtship, women were forced to deliberate rationally about their futures, make important decisions, and consciously contemplate the limits and contradictions inherent in a female identity. In a peculiar process that temporarily overturned the established gender hierarchy, women were forced to find the balance between asserting their newfound power and coming to terms with their future dependence. Accordingly, courtship became much more than a transitory state between childhood and marital submission to male patriarchs. Courtship was a significant and transformative period in which women confronted the realities of gendered power. Though they may not have been able to change their future dependence, women made choices that would alter its character and in doing so, they actively shaped their lives.

Bibliography

*Primary Sources*

Anonymous. "A Letter from a young gentleman to his sister." In *Letters on courtship and marriage,* 196-218. Trenton: Daniel Fenton and James Wilson, 1813. *The Gerritsen Collection of Aletta H. Jacobs* Cornell University Library, 7 Nov. 2007. <http://gerritsen.chadwyck.com>

Anonymous. "From a Schoolmaster to A Lady of His Affections (Grace Goddard)." 1800? Mss. Dept., Misc. mss. boxes "G," folder 2. Goddard Family Papers. American Antiquarian Society, Worcester.

Bowne, Eliza Southgate. "Diary of Eliza Southgate Bowne," June 12, 1800. A Girl's Life Eighty Years Ago: Selections from the Letters of Eliza Southgate Bowne, North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

Chapone, Hester. *Letters on the improvement of the mind : addressed to a young lady*. London: H. Hughes, 1773. *The Gerritsen Collection of Aletta H. Jacobs* Cornell University Library, 7 Nov. 2007. <http://gerritsen.chadwyck.com>

Custis, Eleanor Parke. "Eleanor Parke Custis to Elizabeth Bordley," April 24, 1797. George Washington's Beautiful Nelly: The Letters of Eleanor Parke Custis Lewis to Elizabeth Bordley. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

_____. "Eleanor Parke Custis to Elizabeth Bordley," May 14, 1798. George Washington's Beautiful Nelly: The Letters of Eleanor Parke Custis Lewis to Elizabeth Bordley. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

_____. "Eleanor Parke Custis to Elizabeth Bordley," February 3, 1799. George Washington's Beautiful Nelly: The Letters of Eleanor Parke Custis Lewis to Elizabeth Bordley. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

Dawes, Sarah Fisher. "Sarah Fisher Dawes to Sally Fisher Corbit." December, 16, 1781. The Norris-Fisher Correspondence: A Circle of Friends, 1779-1782. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

_____. "Sarah Fisher Dawes to Sally Fisher Corbit." March 30, 1782. The Norris-Fisher Correspondence: A Circle of Friends, 1779-1782. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

Gisborne, Thomas. *An enquiry into the duties of the female sex*. London: T. Cadell and

W. Davies, 1797. *The Gerritsen Collection of Aletta H. Jacobs* Cornell University Library, 7 Nov. 2007. <http://gerritsen.chadwyck.com>

Goddard, Charity White. "Charity White Goddard to Grace Goddard Drury." April 20, 1802, Mss. Dept., Misc. mss. boxes "G," folder 2, Goddard Family Papers. American Antiquarian Society, Worcester.

Goddard, Grace. "Grace Goddard to Anonymous Friend." 1800. Mss. Dept., Misc. mss. boxes "G," folder 2, Goddard Family Papers, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester.

Gregory, John. "Friendship, Love, and Marriage." In *A Father's legacy to his daughters,* 76-132. London: H.D. Symonds, Pater noster Row, 1793. *The Gerritsen Collection of Aletta H. Jacobs* Cornell University Library, 7 Nov. 2007. <http://gerritsen.chadwyck.com>

Livingston, Anne Hume Shippen. "Anne Hume Shippen Livingston to Alice Lee Shippen." October 4, 1781. Nancy Shippen Her Journal Book: The International Romance of a Young Lady of Fashion of Colonial Philadelphia with Letters: to Her and about Her. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 16, 2009).

Livingston, Anne Hume Shippen. "Diary of Anne Hume Shippen Livingston." April, 1782. Nancy Shippen Her Journal Book: The International Romance of a Young Lady of Fashion of Colonial Philadelphia with Letters: to Her and about Her. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 16, 2009).

Logan, Deborah Norris. "Deborah Norris Logan to Sally Fisher Corbit." November 16, 1779. The Norris-Fisher Correspondence: A Circle of Friends, 1779-1782. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

_____. "Deborah Norris Logan to Sally Fisher Corbit." December, 1779. The Norris-Fisher Correspondence: A Circle of Friends, 1779-1782. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

_____. "Deborah Norris Logan to Sally Fisher Corbit." May 6, 1780. The Norris-Fisher Correspondence: A Circle of Friends, 1779-1782. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

_____. "Deborah Norris Logan to Sally Fisher Corbit." 1780[?].The Norris-Fisher Correspondence: A Circle of Friends, 1779-1782. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

Moore, Theophilus. *Marriage customs, modes of courtship, and singular propensities of the various nations of the universe : with remarks on the condition of women*. London: printed for John Bumpus, Holburn, near Middle Row, 1814. *The Gerritsen Collection of Aletta H. Jacobs* Cornell University Library, 7 Nov. 2007. <http://gerritsen.chadwyck.com>

Piozzi. "A Letter to a Young Gentleman on His Marriage." In *Letters on courtship and*

*marriage,* 185-194. Trenton: Daniel Fenton and James Wilson, 1813. *The Gerritsen Collection of Aletta H. Jacobs* Cornell University Library, 7 Nov. 2007. <http://gerritsen.chadwyck.com>

Rogers, Patty. "Diary of Patty Rogers." 1785. Mss. Dept., Octavo vols. "R" Misc. mss. boxes "R." Rogers Family Papers, 1731-1804. American Antiquarian Society, Worcester.

Symmes, Susan Livingston. Susan Livingston Symmes to John Cleves Symmes, February 10, 1794. The Intimate Letters of John Cleves Symmes and His Family Including Those of His Daughter Mrs. William Henry Harrison, Wife of the Ninth President of the United States. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

Tracy, Rachel Huntington. "Rachel Huntington Tracy to Anne Huntington." May 15, 1797. The Huntington Letters in the Possession of Julia Chester Wells. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

_____. "Rachel Huntington Tracy to Anne Huntington." April 12, 1797. The Huntington Letters in the Possession of Julia Chester Wells. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

d'Yrujo, Sally McKean. "Sally McKean d'Yrujo to Anna Payne Cutts." June 10, 1796. Memoirs and Letters of Dolly [sic] Madison, Wife of James Madison, President of the United States. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

_____. "Sally McKean d'Yrujo to Anna Payne Cutts." September 3, 1796. Memoirs and Letters of Dolly [sic] Madison, Wife of James Madison, President of the United States. North American Women's Letters and Diaries. http://ezproxy.ithaca.edu:2472/nwld.search.advanced.html (accessed September 24, 2009).

*Secondary Sources*

Branson, Susan. *These Fiery Frenchified Dames: Women and Political Culture in Early National Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Brown, Kathleen M. *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches & Anxious Patriarchs*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Eustace, Nicole. "'The Cornerstone of a Copious Work': Love and Power in Eighteenth-Century Courtship." *Volume of Social History* 34, no.3 (February 2003): 517-546, http://jstor.org (accessed September 29, 2009).

Glover, Lorri. "An Education in Southern Masculinity: The Ball Family of South Carolina in the New Republic." *The Journal of Southern History* 69, no. 1 (February 2003): 39-70. http://jstor.org (accessed November 17, 2009).

———. *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press,

2007.

Jabour, Anya. "It Will Not Do For Me to Be Married." *Journal of the Early Republic* 17,
no. 2 (Summer, 1997): 193-236. http://jstor.org (accessed October 24, 2009).

_____. *Marriage in the Early Republic: Elizabeth and William Wirt and the Companionate Ideal.*
Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Kelley, Mary. *Learning to Stand and Speak: Women, Education, and Public LIfe in America's Republic*.
Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

_____. "Reading Women/Women Reading: The Making of Learned Women in Antebellum America."
*The Journal of American History* 83, no. 2 (September 1996): 401-424. http://jstor.org (accessed
October 24, 2009).

Kenslea, Timothy. *The Sedgwicks in Love: Courtship, Engagement, and Marriage in the Early Republic.*
Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2006.

Kerber, Linda K. *Women of the Republic: Intellect & Ideology in Revolutionary America*. Williamsburg:
University of Carolina Press, 1980.

Kerrison, Catherine. *Claiming the Pen: Women and Intellectual Life in the Early American South*. Ithaca:
Cornell University Press, 2006.

Kierner, Cynthia A. *Beyond the Household: Women's Place in the Early South, 1700-1835*. Ithaca:
Cornell University Press, 1998.

Lewis, Jan. "The Republican Wife: Virtue and Seduction in the Early Republic." *The William and Mary
Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (October 1987): 689-721. http://jstor.org (accessed September 2, 2009).

Lyons, Clare A. *Sex among the Rabble: An Intimate History of Gender & Power in the Age of Revolution,
Philadelphia, 1730-1830.* Chapel Hill: North Carolina Press, 2006.

McCurdy, John. *Citizen Bachelors: Manhood and the Creation of the United States.* Ithaca: Cornell
University Press, 2009.

Norton, Mary Beth. *Founding Mothers & Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American
Society*. New York: Vintage Books, 1996.

Stowe, Steven. "'The Thing Not Its Vision': A Woman's Courtship and Her Sphere in the Southern Planter
Class." *Feminist Studies* 19, no. 1 (Spring, 1983): 113-130. http://jstor.org (accessed October 24,
2009).

Ulrich, Laurel Thatcher. *Good Wives: Image and reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England
1650-1750*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Wulf, Karin. *Not All Wives: Women of Colonial Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania
Press, 2005.

Zagarri, Rosemarie. *Revolutionary Backlash: Women and Politics in the Early American Republic*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

# Herd Behavior During the Popish Plot of 1678-1681: An Examination of Crowd Hysteria and English Anti-Catholicism

Angelica Garcia
Rollins College

French sociologist Gustave Le Bon stated that the most significant "renewal[s] of civilizations" have resulted from ideological transformations based upon religious, political, and social beliefs, accompanied by a change in environmental conditions.[1] These factors, when introduced to the masses, encouraged crowd behavior, which caused the most dramatic sociopolitical, historical episodes. One such event, the "Horrid, Hellish Popish Plot"[2] of 1678 to 1681, provides a typical example of crowd behavior and the public's role in the political development within those years. The Plot began on 11 August with Titus Oates, the protégé of the conspiracy theorist Dr. Israel Tonge, and their "discovery" of a document containing forty-three articles in the wainscot of the virulently anti-Catholic physician[3] Sir Richard Barker's gallery.[4] These articles described a plot, supervised by the Pope[5] and carried out by Catholics (mostly Jesuits), to assassinate King Charles II. Oates had forged the document. Within two days, however, Tonge held an audience with Charles II on the matter.[6] Despite the unreliable character of the discoverers (as the system of English intelligence provided financial incentives that often encouraged hoaxes)[7] and Charles II's suspicions about the inconsequentiality of the threat,[8] the King's need to appear hostile to Catholicism convinced him to allow Oates to proceed with advancing the charges present in the pamphlet.[9] By the morning of the fourteenth,

---

[1] Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (New York: Viking Press, 1960), 13-14.

[2] Titus Oates, *Otes's Letter. For the Right Honourable Sir Leoline Jenkins Knight His Majesties Principal Secretary of State at Whitehall* (London: s.n., 1683), 1.

[3] John Pollock, *The Popish Plot: A Study in the History of the Reign of Charles II* (London: Duckworth & Co., 1903), 10.

[4] Israel Tonge in Douglas Greene (ed.), *Diaries of the Popish Plot: Being the Diaries of Israel Tonge, Sir Robert Southwell, John Joyne, Edmund Warcup, and Thomas Dangerfield: and Including Titus Oates's A True Narrative of the Horrid Plot* (New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1977), 7.

[5] Pope Innocent XI. Henry Care, *The History of the Damnable Popish Plot, in its Various Branches and Progress; Published For the Satisfaction of the Present and Future Ages/By the Authors of the Weekly Pacquet of Advice from Rome* (London: s.n., 1680), 104.

[6] Tonge quoted in Greene, *Diaries*, 8.

[7] Publisher quoted in ibid, 2.

[8] Tonge quoted in ibid, 10-12.

[9] John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England: 1660-1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 163.

"whisperings…of a plott [*sic*]"[10] began to disperse throughout the court, then through the urban and rural areas of the Kingdom.  Until 1681, many English viewed Oates as a national hero. With anti-Catholic attitudes almost inherent within the English psyche, the news of a Popish conspiracy elicited strong reactions, particularly in the aftermath of the unsolved murder of the magistrate Sir Edmund-Bury Godfrey.  The news of Godfrey's murder precipitated a mass panic, characterized by collective hallucinations, paranoia, and violence.  The subsequent trials, whose judges accepted dubious evidence, resulted in the execution of at least fifteen innocents.  The hysteria instigated by Godfrey's death had the characteristics of an anti-Catholic pogrom, as evidenced by the hostile sentiments towards "popery" that preceded the plot, as well as the cathartic manner in which the sequence of events occurred, directed by the influence of herd mentalities as elucidated by Le Bon.[11]

Long before the outbreak of the Plot, England justified and enforced, religiously and politically, an endemic hostility to "popery."  Religiously, Catholicism seemed to Protestants as a corruption of the true faith, resulting in incredibly strong opinions against the Church and its vaguely "cannibalistic" rituals.  Parliamentarian Andrew Marvell once stated that "Popery is such a thing as cannot but for want of a word to express it, be called a religion; nor is it to be mentioned with that civility which is otherwise decent to be used in speaking about the differences in human opinion about divine matters." [12]  The populace especially disliked Jesuits. Taking advantage of the mass-distributive market, provided by the printing press, Protestants

---

[10] Order in Council Concerning Recusants, October 27, 1680, Great Britian, H[istorical] M[anuscript] C[omission], *Marquess of Ormonde MSS* 4:118-19.

[11] The particular work by Le Bon, which serves as the premise for the evaluations made in this paper, is his *La psychologie des foules* (1895), translated into English as *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (1896). His ideas on group psychology have since become virtually prototypical in conceptions about herd behavior as they precipitate social action.

[12] Andrew Marvell in John Kenyon, *The Popish Plot* (London: Cox & Wyman Ltd., 1972), 1.

diffused many of their opinions through doggerel poems, literary works, pamphlets, cartoons,[13]

and sermons.    Sermons became particularly influential in manipulating a largely illiterate

population and, during the trials later in the plot, one of these, by Reverend Dr. Lloyd, served as

official court testimony.[14]   Additionally, several poems captured the violent prejudice latent

throughout English society, such as an example written by John Oldman, regarding the Jesuits:

> Or let that wholesome statute be reviv'd,
> Which England heretofore from Wolves reliev'd;
> Tax every shire instead of them to bring
> Each year a certain tale of Jesuits in:
> And let their mangled quarters hang the Isle
> To scare all future vermin from the soil.[15]

According to Le Bon, "intolerance and fanaticism are the necessary accompaniments of the

religious sentiment."[16]   Therefore, the context of anti-Catholicism within England, prior to the

Plot, provided the volatile environment within which an outbreak of crowd hysteria could occur.

The political atmosphere served the Catholics no better.   Since the Babylonian

Captivity,[17] the English associated the Catholic Church with foreign political influence.  King

Henry VIII's break with Rome resulted in the Act in Restraint of Appeals (1533), the Act of

Succession (1533), and the Act of Supremacy (1534).   Queen Elizabeth I's reign intensified

intolerant attitudes, owing to several Catholic attempts to depose her.   Israel Tonge considered

King Charles I a Protestant "martyr," and blamed the monarch's downfall on Jesuit intrigues.[18]

Thus, as a result of Catholic threats to the monarchy, various legislative measures (such as those

---

[13] Anonymous, *The Dreadful Apparition;  The Pope Haunted with Ghosts. In Relation to Sir Edmundbury-Godfrey's Murther, and the Vindication of the Late Sainted Traytors, who Suffered for the Romish Cause: The Figure by the Verses at Large Explained* (without Newgate: Printed for J. Jordan, at the Angel in Guiltspur Street, 1680), 1.

[14] Robin Clifton, "The Popular Fear of Catholics During the English Revolution: 1640-1660," *Past and Present* 52 (1971), 35, 39, 41;  [Trueman], *A Second Letter to Mr. Miles Prance in Reply to the Ghost of Sir Edmund-Bury Godfrey* (London: s.n., 1682), 2.

[15] Elain K. Dakers and Jane Lane, *Titus Oates* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1971), 41.

[16] Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 73.

[17] Refers to the Avignon residency.

[18] Tonge quoted in Greene, *Diaries*, 1.

against recusancy) became part of the English legal system. Enforcement of anti-Catholic measures, however, occurred only sporadically (except in times of instability). The excessive severity of laws, such as the Act of 1585, in addition to expensive trial costs and neighborhood solidarity toward Catholic friends and relatives, resulted in widespread inconsistency in their enforcement, except for those relating to Catholic exclusion from public life.[19] Exclusion legislation developed as a result of a perceived political threat, as related by Sir Henry Capel. Capel accused the papacy of developing the notion of standing armies and arbitrary government.[20] Therefore, the existence of a politically threatening association with Catholics created a suggestive atmosphere for the masses.

Contributing to the instability of England's sociopolitical environment, real and imagined, Catholic conspiracies created a precedent for the Popish Plot. Capel, for example, predicted that should England "lay popery flat," arbitrary government would end.[21] Actual Catholic plots had occurred before, including the Ridolfi Plot in 1571 to depose Elizabeth, the scheming of Mary I, the assassination plots of Throckmorton and Babington in the 1580s, the Gunpowder Plot in 1605, and the Irish Rebellion of 1641.[22] Thus, Protestants could readily accept the suggestion that Catholics would organize other treasonable activities. In 1666, as the Great Fire of London blazed through the city, many Protestants immediately suspected the Catholics. The House of Commons stated officially that Catholics had started the conflagration and, upon constructing a monument to commemorate of the fire in 1671, city authorities inscribed an attribution of Catholic guilt on the structure.[23] This association of Catholics with

---

[19] Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, 5-7.
[20] Sir Henry Capel quoted in ibid., 2.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, 3.
[23] The line regarding the "treachery and malice of the popish faction" remained on the monument until 1830, though it was removed for a period under James III, then restored under William III. Ibid., 3, 10-13.

incendiarism, perhaps recalling the infamous reign of Queen Mary, surfaced again during the Popish Plot.[24]   The importance of incendiary rhetoric to the events of 1678 may have emerged from the personal suffering experienced by Tonge, one of the Plot's instigators.   The London Fire destroyed his "parsonage and glebe houses."[25]   As a result of the crowd's tendency to react irrationally when sufficiently influenced by expectation and the belief that another plot would inevitably occur, Oates' scheme became far more believable to the masses.[26]

Within this context, the ability of Oates, a compulsive liar, and the fanatical Tonge to instigate a mass panic demonstrates the importance of leadership in directing crowds.   Hoaxes had occurred before, largely because of the reward system utilized by the English government to encourage informants.   A member of the Privy Council remarked that traders, beggars, and unemployed individuals "in tymes of suspition or trouble may by Tales and false Rumours distrate the peoples minds [*sic*]" by reporting on imagined Catholic treasons.[27]   Tonge and Oates' scheme followed this pattern, and government officials may have ignored the Plot, but for the atmosphere created by the Exclusion Bill Crisis (which also arose in the years of 1678-1681). In this suspicious and hostile atmosphere, the masses could appreciate the abilities of the Plot's leadership.   According to Le Bon, irrationality, impulsiveness, and the lack of the capacity to reason characterize "excessively suggestible" crowds.[28]   To achieve the stated goals of a popular movement, a crowd requires skillful cultivation, with emphasis on the affirmation, repetition, and contagion of their basic ideological motivations.[29]   Thus, the leadership (with Oates eventually

---

[24] Ibid.
[25] Publisher quoted in Greene, *Diaries*, 1.
[26] Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 43.
[27] Clifton, "Popular Fear," 52.
[28] Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 37-39.
[29] Ibid., 124.

surpassing Tonge in importance) provided the direction necessary to focus the emotions of the crowd during the Popish Plot.[30]

After the destruction of his parish in the London Fire,[31] Israel Tonge had two motivations for instigating the Popish Plot: his virulent anti-Catholicism and his financial difficulties. Although Charles II had made a declaration on behalf of the ministers who suffered in 1666, Tonge received no monetary aid from the King. [32] Thus, the fire left Tonge destitute and furious at the Catholics, especially the Society of Jesus, for having started the inferno.[33] Tonge, suspecting a Popish Plot, claimed to have learned about the Catholic assassination scheme from Richard Greene in 1675.[34] One year later, while under the patronage of Sir Richard Barker, Tonge became associated with Titus Oates, who had business with the physician.[35] This meeting between Tonge and Oates became a pivotal moment in the history of the Plot, because Tonge managed to convince the unemployed Oates to take part in the scheme. Their meetings established the theme (an anti-Jesuit assassination), and form (a treatise) of the Plot, as Tonge showed Oates several essays, regarding the plot, that he had prepared for publication, claiming to have consulted with some very "knowinge [*sic*]" people about the matter.[36] Tonge offered to assist Oates in the composition of additional treatises, so that they might subsist off the revenue gained from their "combat with the Romanists."[37] Le Bon held that the leader of a crowd often becomes the first person influenced by the ideology he espouses with firm, "deranged"

---

[30] Ibid., 118.
[31] Publisher in Greene, *Diaries*, 1.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, 46-46.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Publisher in Greene, *Diaries,* 1-2.
[36] Ibid., 2.
[37] Ibid.

conviction.[38]   By convincing Oates to aid him, Tonge personally developed the leadership

required for harnessing the energies of English Protestants.

Oates' ability to guide the crowd, despite his many peculiarities and history of

dishonesty, reveals the depth of Protestant hatred towards Catholics in the seventeenth century.

Many of his contemporaries viewed Oates as an oddity, particularly owing to his unusual

appearance.  John Warner described Oates as having

> … the speech of the gutter, and a strident and sing-song voice, so that he
> seemed to wail rather than to speak.  His brow was low, his eyes small and
> sunk deep into his head; his face was flat, compressed in the middle so as to
> look like a dish or discus; on each side were prominent ruddy cheeks, his nose
> was snub, his mouth in the very centre of his face, for his chin was almost
> equal in size to the rest of his face.  His head scarcely protruded from his
> body, and was bowed towards his chest.[39]

Oates also had a reputation for deceitfulness, as demonstrated by three incidents in his past.  The

first of these, the Coat-Tailor Incident,[40] revealed a pattern of elaborate, escalating deception for

the purpose of self-gain.  As a youth, Oates bought a coat from a tailor and resold it to a

secondhand clothes dealer, pocketing the profit.  When asked by the tailor for payment, Oates

insisted he had already paid.  The tailor confronted Oates' tutor, Dr. Thomas, after seeing the

coat in the secondhand dealer's shop.  Thomas demanded an explanation from Oates, who

feigned outrage, asked for a Bible to swear upon, and had his mother lie about sending him

money privately (for Thomas managed Oates' expenses) via a carrier, who subsequently denied

knowing Oates.  Oates' deceitful proclivities also manifested themselves in the Parker Affair.[41]

In 1675, Oates accused the schoolmaster William Parker of child molestation, in hopes of

---

[38] Le Bon, *The Crowd,* 118.

[39] John Warner quoted in Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, 48.

[40] Dakers and Lane, *Titus Oates*, 23.

[41] Ibid., 27-29;  Anonymous, *The Life of Titus Oates from His Cradle to his First Pilloring for Infamous Perjury with a True Account of Birth and Parentage, Impartially Set Forth for the Satisfaction of All Persons* (London: Printed by E. Mallet, 1685), 2.

assuming Parker's position at the school.  Oates then went to the office of the Mayor of Hastings and persuaded him to investigate William Parker Sr. for treasonable and seditious speech.  The implausible details, despite the firmness by which Oates lied, eventually led to both Parkers' exonerations.  As a result, Oates faced a charge of perjury.  The Parker Affair revealed Oates' willingness to lie (and lie elaborately) under oath.  Additionally, in a separate case involving an alleged threat of violence toward a churchwarden, Francis Norwood, the mayor decided against Oates and ordered him to appear at the next sessions.  Oates, instead, fled to the sea.[42]

Oates also invented numerous fabrications regarding the Jesuits, with whom he had once associated.[43]  For example, Oates stated that he had attended a treasonous Jesuit conference in London on 24 April, 1678.[44]  In fact, Oates still attended St. Omer's College in France on that date.[45]  Furthermore, the "conference" (in actuality just a provincial congregation), which Oates mentioned had not occurred at the location he specified.[46]  Oates did, however, discuss the event with a schoolfellow named Clavery, while at St. Omer's.[47]  Indeed, the pamphlet Oates produced contained the names of many Jesuits (perhaps former colleagues).[48]  Oates had quarreled with the Jesuit Order at his college after dismissal from the institution, and had remarked that "he would be revenged of the Jesuits to the full for denying him Entrance into their Order, and for turning him out."[49]  Yet, despite these obvious biases, the charged environment allowed the crowd to ignore its leader's rather obvious character flaws and factual inconsistencies.  Instead,

---

[42] Oates became a chaplain for the English navy.  Pollock, *The Popish Plot*, 76.
[43] Ibid, 3.
[44] Lane and Dakers, *Titus Oates*, 67.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Titus Oates, *A True Narrative of the Horrid Plot and Conspiracy of the Popish Party Against the Life of His Sacred Majesty, the Government, and the Protestant Religion: with a List of Such Noblemen, Gentlemen, and Others that Were the Conspirators; and the Head Officers Both Civil and Military, that Were to Effect It* (Edinburgh: Re-printed by the Heir of Andrew Anderson, Printer to His Most Sacred Majesty, 1675), 61.
[49] Anonymous, *Life of Titus Oates*, 3.

many hailed Oates as a champion for Protestant (and, therefore, English) freedom from Rome. One anonymous poem, from 1680, compares "Dr. Titus Oates"[50] to Alexander the Great, Hannibal, and God, while describing Rome as the "Old Great Dragon."[51] The fear of popery had become so pervasive by the late 1600s that, under ideal circumstances, an individual as unsavoury as Oates could direct the crowd into mass hysterics. Oates only needed a sudden change in environment to achieve the height of his popularity.

The Plot may have remained a minor affair but for Sir Edmund-Bury Godfrey's unsolved murder, which served as the pivotal moment in creating a paranoid atmosphere. On 6 September, soon after rumors of a popish conspiracy against Charles II emerged, Godfrey took Oates' affidavit concerning the "felonious" plan of the Catholics to commit regicide and ignite fires in various towns.[52] Thus, the discovery of Godfrey's corpse in a ditch on Primrose Hill, on 17 October at 6:00 p.m.,[53] immediately aroused Protestant suspicions, owing to his connection with the events of the Popish Plot. Additionally, the murderers had not relieved the body of this prosperous wood and coal dealer and Justice of the Peace[54] of his valuables, only taking his Notes of Examinations (a notebook that contained details of the Plot) with them.[55] Protestants

---

[50] The Jesuits actually dismissed Oates from college and so he had no doctoral credentials. Ibid., 3.

[51] Anonymous, *A New Year's Gift: Being a Poem Dedicated to Lasting Memory of that Worthy and Learned Dr. Titus Oates, the First Discoverer of the Popish Plott, To Destroy the Sacred Person of His Majesty, and to Extirpate the Protestant Religion* (London: s.n., 1680), 1.

[52] Tonge quoted in Greene, *Diaries*, 36.

[53] Many suspicious circumstances surrounded Godfrey's death. First, according to Midlesex Coroner Mr. Cooper, Godfrey's murderers had strangled him. The initial state of the body matched this description. Upon the return to Primrose Hill after the initial discovery, however, someone ran Godfrey's body through with his own sword. Secondly, because of the presence of valuables on the body, robbery does not appear to have motivated Godfrey's killers. Third, the reports of a mother, butcher, and two boys who had searched the area on Monday, Tuesday, and earlier on Thursday for a missing calf produced no body, thus suggesting the murders had moved the corpse. Finally, most individuals discounted possible suicide as the means of death, despite Godfrey's melancholy personality. Anonymous, *A True and Perfect Narrative of the Late Terrible and Bloody Murther of Sr. Edmundberry Godfrey; Who was Found Murthered on Thursday the 17th. of this Infant October, in a Field Near Primrose-Hill with a Full Account of the Manner of His Being Murthered, and in What Manner He was Found. Also, The Full Proceedings of the Coroner, Who Sat Upon the Inquest* (s.n.: Printed by N.T., 1678), 4-8; [Trueman], *Second Letter*, 4.

[54] Kenyon, *Popish Plot,* 77.

[55] Anonymous, *Murther of Godfrey*, 6.

immediately seized upon the opportunity to canonize Godfrey as a martyr for Oates' cause.[56]

Thus, Godfrey's murder created a "great spirit" amongst the people, and, after the discovery of

incriminating letters, dated between 1674 and 1675,[57] in the residence of Edward Coleman (the

secretary to the Duchess of York),[58] "made it impossible for the government to 'lay' the Plot."[59]

Le Bon remarked, "crowds do not reason…they accept or reject ideas as a whole."[60]

Thus, the public viewed Godfrey's murder in 1678 as proof of the plot in its entirety. Those

considering the Plot knew of this assumption. Sergeant Maynard, in his testimony to Commons,

explained, "What ground was there for Godfrey's death? Nothing, but in relation to Mr. Oates'

information. How many lies and stories were made, to persuade the world about it? But when

the murder was discovered, the world was awakened."[61] An anonymous letter to Miles Prance[62]

also discussed the how the Plot's proponents managed to "attain their designs."[63]

> All the world remembers the great Torrent that carried all before it in favour
> of the Plot, and the murder of Sir E.B.G by the Papists, without which (as
> T.O. was heard to say) his plot had failed. I cannot but observe how skillful
> and industrious these people are, to hide and prevent the truth of that man's
> Death from clearly appearing and shining forth, as without a doubt it would
> …was not the matter now (as formerly) puzeled [*sic*] with Legends, and long
> stories…?[64]

---

[56] Anonymous, *An Elegie on the Right Worshipful Sir Edmund-Bury Godfrey, Knight, One of His Majesties Justices of the Peace: Who was Found Murthered on Thursday the 17th of this Infant October, 1678. In a Ditch on the South-Side of Primrose-Hill Near Hampstead* (London: Printed in Sweetings-Rents Near the Royal Exchange, 1678), 1.

[57] Anonymous *Account of the Plot*, HMC *Marquess of Ormonde MSS* 4:108.

[58] "Bl. Edward Coleman," *Catholic Online*, http://www.catholic.org/saints/saint.php?saint_id=3052.

[59] Sergeant Maynard to the House of Commons, quoted in Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, 77.

[60] Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 53.

[61] Maynard to the House of Commons, quoted in Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, 77.

[62] Prance accused Henry Berry, Robert Green, Thomas Godden, and Lawrence Hill of strangling Godfrey. He then committed perjury at the subsequent trial, which resulted in the execution of all but Godden, and accepted reward money for locating the murderers. Alan Marshall, "Miles Prance," in H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 45, (London: Oxford University Press, 2004), 208-9.

[63] [Trueman], *Second Letter*, 2.

[64] Ibid.

In an excellent example of the fallacy of composition,[65] many Protestants supposed that since Godfrey's murder established the accuracy of at least one aspect of the plot described by Oates, the entirety of his treatise must also have some basis in fact. For example, one cartoon depicted the Pope addressing the ghost of Godfrey, accepting complete responsibility for his death.[66] With the details of the Plot apparently confirmed, the concerned masses responded quickly. The excessive public reaction to Godfrey's murder and Coleman's letters forced Parliament to act.[67]

Hysteria occurred both within the government and the public sphere. With regards to government, important individuals, when not in Parliament or Council, spent countless hours in committees and sub-committees doing paperwork and taking depositions. Henry Pierrepont, first Marquess of Dorchester, called it "a very wearisome life here, with little satisfaction in it; we either sit morning and afternoon, or the whole day without adjourning for a dining time." [68] The Justices of the Peace worked ceaselessly in their search for those able to provide additional information on the Catholic conspiracy.[69] Although the politics of the Exclusion Bill Crisis gave the official reaction a more manipulative air, panic also dominated the proceedings of the trials. For example, the judge conducting Popish Plot trials accepted rather dubious evidence. "The Coroner's Jury were first of opinion, and accordingly…much Art and Skill was used to procure their verdict to the contrary."[70] Despite Oates' inconsistencies[71] and obvious ulterior motives,

---

[65] Composition is a logical fallacy- one draws a conclusion about a whole based on a whole from its parts, despite a lack of lack of justification for such an inference.
[66] Anonymous, *The Dreadful Apparition,* section 4.
[67] Anonymous, *Account of the Plot*, 1.
[68] Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, 100.
[69] Ibid.
[70] [Trueman]*, Second Letter*, 2.
[71] Initially, the King asked Tonge if the Plot involved any persons of importance, to which Tonge replied that he had not heard of any except perhaps Lord Peters. On the treatise about the Plot, however, Oates had implicated numerous prominent individuals. Tonge quoted in Greene, *Diaries*, 13.

the courts found fifteen innocent men, such as William Howard,[72] guilty of treason. Le Bon's studies of parliamentary assemblies may explain some of the government's receptiveness to the panic, as he notes that simplistic thinking, irritability, suggestibility, exaggerated sentiments, and susceptibility to the influence of a few leaders often characterize such legislative bodies.[73] This description recalls individuals such as Anthony Ashley Cooper, first Earl of Shaftesbury, who led the opposition to Charles II in Parliament.

The target of the Plot, himself, proved a notable exception to the heightened anti-Catholic emotionalism. The monarch immediately dismissed the charges of conspiracy, despite the serious threats elucidated in Oates' document:

> He and the rest of the Fathers were given to understand that the King was altogether given to his pleasures, and that they had an attempt to stab him at his Court of Whitehall; and if that could not be conveniently done, they would employ one of his Physicians to poison him; for which work they had ten thousand pounds.[74]

King Charles, however, during his meetings with Christopher Kirkby, Tonge, and Oates, remarked on the tediousness of the pamphlet and refused to attend to the matter himself.[75] Tonge recalled that Charles II "expressed himselfe as not giving any credence to what was pretended either of the Popish or French King seeking his life, alleging that if the Papists attempted anything against him they would be knocked on the head themselves [*sic*]."[76] Yet, despite his dismissals, Charles did little to quash the unrest until 1681, thus, passing on the responsibility for this affair to the Plot's instigators.

---

[72] Executed by beheading on Tower Hill on December 29, 1680. Anonymous, *Animadversions on the Last Speech of William Viscount Stafford Who was Beheaded on Tower-Hill for High Treason in Conspiring the Death of the King &c. on Wednesday, December 29th. 1680* (London: s.n., 1680), 1.

[73] Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 187.

[74] Oates, *A True Narrative of the Plot*, 5-6.

[75] Tonge quoted in Greene, *Diaries*, 10-12; Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, 52.

[76] Tonge quoted in Greene, *Diaries*, 10-12.

Panic amongst the masses greatly surpassed the concern evinced by officialdom, as the "Plot had filled all mens heads with Fears and Jeolousies [*sic*]."[77] The potential threat to the monarch, and the impending rise of popery, frightened individuals throughout the country.[78] Most of the crowd hysteria transpired in urban areas, particularly London, with anti-Catholic activity in cities mostly waning by 1679.[79] The provinces cooled somewhat earlier, in 1678.[80] Many cities and towns took measures to defend themselves. In response to the perceived threats, city officials placed chains across streets at night.[81] On 17 November, 1679,[82] processions featuring effigies of the Pope and representations of Godfrey's murdered body marched through towns, inflaming the "general aversion" to Catholics.[83] Protestants blamed suspicious fires on Papists and Jesuits.[84] Additionally, many families chose to arm themselves, particularly with commemorative daggers bearing Godfrey's name.[85] Women often carried these engraved weapons at night, in accordance with Le Bon's notion that women, in particular, often succumb to crowd behavior.[86] In response to popular fears, the Captain General James Scott, 1st Duke of Monmouth, ordered regular garrisons to conduct night patrols.[87] Protestants even recruited armed, pseudo-military units to protect them from Catholic intrigues.

---

[77] [Trueman], *Second Letter,* 1.

[78] Evelyn quoted in Charles Richard Nairne Routh*, They Saw it Happen: An Anthology of Eye-Witnesses' Accounts of Events in British History: 1485-1688* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 187.

[79] Kenyon*, Popish Plot*, 239; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, 161.

[80] Miller, *Popery and Politics*, 161.

[81] Ibid.

[82] The source seems unclear as to whether the date of these processions occurred in 1679 or 1680. Since the anti-Catholic activity in the countryside had mostly dissipated by 1678, however, the earlier date appears the most probable one.

[83] Calamy quoted in Routh, *They Saw it Happen,* 188-189.

[84] Miller, *Popery and Politics*, 161.

[85] Ibid.

[86] Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 46.

[87] Kenyon*, Popish Plot*, 101-102.

Over two thousand men of the Trained Bands held nightly watches with the intent of deterring the "night riders."[88]  The incidents surrounding the night riders serve as an example of collective hallucination, a phenomenon Le Bon attributes to the crowd's high expectations, triggered by a powerful suggestion, and further exacerbated by the inability of individuals to engage in rational thinking.[89]  Multiple instances of night rider sightings occurred throughout the provinces.  A sighting took place on 15 November in Yorkshire, with the witness claiming to have heard and seen forty armed horsemen passing through Skelton and Brotton at night.  City authorities responded with a twenty-four hour watch on the harbor.[90]  Citizens in Wiltshire observed the horsemen riding north, every night between twelve, and two in groups of twenty, as they crossed the bridges of Hannington, Castle Eaton, and Cricklade.[91]  The House of Lords heard a report of night riders in Yorkshire.  Sir John Ernle, Chancellor of the Exchequer, remarked to the Commons that sightings also occurred in Gloucestershire, leading to a debate as to whether or not Parliament should confiscate Catholic-owned horses.[92]  Concerns over a Catholic military coup thus became so prominent in the countryside that the crowd experienced elaborate delusions with reference to the threats they expected.  After 1679, however, the hysteria had already peaked, with the end of the Plot coming two years later.

Faithful to the typical pattern of a pogrom (slow beginning, climax, and rapid diffusion), the crowd hysteria waned quickly, with the greatest concentration of crowd hysteria occurring in the first two years. The century-long accumulation of anti-Catholic sentiment seems to have resulted in a rapid cathartic release, triggered by the crucial point in the Popish Plot – Sir Edmund-Bury Godfrey's murder.  Godfrey's death, and the discovery of Coleman's letters,

---

[88] Calamy quoted in Routh, *They Saw it Happen*, 188-189;  Miller, *Popery and Politics*, 161.
[89] Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 43.
[90] Kenyon*, Popish Plot*, 101-102.
[91] Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 187.
[92] Kenyon*, Popish Plot*, 101-102.

became the climax of the Plot because these incidents seemed to prove the validity of Oates'

accusations. The subsequent panic instigated by the unfortunate magistrate's demise led to a

variety of reactions from the government and the public, such as the increase in anti-Catholic

legislation, the execution of "traitors," the exploitation of Trained Bands, and collective

hallucinations. Soon after, however, the anti-Catholic outrage in the rural and urban areas

quieted, and the courts began to acquit suspected Papists. Oates, exposed as a liar and charged

with perjury, received a guilty verdict and a sentence of whipping and annual pillory.[93] The

Popish Plot exemplifies the pattern of herd behavior and its role in societal movements. Le

Bon's conception of a suggestible crowd, directed under the leadership of a fanatical demagogue,

and motivated by prejudicial ideology, describes the fundamental characteristics of the Popish

Plot accurately. Additionally, the incident also reflects the contagious nature of crowd hysteria.

In this case, the English Protestants became what Le Bon termed a "psychological crowd,"

typified by a transitory, but clearly defined, collective mentality.[94] Finally, the Plot demonstrates

clearly that paranoid, irrational public desires can, under specific conditions, direct national

policy.

---

[93] Anonymous, *A Full Description of the Manner of Executing the Sentence Upon Titus Oates for Perjury* (London: s.n., 1685), 1.
[94] Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 23-24.

# Bibliography

Anonymous. *A True and Perfect Narrative of the Late Terrible and Bloody Murther of Sr. Edmundberry Godfrey; Who was Found Murthered on Thursday the 17th. of this Infant October, in a Field Near Primrose-Hill with a Full Account of the Manner of His Being Murthered, and in What Manner He was Found. Also, The Full Proceedings of the Coroner, Who Sat Upon the Inquest.* S.n.: Printed by N.T., 1678.

Anonymous. *An Elegie on the Right Worshipful Sir Edmund-Bury Godfrey, Knight, One of His Majesties Justices of the Peace: Who was Found Murthered on Thursday the 17th of this Infant October, 1678. In a Ditch on the South-Side of Primrose-Hill Near Hampstead.* London: Printed in Sweetings-Rents Near the Royal Exchange, 1678.

Anonymous. *Animadversions on the Last Speech of William Viscount Stafford Who was Beheaded on Tower-Hill for High Treason in Conspiring the Death of the King &c. on Wednesday, December 29th. 1680.* London: s.n., 1680.

Anonymous. *The Dreadful Apparition; The Pope Haunted with Ghosts. In Relation to Sir Edmundbury-Godfrey's Murther, and the Vindication of the Late Sainted Traytors, who Suffered for the Romish Cause: The Figure by the Verses at Large Explained.* Without Newgate: Printed for J. Jordan, at the Angel in Guiltspur Street, 1680.

Anonymous. *A New Year's Gift: Being a Poem Dedicated to Lasting Memory of that Worthy and Learned Dr. Titus Oates, the First Discoverer of the Popish Plott, To Destroy the Sacred Person of His Majesty, and to Extirpate the Protestant Religion.* London: s.n., 1680.

Anonymous. *A Full Description of the Manner of Executing the Sentence Upon Titus Oates for Perjury.* London: s.n., 1685.

Anonymous. *The Life of Titus Oates from His Cradle to his First Pilloring for Infamous Perjury with a True Account of Birth and Parentage, Impartially Set Forth for the Satisfaction of All Persons.* London: Printed by E. Mallet, 1685.

Anonymous. *Order in Council Concerning Recusants.* Great Britain, Historical Manuscript Comission, *Marquess of Ormonde MSS* 4, 1680.

Anonymous. *Account of the Plot*, Great Britain, Historical Manuscript Comission. *Marquess of Ormonde MSS* 4, 1680.

"Bl. Edward Coleman." *Catholic Online*. http://www.catholic.org/saints/saint.php?saint_id=3052.

Care, Henry. *The History of the Damnable Popish Plot, in its Various Branches and Progress; Published For the Satisfaction of the Present and Future Ages/By the Authors of the Weekly Pacquet of Advice from Rome.* London: s.n., 1680.

Clifton, Robin. "The Popular Fear of Catholics During the English Revolution: 1640-1660."
*Past and Present* 52, 1971.

Dakers, Elain K. and Lane, Jane. *Titus Oates.* Westport: Greenwood Press, 1971.

Greene, Douglas, ed. *Diaries of the Popish Plot: Being the Diaries of Israel Tonge, Sir Robert Southwell, John Joyne, Edmund Warcup, and Thomas Dangerfield: and Including Titus Oates's A True Narrative of the Horrid Plot*. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1977.

Kenyon, John. *The Popish Plot*. London: Cox & Wyman Ltd., 1972.

Le Bon, Gustave. *The Crowd: A study of the Popular Mind*. New York: Viking Press, 1960.

Marshall, Alan. "Miles Prance" in Matthew, H.C.G. and Harrison, Brian, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* vol. 45. London: Oxford University Press. 2004.

Miller, John. *Popery and Politics in England: 1660-1688*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Oates, Titus. *A True Narrative of the Horrid Plot and Conspiracy of the Popish Party Against the Life of His Sacred Majesty, the Government, and the Protestant Religion: with a List of Such Noblemen, Gentlemen, and Others that Were the Conspirators; and the Head Officers Both Civil and Military, that Were to Effect It*. Edinburgh: Re-printed by the Heir of Andrew Anderson, Printer to His Most Sacred Majesty, 1675.

Oates, Titus. *Otes's Letter. For the Right Honourable Sir Leoline Jenkins Knight His Majesties Principal Secretary of State at Whitehall*. London: s.n., 1683.

Pollock, John. *The Popish Plot: A Study in the History of the Reign of Charles II.* London: Duckworth & Co., 1903.

Routh, Charles Richard Nairne. *They Saw it Happen: An Anthology of Eye-Witnesses' Accounts of Events in British History: 1485-1688*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Trueman. *A Second Letter to Mr. Miles Prance in Reply to the Ghost of Sir Edmund-Bury Godfrey*. London: s.n., 1682.

**Politics, Trade, and Diplomacy: The Anglo-Ottoman Relationship, 1575-1699**

**Maria Blackwood**
**Yale University**

In 1575, two enterprising London merchants dispatched a pair of agents overland to Constantinople in order to secure the right to trade directly with the Ottoman Empire. This privately funded action, motivated by the pursuit of profit, proved to be the basis for England's diplomatic relationship with Turkey, establishing foundations that remained in place for 300 years. In line with its beginnings, the relationship between England and the Ottoman Empire remained predominantly mercantile during the first stage of its existence. The Levant Company was established in 1581 to conduct trade with the Ottomans; the merchant William Harborne was shortly dispatched as England's first ambassador to the Ottoman Porte.[1] All early ambassadors had prior experience as the Company's agents in the Ottoman Empire.[2] Moreover, these early ambassadors were selected and paid by the Levant Company rather than by the state. The ambassador's role extended beyond diplomatic representation on behalf of the monarch, to managing the Company's interests in Turkey.

In the middle of the seventeenth century, the diplomatic relationship between England and the Ottoman Empire began to shift. The Levant Company gradually lost control over Anglo-Ottoman relations, which changed from a predominantly commercial relationship to a more conventionally diplomatic one. This shift was complete when, in 1691, Ambassador William Hussey died at his post, and William III appointed a successor without consulting Levant Company officials. While the Company remained nominally involved with the ambassadorship until 1803, after Hussey's death, Company authorities ceased to influence ambassadorial appointments and were merely presented with the king's choice as a fait accompli.[3]   In

---

[1] Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Phillip II* (London: Harper Collins, 1992), 442-443.

[2] Alison Games, *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 154; Alfred Cecil Wood, *A History of the Levant Company* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1935), 80.

[3] Wood, *A History of the Levant Company*, 133; James Mather, *Pashas: Traders and Travellers in the Islamic World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 135.

examining the reasons behind this fundamental change in the nature of the ambassadorship, it is crucial to consider the dual nature of England's early ambassadors to the Ottoman Porte. Men such as William Harborne served two masters, the Levant Company and the Crown, in two different capacities, those of diplomatic representative and commercial agent. For the Elizabethans, trade was not a matter of state. It was, therefore, private initiative that inaugurated official contacts between the English and the Turks. Over the course of the seventeenth century, however, trade became increasingly political. As commercial interests became a matter of state, the ambassador's two roles were fused, and he became a creature of the Crown rather than the Company.

### Trade, Politics, and Imperialism: Traditional Answers Revisited

In examining why the diplomatic relationship between England and the Ottoman Empire evolved from primarily commercial contacts dominated by the Levant Company to diplomatic relations controlled by the central government, scholars predominantly point to one of three factors: English imperial aspirations, an economic shift away from Levantine trade, and internal political considerations. Because the hundred-year period between Harborne's appointment to Istanbul and the establishment of royal control over diplomatic relations with Turkey coincides with the beginnings of England's imperial ambitions, some scholars point to the emergence of English imperial aspirations as the driving factor behind the shift in Anglo-Ottoman relations. Literary scholar Gerald Maclean describes the dynamic between England and the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as "imperial envy."[4] At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, the English were a relatively unimportant nation bent on competing with Spain for New World riches. The Ottoman Empire, meanwhile, was a fabulously wealthy polity that

---

[4] Gerald Maclean, *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 20.

stretched across three continents. Maclean argues that the "imperial envy" the English experienced in their relations with the Ottomans played a role in inspiring their own imperial ambitions and was part of the impetus that transformed them into an imperial nation. This transformation, in turn, changed the fundamental nature of the Anglo-Ottoman relationship.[5]

By the end of the seventeenth century, Maclean argues, "imperial envy started to give way to an emergent imperiousness;" the English increased the power of their navy and laid the foundations of their own Eastern empire. [6] Shortly after the Restoration of 1660, the English began establishing colonies in North Africa and the Indian Subcontinent.[7] With the Restoration also came the chartering of the Royal African Company and the acquisition of Tangier and Bombay.[8] The Treaty of Utrecht gave the newly minted British Newfoundland, Acadia, and Nova Scotia at the expense of the French, while the Spanish ceded Gibraltar and Minorca.[9] The British had become Europe's dominant colonial and maritime power. Envy was replaced by a sense of parity, and the Ottomans were increasingly seen as useful, but subordinate, allies. By the late seventeenth century, English writers had begun presenting the Ottomans less as distant trading partners and more as potential allies in the game of international intrigue and empire building.[10] Moreover, there was a new consciousness that the Ottoman government might hold valuable lessons for the ordering and administration of empire.[11] As a result of this shift, the Anglo-Ottoman relationship, Maclean argues, was increasingly seen in political, rather than commercial, terms.

---

[5] Ibid., 20.
[6] Ibid., 21.
[7] Ibid., 27.
[8] Ibid., 189.
[9] Ibid., 197.
[10] Ibid., 189, 197.
[11] Ibid., 191.

The imperial consciousness that emerged in the second half of the seventeenth century brought with it the development of a centralized imperial state.[12] Historian Alison Games argues that state centralization gradually eroded the English style of piecemeal expansion governed by the large overseas companies.[13] Whereas trading companies had once carried out their own diplomacy and funded their own armies, the emergence of a centralized imperial state meant that the Crown assumed direct control over English diplomatic relationships.[14] Like Maclean, Games presents English imperial aspirations as the driving force behind the shift in Anglo-Ottoman relations.

Despite its later imperial dimensions, the initial relationship between England and Turkey was predominantly commercial. Economic factors drove the establishment of diplomatic relations between England and the Ottoman Empire, and some scholars see in them an explanation for this relationship's subsequent evolution. Whereas between 1620 and 1683 England was the undisputed leader in the Levantine trade, in the eighteenth century, commercial relations with the Americas and the East Indies began to eclipse England's commerce in the Mediterranean.[15]

From the second half of the seventeenth century on, the Levant Company felt mounting competitive pressure from the East India Company in the domestic market, especially with regard to spices, raw silk, and manufactured silk goods.[16] In the Mediterranean, meanwhile, the French were becoming an increasingly formidable commercial competitor. Beginning in the 1660s, Jean-Baptiste Colbert made a conscious effort to promote French trade with the Levant,

---

[12] Games, *The Web of Empire*, 298.

[13] Ibid., 292.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Bruce McGowan, *Economic Life in Ottoman Europe: Taxation, Trade, and the Struggle for Land, 1600-1800* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 21; Games, *The Web of Empire*, 51.

[16] Wood, *A History of the Levant Company*, 103.

reviving the French cloth industry and tightening administrative control over trade with Turkey. Colbert's efforts came to fruition beginning in the 1680s, when French trade with the Turks began to make significant gains at the marked expense of the Levant Company.[17] English trading activity accounted for 39.8 percent of Ottoman exports in 1634 and 39 percent in 1686; by 1784, however, England's share had fallen to a mere 9.2 percent.[18] After 1700, English woolen fabrics fell behind French textiles; the English themselves lost interest in Levantine silk, one of their major imports from the region.[19] As Alfred Wood argues in his book *A History of the Levant Company*, the resurgence of France and competition from the East India Company were crucial factors in the decline of Anglo-Ottoman trade. Wood explains that as Levantine trade suffered, so did the power of the Levant Company, and he attributes the shift in the relationship between England and the Ottoman Empire to an economic shift away from Levantine trade.

In addition to economic and imperial considerations, internal political realities also influenced international diplomacy. Historian Daniel Goffman argues that England's internal political situation had ramifications for its nationals in the Levant, and that the 1640s saw conflicts between various English factions in the Ottoman Empire.[20] Because the Levant Company's merchants tended to sympathize with Parliament, Charles I hoped to curb Company power and increase his control over Levantine commerce and diplomacy.[21] As Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell was also eager to diminish Company control over England's diplomatic relations with the Ottoman Porte. Although the Levant Company appointed him, Thomas Bendish, who served as ambassador from 1647 to 1661, largely circumvented the Company in his relationship with Cromwell. Whereas, before 1653, the bulk of ambassadorial

---

[17] Ibid., 106-108.
[18] McGowan, *Economic Life in Ottoman Europe*, 16.
[19] Ibid., 21-22.
[20] Daniel Goffman, *Britons in the Ottoman Empire, 1642-1660* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998), 5.
[21] Ibid., 71.

correspondence was addressed to the directors of the Company, Bendish corresponded primarily with Cromwell and his secretary, John Thurloe.[22] Upon the restoration of the monarchy, Charles II sought to curtail further the Levant Company's authority in order to bolster royal power. He recalled Bendish and removed much of the Company's autonomy.[23]

Charles II appointed Heneage Finch, second earl of Winchilsea, as Bendish's replacement. Finch was the first nobleman to hold the ambassadorship and the first ambassador whose correspondence was addressed almost exclusively to the royal court.[24] "This ambassador was very much the king's man rather than a representative of the company, and his papers reflect the affairs of state rather than of commerce," Goffman explains.[25] Those letters that the Company did send to the ambassador were more supplicating in tone than its correspondence with his predecessors, and were primarily concerned with imploring him to decrease his expenses. A 1663 dispute over compensation and the Company's unwillingness to cover the expenses of the ambassador and his secretary "probably accelerated the company's forfeiture of control to the state, which picked up the purse and with it absolute authority over its ambassador."[26] Goffman ascribes the shift in Anglo-Ottoman relations to English domestic political maneuverings.

Upon closer examination, however, these three explanations for the changing nature of the Anglo-Ottoman relationship leave something to be desired. The Levant Company's definitive decline did not begin until the eighteenth century, well after the ambassadorship had begun its definitive shift to the Crown. Although the East India Company eventually overtook the Levant

---

[22] Ibid., 190-191, 194.
[23] Ibid., 201.
[24] Ibid., 207.
[25] Ibid., 208.
[26] Ibid.

Company, the latter's dominant position in the silk trade was secure until the 1680s.[27] Far from seeing the Ottomans as a model of imperial rule, English ambassadors frequently remarked on the rampant corruption present in the Ottoman administration and engaged in speculation on the Empire's imminent decline.[28] The politically turbulent 1640s, meanwhile, were a period of stability in terms of the ambassadorial appointment.[29] In examining the shifting nature of the ambassadorship, it is important to focus on the duality of the ambassador's role. The traditional narratives all assume that the political dimension of the ambassador's role came to eclipse his importance as an agent of English commerce. In actuality, rather than being subordinated to politics, trade itself became political. The separation between the two spheres ceased to exist, and the ambassador's two functions were fused.

## Establishing Trade with Turkey

Harborne's voyage did not mark the beginning of commercial contact between England and the Ottoman Empire. The English had traded woolen cloth to Turkey since at least the early fifteenth century, and Levantine goods, such as currants and wine, had long been present in English markets.[30] Before Harborne's voyage to Istanbul, there existed two main arteries for Ottoman-English exchange: an overland route via Poland, for which the main entrepôt was Antwerp, and the Mediterranean trade conducted by Venice and Genoa.[31] Englishmen could—and, on rare occasion, did—trade with Turkey, provided they sailed under the French flag.[32]

---

[27] Mather, *Pashas*, 204-208.

[28] See, e.g., "The Earl of Winchilsea to Sir Henry Bennet," June 24, 1665, *HMC Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Allan George Finch, Volume 1*, 379.

[29] Gary M. Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives, 1509-1688* (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1990), 285.

[30] Halil Inalcik, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600," in Halil Inalcik and Donald Quataert, eds., *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914* (New York: Cambridge University Press) 1996, 364; Mather, *Pashas*, 34.

[31] Inalcik, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600," 364.

[32] "Giovanni Francesco Moresini, Venetian Ambassador in Constantinople, to the Doge and Senate," March 4, 1581, *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, Volume 8*, 50-51; Inalcik, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-

Nevertheless, this route was "not heretofore in the memory of any man nowe living knowen to be commonly used and frequented by way of merchandize, by any the Marchants or any Subjects of us, or our progenitors [*sic*]," as the letters patent granted by Elizabeth I to the Turkey Company note.[33] It was not until the closing decades of the sixteenth century that direct trade—English merchants sailing, under the English flag, from their homeland to Istanbul, Aleppo, or another of the Empire's major commercial centers—was established. Although the government acknowledged the benefits that such a commercial relationship would entail, it was the mercantile community that drove the establishment of relations with Turkey and the foundation of the Turkey Company and its successor, the Levant Company.

Direct trade between England and Turkey held great potential for English merchants because the commercial needs of these two states were reciprocal. England was a source of tin, lead, and steel—raw materials necessary for the production of armaments for Turkey's frequent wars with Persia—as well as wool, which was used for Ottoman army uniforms. As a Protestant country, England did not have to abide by the papal prohibition on export of these and other military items to the Ottoman Empire.[34] Turkey, meanwhile, as the polity that controlled the vast swath of territory stretching from the Maghreb to the Arabian Peninsula, lay between European markets and the Eastern luxuries Europeans craved. The Ottomans controlled the major trading routes for Indian cotton textiles, indigo, and spices, as well as Persian silks. The Empire also exported valuable local produce such as cotton, beeswax, grain, and Anatolian silk.[35] By trading

---

1600," 365. For early English travel to Ottoman dominions, see, e.g., Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations and Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation*, *Volume 5* (New York: Macmillan, 1904), 63-63, 109-110, 153-164.

[33] "The letters patents, or privileges graunted by her Majestie to Sir Edward Osborne, Master Richard Staper, and certaine other Marchants of London for their trade into the dominions of the great Turke, in the yeere 1581[*sic*]," in Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, 192.

[34] Games, *Web of Empire*, 50; Inalcik, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600," 188; Mather, *Pashas*, 34-35.

[35] Mather, *Pashas*, 24-25.

with the Ottomans directly, rather than through Italian middlemen, English merchants could cut their costs significantly.[36]

The international situation was also favorable to the establishment of direct trade between England and Turkey. In the 1570s, the Dutch war for independence led to a complete disruption of the Antwerp entrepôt, while Venice's 1570-1573 war with Turkey interrupted the Serene Republic's trade with northern Europe.[37] Phillip II's 1580 annexation of Portugal and its colonies further restricted English access to both eastern imports and outlets for English woolen exports.[38] With their supply lines disrupted and their competitors otherwise occupied, England's merchants found themselves with both the motivation and the opportunity to establish direct trade with the Ottomans.[39]

Elizabeth's government also had an interest in the prospect of establishing English trade with Turkey. Indeed, once the Turkey Company was established, the Queen and individuals connected to her contributed £40,000 to the fledgling enterprise's capital, half of the total sum.[40] Sir Francis Walsingham penned, most likely in 1578, a brief treatise on the potential benefit of establishing a direct commercial relationship with the Ottomans, outlining the steps necessary to undertake such a venture.[41] "You shall vend your own commodities with most profit, which before did fall into strangers' hands," Walsingham writes, explaining the trade's high potential for profitability. "You shall furnish not only this realm but also the most part of the hitherpart of Europe with such commodities as are transported out of the said Turk's dominions to the great

---

[36] Ibid., 35.

[37] Robert Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550-1653* (London: Verso, 2003), 16; Inalcik, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600," 365.

[38] Inalcik, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600," 365-366.

[39] Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, 16.

[40] Mather, *Pashas*, 36.

[41] S.A. Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey: 1578-1582* (London: Oxford University Press, 1977), 28.

enriching of this realm."[42] Nevertheless, Sir Walsingham was adamant that this would be a venture financed by merchants, recommending, "some apt man … be sent with her majesty's letters unto the Turks to procure an ample safe-conduct, who is always to remain there at the charge of the merchants, as agent.[43]

While the state granted its support to the establishment of direct trade with the Ottomans, the impetus lay squarely with England's merchants. It was two such enterprising merchants, Edward Osborne and Richard Staper, who laid the foundations for England's commercial relationship with Turkey. In 1575, these two prominent members of London's mercantile community dispatched a pair of agents to Constantinople via Poland, so that they might secure a safe conduct from the sultan for William Harborne, a factor of Osborne's. Following the successful completion of this mission, Harborne set out for Constantinople in July 1578. Osborne and Staper financed both journeys.[44] Their investment proved fruitful, for in May 1580, Sultan Murad III issued Harborne a charter of privileges granted to English merchants. This document, which would be the basis for English trade in the Levant for the next three hundred years, established that English subjects were free to trade within Ottoman dominions, English slaves were to be set free, Englishmen living in Turkey would not be liable to taxation, and English ships were not to be plundered. It also conferred on England the right to appoint consuls in major commercial cities.[45] The following year, Queen Elizabeth, acknowledging that the capitulations

---

[42] Sir Francis Walsingham, "A consideration of the trade into Turkey," in M. Epstein, *The Early History of the Levant Company* (New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1968), 245-246.

[43] Ibid., 248.

[44] Wood, *History of the Levant Company*, 7-8; Mather, *Pashas*, 36.

[45] Mather, *Pashas*, 26; "A Latin rendering of the privileges or letters of the most potent Mussulman the Emperor Sultan Mured Khan at the request of Elizabeth, etc. confirming peace and alliance," *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 14*, 284.

had been obtained "by [their] great adventure and industry, with their great costs and charges," granted Osborne and Staper letters patent, establishing the monopoly of the Turkey Company.[46]

In addition to laying the foundations for the establishment of the Turkey Company, Harborne's journey to Constantinople marked the beginning of diplomatic correspondence between the English government and the Ottoman Porte. From the outset, the Crown saw commercial interests as paramount in the English relationship with Turkey. Despite the potential strategic benefits of their alliance, Elizabeth I focused her first letter to Sultan Murad III almost exclusively on the commercial benefits that the opening of trade between England and Turkey would confer on the sultan's dominions:

> The products in which our realm abounds and which those of other princes lack are so necessary for the uses of mankind that no people can be without them, or fail to rejoice when it has obtained them by long and difficult journeys. But everyone sells more dearly to others in proportion as he seeks a living and a profit from his labor. So as the acquisition of those products is advantageous, but the purchase of them from these others burdensome, the advantage to your subjects will be increased by this free access of a few of our people to your land; the burden will be diminished by allowing any of our subjects to go.[47]

This preoccupation with the commercial dimension of the Anglo-Ottoman relationship is also evident in the role envisioned for Harborne when he was appointed as England's first ambassador to the Porte. On November 20, 1582, Elizabeth granted Harborne a commission to "make, ordain and constitute him our true and undoubted Orator, Messenger, Deputy, and Agent" in the Ottoman Empire.[48] His duties and privileges focused on England's mercantile presence in Turkey. These privileges included the confirmation and ratification of agreements with the sultan, ensuring that English merchants operated within the confines of the privileges

---

[46] "The letters patents, or privileges graunted by her Majestie to Sir Edward Osborne, Master Richard Staper, and certaine other Marchants of London," 192.

[47] "Her Majesty's Answer to the Turk's Letter," October 25, 1570, *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 14*, 76.

[48] "The Queenes Commission under her great seale, to her servant master William Hareborne, to be her majesties Ambassadour or Agent, in the partes of Turkie," Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, 223.

granted to them by Murad III, determining in which Ottoman ports and cities they were permitted to trade, appointing consuls, and fulfilling "all and singular things whatsoever, which shall seem requisite and convenient for the honest and orderly government of our said subjects, and of the manner of their traffic in those parts."[49]

The highly commercial nature of England's new venture in the Levant is illustrated by the fact that most of the men who would become the founding members of the Turkey Company were well-established merchants. The Company's original joint stock had twelve investors, almost all of whom were extensively involved in the Russian and Spanish trade. Ten of them were members of the Spanish Company, nine were Muscovy Company investors, and eight belonged to both categories. Only one was not involved in either company.[50] Founding the Turkey Company furthered goals that these merchants had pursued through both the Muscovy Company and the Spanish Company. The overland route from Russia to Persia, which had been established in the 1550s and 1560s, was more dangerous and costlier than the seaborne trade that the Turkey Company conducted, while the Spanish Company's activities were disrupted by Spain's hostility to England and Phillip II's annexation of Portugal.[51] In establishing the Turkey Company, its founding members were both pursuing new commercial opportunities and adjusting their approach to existing commercial ventures. In both regards, their primary concerns were profit and trade.

The Turkey Company experienced almost immediate success. On June 9, 1584, the first English merchant ship, sailing under the English flag, arrived at Constantinople, and England soon became the Ottoman Empire's most important supplier of key strategic goods, such as

---

[49] Ibid., 223-224.
[50] Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, 17.
[51] Ibid., 16-17.

gunpowder, arms, tin, and steel.[52] "At this present juncture the arrival of an English ship with tin, tallow, and a vast quantity of swords among her cargo, has given great satisfaction," the Venetian ambassador in Constantinople reported to his government in February 1596.[53] English merchants also sent cloth, herring, and cod to the Levant.[54] English cloth exports were highly competitive because of low wages and the availability of inexpensive, native wool. Moreover, the English were able to stabilize their prices, while their competitors were forced to steadily raise prices.[55] Already in the first half of the seventeenth century, the Levant Company was re-exporting pepper, ginger, indigo, cochineal, sugar, and brazil wood, the fruits of England's fledgling colonial trades, to Turkey.[56]

The Company's ships returned to England with valuable cargoes of Anatolian cotton, carpets, and gallnuts; raw silk from Persia; currants, wine, and olive oil from the Mediterranean islands; and spices, drugs, and dyes from India and Indonesia.[57] The cargo of a single of its ships brought the Turkey Company £70,000 in revenues, in 1588. In 1603, the *Royal Exchange* was reported to be carrying 300,000 ducats' worth of indigo, silk, spices, bombazine, and other goods.[58]

In January 1592, the Turkey Company merged with the similarly oriented Venice Company to become the Levant Company, an entity that monopolized English trade in the

---

[52] Mather, *Pashas*, 29; Inalcik, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600," 370.

[53] "Marco Venier, Venetian Ambassador in Constantinople, to the Doge and Senate," February 10, 1596, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 9*, 183.

[54] Games, *Web of Empire*, 50; Inalcik, "The Ottoman State, Economy and Society, 1300-1600," 188, 370.

[55] Inalcik, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600," 370.

[56] Mather, *Pashas*, 57.

[57] Inalcik, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600," 370; Games, *Web of Empire*, 50; "Piero Bondumier, Venetian Governor in Zante, to the Doge and Senate," January 15, 1603, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 9*, no. 1119.

[58] Wood, *History of the Levant Company*, 17; "Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli, Venetian Secretary in England, to the Doge and Senate," February 19, 1603, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 9*, no. 1136.

eastern Mediterranean.[59] This merger established a general pattern of English trade in the Levant—the exchange of woolen cloth, lead, and tin for raw silk in Ottoman ports, and the subsequent purchase of currants and wine in the Greek islands controlled by Venice—that proved to be highly lucrative. Profits from the resale of silk in Europe were very high, enabling Levant Company merchants to dump their woolen cloth and eliminate their Venetian competition.[60] "They are utterly supplanting your subjects in the carrying trade, weakening your customs and ruining the merchant service, as your Excellencies must be well aware," the Venetian governor at Zante complained to the doge and senate in February 1603. "They trade in their own ships to the ports of Alexandria, Alexandretta, and Smyrna and other Turkish cities in Asia Minor, and in the Archipelago, where our ships only used to trade, to the great benefit of the State and of private individuals."[61]

From 1620 to 1683, England was the undisputed leader in the Levantine trade.[62] From 1662 to 1668, the value of the Levant Company's exports to the Ottoman Empire grew by over 25 percent, while the value of their imports from the Levant increased by 15 percent.[63] Although the establishment of the East India Company in 1600 gave the Levant Company serious competition in the importation of spices into England, the Company remained dominant in the highly profitable silk trade.[64] Indeed, in the 1660s, the Levant Company accounted for the vast

---

[59] Inalcik, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600," 369; Suraiya Faroqhi, "Crisis and Change, 1590-1699," in Halil Inalcik and Donald Quataert, eds., *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 368.

[60] Inalcik, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600," 369; Faroqhi, "Crisis and Change, 1590-1699," 523.

[61] "Maffio Michiel, Venetian Governor in Zante, to the Doge and Senate," February 22, 1603, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 9*, no, 1140.

[62] Bruce McGowan, *Economic Life in Ottoman Europe: Taxation, Trade, and the Struggle for Land, 1600-1800* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 21.

[63] Mather, *Pashas*, 129.

[64] Ibid., 41-42.

majority of English silk imports, transporting roughly 280,000 pounds of silk annually.[65] In addition to their commercial success, Levant Company merchants also enjoyed a high degree of domestic prestige. In 1638, Lewes Roberts remarked that the Levant Company "for all its height and eminency is now second to none other of this land."[66] The Company's membership was described by another contemporary as being "composed of the wealthiest and ablest merchants in the City."[67] During the years of the Company's early prosperity, trade was a matter firmly controlled by merchants, rather than by the state.

### Serving Two Masters: The Dual Role of the Ambassador at the Ottoman Porte

The early years of England's trade with Turkey established enduring patterns that proved crucial to the later development of the Anglo-Ottoman diplomatic and commercial relationship. From the outset, English ambassadors to the Ottoman Porte occupied a dual role. When William Harborne was dispatched to Constantinople as ambassador, he was expected to act on behalf of both the Queen and the Company. Into the eighteenth century, English ambassadors to Constantinople received two sets of instructions, one from the Company, and one from the Crown.[68] This dual position was unique among English officials in Turkey. Unlike the ambassador, consuls in cities such as Smyrna and Aleppo, although they answered to the ambassador, concerned themselves almost entirely with Company affairs.[69]

While the ambassador was officially a representative of the Crown, he was also a salaried servant of the Company. Harborne's gifts to the sultan, which included several dogs, an elaborate silver clock, a case of candlesticks, and ten pieces of gold plate, were presented in the name of the Queen, but financed by the Turkey Company, and this precedent was followed for much of

---

[65] Ibid., 130.
[66] Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, 4.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Mather, *Pashas*, 4.
[69] Ibid.

the Levant Company's subsequent history.[70] In the early decades of the Anglo-Ottoman relationship, the Levant Company selected and paid for England's ambassadors to the Porte, offering them generous salaries.[71] Indeed, when the Company was temporarily dissolved in 1603, there was speculation that the ambassador would be withdrawn.[72] As one Venetian official put it, "that Company alone as its sole charges maintained the English Ambassador in Constantinople, the Crown contributing nothing but credentials."[73]

Much of the ambassador's business related directly to the English commercial presence in Turkey. Barton was able to secure the right to export grain from Ottoman territories, something that had been, up to that point, forbidden by imperial decree.[74] In 1600, Henry Lello, the newly appointed ambassador to Constantinople, renegotiated the English capitulations, securing a customs rate of three percent, down from the previous five or six percent.[75] On several occasions, ambassadors were instructed by the Company to administer oaths to its merchants operating in the Levant, so that they would be honest in their accounting and refrain from selling goods on credit, on pain of fines to be extracted by the ambassador.[76] Ambassadors also brought abuses against English merchants to the attention of the Sultan and his officials,

---

[70] Susan Skilliter, "William Harborne, The First English Ambassador, 1583-1588," in William Hale and Ali Ihsan Bagis, eds., *Four Centuries of Turco-British Relations* (North Humberside, UK: The Eothen Press, 1984), 17, 21; "The presents made to the Grand Signior and others the chief of his Court by the English ambassador in Constantinople the 24th of April, 1582," *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 15*, 653.

[71] Mather, *Pashas*, 47.

[72] "Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli, Venetian Secretary in England, to the Doge and Senate, June 13, 1603," *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 10*, no. 91.

[73] Ibid.

[74] "Copy of a letter sent by the Grand Signor to the Queen of England," January 30, 1592, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian ,Volume 9*, no. 20.

[75] "Agostino Nani, Venetian Ambassador in Constantinople, to the Doge and Senate," December 3, 1600, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 9*, no. 936.

[76] Mather, *Pashas*, 124, 127; "The Levant Company to the Earl of Winchelsea," January 22, 1663, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Volume 3*, 22.

attempted to intercede on behalf of English slaves in Ottoman dominions, and worked to secure English access to various Ottoman ports.[77]

Nevertheless, ambassadors concerned themselves not only with purely commercial matters, but also with those that might be deemed more traditionally diplomatic. Ambassadors provided government officials with intelligence concerning the actions of the Turks and of other European representatives in Constantinople. The reports sent by Edward Barton, who succeeded Harborne as ambassador in 1588, to Walsingham range in topic from the quality of Turkish coins and the prospects for peace between Turkey and Persia to the Imperial ambassador's treatment of his servants.[78] From the beginning, the English Crown attempted to use its new relationship with the Ottomans to the disadvantage of Spain. Harborne and Barton made repeated attempts to secure Turkish naval assistance in restoring Portugal to its displaced king, Don Antonio, engaging in elaborate calculations as to the best way to bribe the appropriate Ottoman officials into supporting the venture. Various English diplomats also urged the sultan to attack Spain in support of the United Provinces and later France.[79] These unsuccessful—but remarkably persistent—attempts to draw the Ottoman fleet into conflict with Spain demonstrate the political dimension of the ambassador's role in Constantinople.

England's first ambassadors to the Ottoman Porte were all merchants connected to the Company. This was an unusual arrangement, a fact that did not escape the notice of representatives of the other European states that had a diplomatic presence in Constantinople.

---

[77] "Matheo Zane, Venetian Ambassador in Germany, to the Doge and Senate," May 6, 1586, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 8*, 161; "Lorenzo Bernardo, Venetian Ambassador in Constantinople, to the Doge and Senate," June 23, 1586, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 8*, 172.

[78] "Edward Barton to [Walsingham?]," March 14, 1589, *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 23*, 133; "Edward Barton to [Walsingham?]," August 29, 1588, *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 22*, 165.

[79] See, e.g., "[William Harborne] to [Walsingham?]," August 1, 1588, *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 22*, 101; "Edward Barton to [Walsingham?]," August 15, 1588, *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 22,* 138; "Agostino Nani, Venetian Ambassador in Constantinople, to the Doge and Senate," February 20, 1601, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 9*, no. 959.

"The English ambassador has been to the Pasha, and has lodged a vigorous complaint, alleging that the other Ambassadors go about saying he is a merchant and not entitled to the rank of Ambassador," Giovanni Moresini, Venice's ambassador at the Porte, reported to his government.[80] Indeed, Harborne's mercantile background proved to be a continued point of tension, allowing the French and the Venetians to express the hostility they felt towards the ascendant English commercial presence in the Levant. This hostility is very clearly expressed in an exchange reported by Venice's representative at the Porte:

> The day after the [newly arrived] French Ambassador's entry, the English Ambassador sent his secretary, and some of his gentlemen, to make the usual complimentary greetings. The secretary began, "My Master the Ambassador," when the French Ambassador broke into a rage, saying "Ambassador! Why he is a merchant, your master, Ambassador![81]

Such derision was also directed towards Harborne's immediate successors, all of whom were mercantile men.[82]

This abuse directed at England's early ambassadors is not only a reflection of French and Venetian hostility to English trading interests in the Levant. It is also clearly indicative of the sharp distinction drawn by Harborne's contemporaries between trade and politics. Their more conventionally diplomatic French and Italian counterparts did not see the Levant Company's ambassadors as fitting political representatives. Moreover, late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth century government representatives saw trade and politics as not only different, but also potentially conflicting, interests. Matheo Zane, Venice's ambassador to the Porte, suspected Barton of not adhering fully to his political instructions because of his dependence on the

---

[80] "Giovanni Francesco Moresini, Venetian Ambassador in Constantinople, to the Doge and Senate," May 22, 1584, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 8*, 93.

[81] Lorenzo Bernardo, Venetian Ambassador in Constantinople, to the Doge and Senate," April 12, 1586, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 8*, 154.

[82] See, e.g., "Simon Contarini, Venetian Ambassador in Constantinople, to the Doge and Senate," February 25, 1612, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 12*, no. 444.

mercantile community. "Probably the Ambassador used language suited to the inclination of the Turks and the position of affairs, rather than expressly ordered by the Queen," Zane wrote to the Venetian doge and senate. "He is dependent on the English merchants who pay his salary and employ him in the interests of their trade."[83]

The Company and the Crown also perceived this distinction between political and commercial interests. In the first months of James I's reign, the Levant Company decided to disband and renounce its charter, claiming that it could not make the annual payment of four thousand pounds that it had promised the Crown during Elizabeth's reign, and that it "could only meet the charges of the Ambassador."[84] This was a political maneuver meant to decrease the Company's financial duties to the monarch. The king replied, however, that "it was a matter of no moment to him that an Ambassador should reside at Constantinople, as he had no wish to continue friendly relations with the Turk," adding, "if the Company found an ambassador necessary to their own interests they must pay for him themselves."[85] When Company officials saw that the king would not lower his financial demands, they petitioned for, and subsequently received, the reinstatement of their charter.[86] Because it did not aid James I's political interests to maintain an ambassador at Constantinople, the king felt no compulsion to support the diplomatic post for commercial reasons.

Monetary questions continued to be points of contention. In the second half of the seventeenth century, the Levant Company became increasingly vocal in its opposition to the use of its money in the carrying out of state business. Heneage Finch, Earl of Winchelsea and cousin

---

[83] "Matheo Zane, Venetian Ambassador in Constantinople, to the Doge and Senate," November 21, 1593, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 9*, 110.

[84] "Nicolo Molin, Venetian Ambassador in England, to the Doge and Senate," February 18, 1604, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 10*, no. 190.

[85] "Nicolo Molin, Venetian Ambassador in England, to the Doge and Senate," March 4, 1604, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 10*, no. 278.

[86] Nicolo Molin, Venetian Ambassador in England, to the Doge and Senate," March 4, 1604, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 10*, no. 192.

to the speaker of the House of Commons of the same name, served as ambassador from 1661 to 1668, and engaged in heated disputes with Company officials over the financial resources with which they provided him. Finch decried the Company's "preposterous frugality," claiming it interfered with his ability to carry out the king's work.[87] "His Majesty's private instructions cannot be observed, for the Company disown the charges of what is done for him, he makes no provision for them, and in this country, nothing can be done without money [*sic*]," Finch complained.[88] Company officials corresponded not only with Finch, but also with his wife, regarding monetary disputes between themselves and the ambassador.[89]

These disputes are indicative of the shifting nature of the ambassadorship. Finch saw his role as servant to Charles II, while the Levant Company declined to finance what it saw as political, rather than commercial, expenses. The Company refused, for instance, to cover expenses associated with Finch's trips to Adrianopole or journeys undertaken by his secretary, Paul Rycaut, contending that these were carried out "on business of State, and not of [the Company's] concernment."[90] They also refused to reimburse expenses incurred by Finch in entertaining the Dutch ambassador for the same reason.[91] The Company pointedly noted that its financial resources "were no more to be disbursed without consent than those of a private person."[92] Company officials also complained to the Crown, contesting that they should only be

---

[87] "The Earl of Winchilsea to Sir Henry Bennet," June 24, 1665, *HMC Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Allan George Finch, Volume 1*, 379.
[88] Ibid.
[89] "Sir And. Riccard, Governor of the Levant Company, to the Countess of Winchelsea," July 31, 1668, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Volume 8*, 513.
[90] "Levant Company to the Earl of Winchelsea," September 16, 1663, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Volume 3*, 273; "Levant Company to the Earl of Winchelsea," March 14, 1664, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Volume 3*, 516.
[91] "Levant Company to the Earl of Winchelsea," September 8, 1668, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Volume 8*, 575.
[92] "Levant Company to the Earl of Winchelsea," December 23, 1663, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Volume 3*, 387.

liable for those expenses incurred in "support of their trade."[93] This trend continued, and by the time of William Trumbull's tenure as ambassador at the Porte (1686-1691), the Levant Company's refusal to countenance any expenses deemed "political" was well established.[94]

## Trade as Politics: The Ambassador's Role Transformed

In order to understand the nature of the shift that occurred in Anglo-Ottoman relations, it is useful to examine the backgrounds of the ambassadors who represented the English monarch and the Levant Company in Constantinople. William Harborne was born around 1542, in the port town of Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, where he was exposed to a commercial environment from a young age. His family lived on Yarmouth's South Quay, surrounded by the activity of a busy harbor, and Harborne left home at about age seventeen to work as a commercial agent abroad. He worked for some time as a factor for Edward Osborne, and Harborne is listed as one of the principal members of the Spanish Company in its 1577 incorporation documents.[95] Harborne was first a merchant, as observed and criticized by his foreign contemporaries. His background is characteristic of England's early ambassadors to the Ottoman Porte. Harborne's successor, Edward Barton, spent his entire adult life in service of the Company, while Paul Pindar, who served as ambassador from 1611 to 1620, was a merchant involved with the Venetian trade before becoming the Company's consul at Aleppo.[96]

---

[93] "Sir Andrew Riccard, Governor of the Levant Company, to Secretary Bennett," October 12, 1664, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Volume 4*, 30.

[94] C.J. Heywood, "English Diplomatic Relations with Turkey, 1689-1698," in William Hale and Ali Ihsan Bagis, eds., *Four Centuries of Turco-British Relations* (North Humberside, UK: The Eothen Press, 1984), 34; Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives, 1509-1688*, 287.

[95] Susan Skilliter, "William Harborne, The First English Ambassador, 1583-1588," in William Hale and Ali Ihsan Bagis, eds., *Four Centuries of Turco-British Relations* (North Humberside, UK: The Eothen Press, 1984) 10-11.

[96] Christine Woodhead, 'Barton, Edward (1562/3–1598)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1597, accessed 21 Oct 2009]; Robert Ashton, 'Pindar, Sir Paul (1565/6–1650)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22291, accessed 21 Oct 2009]

Over time, however, the position of ambassador to Constantinople fell increasingly to aristocrats and government officials. The prestige of the posting increased as well. Sir Richard Bulstrode, who served as the English agent in Brussels under Charles II and James II, called Constantinople "a post of more honor, and profit, than Paris."[97] In the second half of the seventeenth century, the ambassadorship was given to men such as Heneage Finch, second earl of Winchelsea; his kinsman Sir John Finch; James Brydges, eighth baron Chandos; and Sir William Trumbull.[98] Lord Paget, the last ambassador to Constantinople appointed in the seventeenth century, epitomizes this shift. William, seventh baron Paget, came from a firmly aristocratic background. The eldest son of William Paget, sixth baron Paget, Paget served in the House of Lords from 1678 until 1689, when he was appointed English ambassador to Vienna, a post he held until mid-1692. In January of the following year, Paget was dispatched, as William III's ambassador to Constantinople, for a strictly political purpose—the arrangement of peace between Turkey and the Habsburgs, and, by extension, cementing the alliance between William and Emperor Leopold I.[99] Although it took him until January 1698, it was Paget who ultimately negotiated the peace settlement that formed the basis for the Treaty of Karlowitz.[100] His role in a major diplomatic success is a significant departure from Harborne's preoccupation with customs duties and privateers.

Paget is emblematic of the transformation undergone by the ambassadorship over the course of the seventeenth century. This change occurred both in how the ambassadorship was

---

[97] C.J. Heywood, "Sir Paul Rycaut, a Seventeenth-Century Observer of the Ottoman State: Notes for a Study," in Ezel Kural Shaw and C.J. Heywood, *English and Continental Views of the Ottoman Empire: 1500-1800* (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1972), 50; J. D. Davies, 'Bulstrode, Sir Richard (1617–1711)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008. [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3930, accessed 12 Dec 2009]
[98] Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives*, 286-287.
[99] Colin Heywood, 'Paget, William, seventh Baron Paget (1637–1713)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21124, accessed 10 Dec 2009]; Heywood, "English Diplomatic Relations with Turkey, 1689-1698," 26-27.
[100] Heywood, "English Diplomatic Relations with Turkey, 1689-1698," 38.

perceived by the men who occupied it, and in the attitudes of the Crown and the Company toward the posting. Convinced that his presence as ambassador in Constantinople concerned the king more than it had previous monarchs, Heneage Finch considered it appropriate that the government should contribute to his salary:

> I believe I have that share of matters of state in my hands which former English ambassadors could never pretend to … and may deserve to be regarded as one of a greater trust that the mere concernment of merchandize and trafficke, and consequently to have other encouragements from his Majesty, and allowances thereunto, than the merchants' pension [*sic*].[101]

By the time William Paget served as ambassador in the 1690s, the Crown, indeed, provided him with money for his equipage, his "ordinary entertainment," as well as his "extraordinary expenses."[102]

While ambassadors came to see themselves primarily as the king's servants, the Levant Company was increasingly excluded from the selection of England's diplomatic representatives at the Porte. The question of who had the right to appoint ambassadors—the Company or the Crown—was an ambiguous one. The Company's 1605 charter gave the Company the right to appoint consuls, but it made no mention of the ambassadorship.[103] The precedent of the Company choosing an ambassador, and then presenting its choice to the king, began to give way in the 1620s. But, for the next few decades, a compromise was usually reached between the Company and the king in making the final appointment.[104] As trade became increasingly a matter of state, however, the monarch gained the upper hand in ambassadorial appointments to

---

[101] "The Earl of Winchilsea to Sir Heneage Finch," August 20, 1661, *HMC Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Allan George Finch, Volume 1*, 145.

[102] 'William and Mary: April 1689', *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: William and Mary, 1689-90* (1895), pp. 47-84. URL: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=57538&strquery=Paget Date accessed: 12 December 2009. >
"William and Mary: April 1695', *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: William and Mary, 1694-5* (1906), pp. 415-450. URL: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=57822&strquery=Paget Date accessed: 20 December 2009. >

[103] Wood, *History of the Levant Company*, 87.

[104] Ibid., 87-88; Mather, *Pashas*, 140.

the Porte. This change was clearly expressed by Sir John Finch, ambassador from 1672 to 1682, who contended, "the Company had no more authority to choose ambassadors than [a] servant had, and that they might as well coin money, or raise men."[105]

The first definitive move in this direction occurred in June 1660, when Charles II informed the Company that he intended to recall Sir Thomas Bendish and replace him with Heneage Finch, the first peer to hold the ambassadorship, as he was "a person whose quality may raise the reputation of the office."[106] This change occurred despite the Company's desire that Bendish continue his appointment as ambassador, and was the first instance in which the king's will was imposed against the Company's will (Company authorities had rejected royal recommendations under Charles I, for instance).[107] Finch was still expected to look after England's commercial interests in the Levant. "The principal part of your employment is to protect our merchants in their lawful trade and to assist them in the orderly government thereof," the Crown's 1660 instructions to Finch explained.[108] Nevertheless, Finch would fulfill his duty as a servant of the king, rather than the Company.

The transference of the ambassador's commercial duties from the Company to the Crown is illustrated by the instructions sent to Finch's successor. In 1667, Charles II wrote to the Company that he had recalled the Earl of Winchelsea from his post in Constantinople, as he had served there longer than was customary, and announced that he had chosen as Finch's replacement Sir Daniel Harvey.[109] Whereas they wrote directly to Paul Rycaut, then Consul at

---

[105] Sir John Finch's Notebook," *HMC Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Allan George Finch, Volume 2*, 152-153; Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives*, 287.

[106] "The King to the Turkey Company," June 25, 1660, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II Volume 1*, 65.

[107] "Sir Andrew Riccard, governor, and the Levant Company, to Sir Thos. Bendish, ambassador," October 17, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, 1660-1661*, 315; Wood, *History of the Levant Company*, 87.

[108] Mather, *Pashas*, 135.

[109] "The King to the Turkey Company," December 28, 1667, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Volume 8*, 103.

Smyrna, instructing him to "help suppress false and adulterated moneys," Company officials requested that the king "direct his ambassador to intimate to the Grand Vizir and the Sultan the ill consequences of permitting such coins to be imported and passed in payment."[110] The Crown did not only appoint Harvey, it also gave him instructions that can be deemed strictly commercial, something that had previously been done by Company officials.

The Company briefly regained its voice in nominating ambassadors, in the 1680s, before definitively losing its authority in the years following the Glorious Revolution. In 1691, William Hussey died en route to taking his post as ambassador in Constantinople. William III selected William Harbord to replace Hussey, instructing him to travel first to Vienna, in order to confer with the Emperor about a potential peace settlement with the Turks. This was a purely political appointment, made without as much as a pretence of consulting the Levant Company.[111] Lord Paget, who was then serving as English ambassador to Vienna, was to inform the Emperor and his ministers that "Mr. Harbord is sent on purpose for this service; for he is not to stay as ordinary ambassador for the merchants."[112] From 1691 on, the Company lost all its authority in selecting the ambassador, and was merely presented with the royal choice for unanimous ratification.[113]

It was not only the choice of ambassador that fell increasingly to the Crown. The Company was also beginning to lose its control over purely commercial questions. In 1663, Charles II conducted negotiations with the Ottoman sultan concerning English trade in Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, without the knowledge of Company officials. "The negotiations with the

---

[110] "Levant Company to Consul Rycaut," May 21, 1668, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Volume 8*, 402. "Order of a general court of the Levant Company," June 16, 1668, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Volume 8*, 441.
[111] Wood, *History of the Levant Company*, 133.
[112] "Nottingham to Lord Pagett," October 30, 1691, *HMC Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Allan George Finch, Volume 3*, 293.
[113] Wood, *History of the Levant Company*, 133-135.

Porte required so much secrecy that, although the Company has to bear part of the charge, they could not be communicated to it until placed beyond responsibility of miscarriage," the king explained in a letter to the Company.[114] During his tenure as ambassador, Sir John Finch noted that Charles saw commerce as a means of exerting political pressure on the Turks, because "no nation could furnish them with tinn or leade but himselfe, nor with cloth so good as that of England [*sic*]."[115] Finch criticized the instructions he had received from the Company as a violation of the royal prerogative, an attempt at wielding authority that the merchants "could no more exercise than the whole city, nor neither of them more than a company of cobblers."[116] When two merchants informed Finch that the Company intended to send him orders to intercede with the Grand Signor on behalf of an English merchant, he curtly told them that he "supposed they meant the Company would desire the King to send [him] such an order."[117] Whereas, in the early decades of the Anglo-Ottoman relationship, the English government lacked any concept of trade policy, by the second half of the sixteenth century, trade was becoming a political matter, the province of the state.[118]

A similar affront to Company authority occurred, in 1673, when the English consul in Venice, "without making any communication to the Levant Company, which gives the rule in such matters, … obtained from his Britannic Majesty … an order to impose on all effects and merchandise brought to this mart in English ships a charge of half a ducat per ton."[119] The Council of Trade confirmed this tariff, which the Venetians deemed "intolerable." It was heatedly disapproved of by the Levant Company, however, which expressed as much in a letter

---

[114] "The King to the Levant Company," December 22, 1663, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Volume*, 385.

[115] "Sir John Finch's Notebook," *HMC Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Allan George Finch, Volume 2*, 148.

[116] Ibid., 152.

[117] Sir John Finch's Notebook," *HMC Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Allan George Finch, Volume 2*, 153.

[118] Mather, *Pashas*, 136.

[119] "To the Most Illustrious Savii alla Mercanzia." May 9, 1673, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 38*, no. 71.

to Venetian authorities.[120] "So far as we are concerned we have never approved and what he has obtained was not at our instance, indeed directly opposite. In our opinion it is a charge that will injure trade and navigation," the Company wrote.[121] Nevertheless, the Company could do little to circumvent the will of the Crown. "I suspect that the merchants of the Levant Company here will not have the courage to say as much as they wrote," the Venetian secretary in England confided to his government.[122] Disheartened by the opposition they encountered from government officials, "they do not dare to venture any fresh remarks, anticipating difficulties and even greater obstinacy on the part of the Ministry." [123] Commercial policy had fallen firmly within the jurisdiction of the Crown.

## Conclusion

The Anglo-Ottoman relationship was initiated, in the 1570s, by two merchants who hoped to supplement and expand their Spanish and Russian commercial enterprises. In these early years, the impetus for establishing relations with the Porte came from private individuals rather than from the Crown. Consequently, the Levant Company controlled the appointment of English ambassadors to the Ottoman Empire. Although they did participate in diplomatic questions, such as potential Turkish naval intervention against Spain, the early ambassadors were all mercantile men who spent most of their lives in the service of the Company. Over the course of seventeenth century, however, this early model for Anglo-Ottoman relations underwent a gradual but significant change. The ambassadorship became more prestigious and more

---

[120] Ibid.
[121] "Letter Written from England upon the tariff of the Consul Hayes in reply to the merchants of this mart," March 6, 1673, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 38*, no. 72.
[122] "Girolamo Alberti, Venetian Secretary in England, to the Doge and Senate," June 2, 1673, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 38*, no. 83.
[123] "Girolamo Alberti, Venetian Secretary in England, to the Doge and Senate," June 9, 1673, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Volume 38*, no. 84.

aristocratic. Its occupants began to see themselves as servants of the king, rather than the Company, and the Crown took an increased interest in the commercial aspects of their role.

This shift in the nature of the ambassadorship, marked by turning points, in 1661, and 1691, resulted from the rise of trade as a matter of state. The ambassador's political role did not supersede his commercial function. Rather, the mercantile dimension of the ambassadorship became part of the ambassador's role as the Crown's representative. This altered role of England's ambassador at the Porte is significant because it is indicative of a broader change in the nature of the English government. As politics became less universalist, and more oriented towards the pragmatic benefits of economic dominance, commercial policy emerged as an aspect of the modern state.[124]

---

[124] Steve Pincus, "From holy cause to economic interest: the study of population and the invention of the state," in *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration*, Alan Craig Houston and Steven C. Pincus, eds. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 274-275.

# Bibliography

*Primary Sources*

Bent, J. Theodore. *Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1989.

Calendar of State Papers Domestic: James I.

Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles I.

Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles II.

Calendar of State Papers Domestic: William and Mary

Calendar of State Papers Foreign: Elizabeth.

Calendar of State Papers, Venetian.

Epstein, M. *The Early History of the Levant Company*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1968.

Hakluyt, Richard. *The Principal Navigations and Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the
English Nation*, *Volume 5*. New York: Macmillan, 1904.

Historical Manuscripts Commission. *Reports on the Manuscripts of the Late Allan George
Finch, Esq., of  Burley-on-the-Hill, Rutland, Volumes 1-4*. London: His Majesty's
Stationery Office, 1922.

Historical Manuscripts Commission. *Reports on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire,
preserved at Easthamstead Park, Berks, Volume 1*. London: His Majesty's Stationery
Office, 1924.

Knolles, Richard. *The General Historie of the Turkes from the first beginning o that Nation to
the rising of the Othoman Familie… Together with the lives and conquests of the
Othoman Kings and Emperors* (London, 1603).

Mundy, Peter. *The Travels of Peter Mundy, in Europe and Asia, 1608-1667*. Cambridge: The
Hakluyt Society, 1907.

Roberts, Lewes. *The Merchants Map of Commerce: wherein the universal manner and matter of trade is compendiously handled* (London, 1671).

Rosedale, H.G. *Queen Elizabeth and the Levant Company: A Diplomatic and Literary Episode of the Establishment of our Trade with Turkey*. London: Henry Frowde, 1904.

Rycaut, Paul. *The History of the Turkish Empire from the year 1623 to they year 1677* (London, 1668).

Sanderson, John. *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant, 1584-1602*. London: The Hakluyt Society,  1931.

Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey, 1578-1582: A Documentary Study of the First Anglo-Ottoman Relations*. London: Oxford University Press, 1977.

***Secondary Sources***

Anderson, Sonia P. *An English Consul in Turkey: Paul Rycaut at Smyrna, 1667-1678*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Ashton, Robert. 'Pindar, Sir Paul (1565/6–1650)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22291, accessed 21 Oct 2009]

Bell, Gary M. *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives, 1509-1688.* London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1990.

Braudel, Fernand. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Phillip II.* London: Harper Collins, 1992.

Brenner, Robert. *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550-1653.* London: Verso, 2003.

Brown, Michael J. *Itinerant Ambassador: The Life of Sir Thomas Roe*. Lexington: The
University of Kentucky Press, 1970.

Davies, J.D. 'Bulstrode, Sir Richard (1617–1711)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*,
Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3930, accessed 12 Dec 2009]

Epstein, M. *The Early History of the Levant Company*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1968.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Crisis and Change, 1590-1699." In *An Economic and Social History of the
Ottoman Empure, 1300-1914*, Halil Inalcik and Donald Quataert, eds. New York:
Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Games, Allison. *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560-
1660*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Gauci, Perry. *Emporium of the World: The Merchants of London 1660-1800*. New York:
Hambledon Continuum, 2007.

Gauci, Perry. *The Politics of Trade, The Overseas Merchant in State and Society, 1660-1720*.
New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Goffman, Daniel. *Britons in the Ottoman Empire, 1642-1660*. Seattle: University of Washington
Press, 1998.

Grassby, Richard. *The English Gentleman in Trade: The Life and Works of Sir Dudley North,
1641-1691*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Heywood, C.J. "English Diplomatic Relations with Turkey, 1689-1698." In *Four Centuries of
Turco-British Relations*, William Hale and Ali Ihsan Bagis, eds. North Humberside, UK:
The Eothen Press, 1984.

Heywood, C.J. "Sir Paul Rycaut, a Seventeenth-Century Observer of the Ottoman State: Notes for a Study," In *English and Continental Views of the Ottoman Empire: 1500-1800,* Ezel Kural Shaw and C.J. Heywood, eds. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1972.

Heywood, Colin. 'Paget, William, seventh Baron Paget (1637–1713)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21124, accessed 10 Dec 2009]

Horn, D.B. *British Diplomatic Representatives 1689-1789*. London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1932.

Inalcik, Halil. "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600." In *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914,* Halil Inalcik and Donald Quataert, eds. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996

Maclean, Gerald. *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Mather, James. *Pashas: Traders and Travellers in the Islamic World*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

McGowan, Bruce. *Economic Life in Ottoman Europe: Taxation, Trade, and the Struggle for Land, 1600-1800*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Pincus, Steve. "From holy cause to economic interest: the study of population and the invention of the state." In *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration*, Alan Craig Houston and Steven C. Pincus, eds. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Rabb, Theodore K. *Enterprise and Empire: Merchant and Gentry Investment in the Expansion of England, 1575-1630*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Skilliter, Susan. "William Harborne, The First English Ambassador, 1583-1588." In *Four Centuries of Turco-British Relations*, William Hale and Ali Ihsan Bagis, eds. North Humberside, UK: The Eothen Press, 1984.

Strachan. Michael. *Sir Thomas Roe: A Life*. Wiltshire: Michael Russel Ltd., 1989.

Vaughan, Dorothy M. *Europe and the Turk: A Pattern of Alliances 1350-1700*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1954.

Wood, Alfred Cecil. *A History of the Levant Company.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1935.

Woodhead, Christine. 'Barton, Edward (1562/3–1598)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1597, accessed 21 Oct 2009]

# *Quel horreur!*: Violence in Reformation France

By Christopher McFadin
Marquette University

> Oh happy victory!  It is to you alone Lord, not to us, the distinguished trophy of honor.  In one stroke you tore up the trunk, and the root, and the strewn earth of the heretical vermin.  Vermin, who were caught in snares that they had dared to set for your faithful subjects.  Oh favorable night!  Hour most desirable in which we placed our hope.[1]

> Michel de Roigny, On the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, 1572

The level of sectarian violence that erupted in Reformation France was extraordinary. Otherwise ordinary Catholics tortured their Huguenot neighbors to death and then afterwards mutilated their corpses, sometimes feeding the disfigured remains to farm animals.  Catholic children elicited applause from their coreligionists as they killed adult Huguenots by tearing them to pieces.  Huguenots assaulted Catholic priests during the Mass, pillaged Catholic churches, and desecrated the Host.  Indeed, as the sectarian duel increased in frequency and intensity, a man could be killed for calling someone a Huguenot; both sides used religion to rationalize the assassinations of dukes and kings.

Our understanding of this violence depends on the suspension of our twenty-first century attitudes toward violent behavior.  Norbert Elias reminds us in his influential work on the development of Western society that our modern view of violence has evolved over an extended period of time.  Specifically, Elias argues that the "courtization of warriors" and the monopolization of force by the state facilitated a "civilizing process" that originated within the

---

[1] Michel de Roigny, "Discours sur les occurrences des guerres intestines," (Paris, 1572), 4.  "O heureuse victoire! À toy seul est Seigneur, non a nous, le trophee insigne de l'honneur.  D'un coup as araché le tronc, & la racine, et la terre ionché, d'heretique vermine.  Vermine, qui se prit la buit dans les filets, quelle avoit osé tendre aux fidelles subiects.  O favorable nuict! Heure plus desiree, qu'elle n'avoit esté des nostres esperée."

European nobility and gradually penetrated the lower classes of European society.[2]  Over time,

this process transformed Western society so much so that what was once considered acceptable

behavior in early modern France—a duel in response to a verbal insult—now seems excessive.[3]

Thus, I would like to ask the reader to suspend judgment when considering early modern

violence in order to appreciate its normative aspect.[4]

Roman Catholicism, albeit with local variations, dominated Western European religious

life until the advent of the Reformation.[5]  The Catholic Church maintained this hegemony

because it violently prevented the spread of heterodox beliefs.[6]  A prominent example of this is

the Albigensian Crusade in which tens of thousands of French Cathars were killed from 1209-

1229.[7]  The vast majority of adherents to Catharism lived in southern France, the same

geographic area that was most receptive to Protestantism after 1572.[8]  Protestants acknowledged

this affinity as a crucial part of their identity, although recent scholarship has questioned the

extent to which Catharism was an established church with a coherent system of beliefs.[9]  Indeed,

---

[2] Norbert Elais, *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), 387-397; *Power and Civility: The Civilizing Process: Volume II*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982), 255-258.

[3] Stuart Carroll, *Blood and Violence in Early Modern France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 10.

[4] William Beik recognizes that the French crowd "had a tolerance of physical violence which we do not share," in "The Violence of the French Crowd from Charivari to Revolution," *Past and Present* 197 (2007): 86; and Denis Crouzet acknowledges the "immense distance" that separates us from our subject matter: "Face à cette fin du XVI$^e$ siècle, la distance est immense, car il faut reconnaître que les protagonistes de cette histoire sanglante étaient portés à penser et à agir en fonction de systèmes immédiats de l'imaginaire qui étaient spécifiques de leur époque." *La nuit de la Saint-Bathélemy: Un rêve perdu de la Renaissance* (Paris: Fayard, 1994), 12-13.

[5] Diarmaid MacCulloch, "The Second Pillar: Papal Primacy," in *The Reformation: A History* (New York: Penguin Books, 2003), 26-34.

[6] Contrary to what some historians have argued, heresy executions did not suddenly appear *ex nihilo* in the Reformation.  William Monter, "Heresy Executions in Reformation Europe, 1520-1565," in *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 61-62.

[7] The estimated number of casualties widely varies among the sources.

[8] Penny Roberts, "Calvinists in Troyes 1562-1572: The Legacy of Vassy and the Background to Saint Bartholomew," in *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* ed. Andrew Pettegree, Alastair Duke, and Gillian Lewis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 100.

[9] Luc Racaut, "Religious Polemic and Huguenot Self-Perception and Identity, 1554-1619," in *Society and Culture in the Huguenot World, 1559-1685* ed. Raymond A. Mentzer and Andrew Spicer (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 41; Mark Gregory Pegg, *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom*,

even during the conflict some crusaders were not sure whom to attack; one soldier supposedly asked the Cistercian abbot Arnaud Amalaric how to distinguish a heretic from a true believer. The abbot allegedly responded, "Kill them all!  God will recognize his own."[10]  The impulse to kill the adherents of heterodoxy was an integral part of medieval religiosity.

The existence of a widespread alternative faith in open conflict with the established church was a momentous innovation.[11]  Many sixteenth century Frenchmen responded to this situation with the same impulse to commit violence as their medieval forbearers.[12]  Thus, in the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, Catholics painted white crosses on their hats to identify themselves, and they killed anyone who did not follow suit.  Some Catholics were killed by mistake, and yet the rioters generally believed that God would not hold them accountable for the errors.[13]  The Reformation inherited more from the medieval period than a general tendency to commit violence against adherents of alternative belief systems; the forms of violence were themselves rooted in the Middle Ages.  An analysis of the violence that accompanied the Protestant and Catholic Reformations in France reveals patterns of behavior that can be categorized into distinct types of violence.  This conceptual framework will enable a deeper understanding of individual acts of violence in the Reformation.

---

(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).  Other scholars question the very existence of medieval heresy as a thing in itself: R.I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250*, 2nd ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 64.

[10] John C. Moore, *Pope Innocent III (1160/61-1216): To Root up and to Plant* (Boston: Brill, 2003), 180.

[11] Philip Benedict, "*Un roi, une loi, deux fois*: Parameters for the History of Catholic-Reformed Co-existence in France, 1555-1685," in *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*, ed. Ole Peter Grell and Bob Scribner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 68.

[12] Historians have noted several cases of peaceful coexistence between French Catholics and Protestants throughout the early modern period: Gregory Hanlon, *Confessions and Community in Seventeenth-Century France: Catholic and Protestant Coexistence in Aquitaine* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993); Robert Sauzet, *Contre-réforme et le réforme catholique en Bas-Languedoc: le diocèse de Nîmes au XVIIe siècle* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1979).

[13] Frederic J. Baumgartner, *Radical Reactionaries: The Political Thought of the French Catholic League* (Genève: Droz, 1975), 26-27.

## I. Popular Violence: The Crowd during the Wars of Religion

When                    [Coligny]                    promised                    himself
An assured victory
On the other foot he walked and danced
Because he was an infidel.
He wanted so much to massacre
The little lambs of the Great Shepherd
On account of his presumptuous pride,
He who was so vicious. [14]

Benoist Rigaud, On Coligny's role in the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre


Historian William Beik defines popular violence as the "social interaction involving threatened or real physical damage to persons or property, carried out by a group of individuals on the spot or through prior planning."[15] Popular violence can be divided into three categories: isolated actions committed by a group of people against one person; local rioting by a crowd against one or more targets; and open rebellion across multiple regions.[16] Religious motivations for violence are most clearly evident in the second of these categories. The majority of these religious riots took place during the decade from the Massacre at Vassy in 1562 to St. Bartholomew's Day in 1572, which historians have termed the "golden age of the religious riot."[17]

---

[14] Benoist Rigaud, "Discours contre les Huguenotz," (Lyon, 1573), 7. "Quand [Admiral Coligny] se promettoit/ Une victoire en asseurance/ D'un autre pied il marche en danse/ Parce qu'infidelle il estoit./ Aussi qu'il vouloit massacrer/ Par son orgueil presomptueux,/ Luy qui estoit tant vitieux,/ Les aigneletz du grand berger." http://contentdm.lib.byu.edu/cdm4/document.php?CISOROOT=/FrenchPolPa&CISOPTR=5491&REC=1

[15] William Beik adapts this definition in "The Violence of the French Crowd" (p. 78) from Charles Tilly, *The Politics of Collective Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 3-4.

[16] Julius Ruff, *Violence in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 184.

[17] Phillip Benedict, *Rouen During the Wars of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 238.

The terms "popular" and "collective" simply mean non-battlefield violence that was acceptable to, or practiced by, a crowd of the same religious identity.[18] The terms do not mean that every member of a particular religious denomination participated in the violence, or that most even approved of it. Thus, the definition of popular religious violence includes the Huguenots who vandalized Catholic churches as well as the Catholics who mutilated Huguenot corpses, even if most Huguenots and Catholics did not actually partake in this violence.

The typical religious riot was not an uncontrolled mob of religious fanatics roaming around town and committing random acts of violence. Rioters usually came from the *menu peuple*, those who "derived their livings from skilled or semiskilled crafts, shops, or small agricultural holdings."[19] The crowd was bound together by a social network: family members, friends, coworkers, and fellow parishioners typically rioted together.[20] Many riots occurred for local reasons and had specific targets. For example, in Dijon, in October 1561, Protestant businessmen started rioting because the authorities were unfairly favoring Catholic interests at the marketplace. Local wine growers, whose businesses bound them to the Roman Church, responded by starting their own riot, which forced the Protestants to leave Dijon.[21]

Men were not the only ones who rioted in Reformation France—women and children also played a prominent role. Since the Old Regime limited the criminal liability of women, they were easily tempted to act out public feelings of resentment with impunity.[22] Some of the most violent rioters were the youngest, usually less than fifteen years old. On July 23, 1562, in Paris, as soon as a Huguenot was executed for sedition, children seized the corpse, dragged it through

---

[18] Natalie Z. Davis defines popular violence as that which was committed "by people who were not acting *officially and formally* as agents of political and ecclesiastical authority." "Rites of Violence," in *Society and Culture in Early Modern France: Eight Essays by Natalie Zemon Davis* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), 153.

[19] Ruff, *Violence in Early Modern Europe*, 205.

[20] Ibid., 186-188.

[21] Robert J. Knecht, *The French Civil Wars, 1562-1598* (New York: Longman, 2000), 76-77.

[22] Ruff, *Violence in Early Modern Europe*, 206.

the mud, ripped it apart, and threw it into the river.[23]   Children displayed a propensity to participate in violence for two reasons: first, peer pressure served as a motivation to commit excessively violent actions; second, several studies have shown that young people are especially susceptible to propaganda.  The content of sermons and political pamphlets during the Wars of Religion was extremely divisive.  In other words, partisan leaders directed their vitriol against members of the opposing faith, and young people, more than any other demographic, took the rhetoric seriously.

The notion of legitimacy was a characteristic central to the religious riot.  The presence of leaders within the crowd was very important; they sanctioned the rioters' actions and allowed them to act freely.[24]  Crowd leadership also carried the added benefit of minimizing bloodshed. Massacres occurred because either the crowd's violence spiraled out of control or because the crowd lacked evident and decisive leadership.  In both cases, rioters sought to legitimize their actions by appealing to authority.  Riots frequently started with the ringing of the tocsin, the official sign for a civic emergency.[25]  Even in the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, the ultimate example of unrestricted bloodletting, Catholics believed that the king had sanctioned their actions—Henry Duke of Guise allegedly uttered, "It is the king's command."[26]  Since these words suggested that the violence represented the royal will, this utterance can be understood as the explanation for the bloody massacre.

A large and growing body of literature also suggests that early modern crowd violence was not blind violence.  Religious riots occurred for five main reasons.  First, crowds wanted to

---

[23] David Potter, ed. and trans., *The French Wars of Religion: Selected Documents* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 62.

[24] Davis, "Rites of Violence," 165-166.

[25] Ibid., 162.

[26] Barbara Diefendorf, *Beneath the Cross: Catholics and Huguenots in Sixteenth-Century Paris* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 99

carry out official justice by popular demand in reaction to a specific offense against the community. This motivation can be seen under the framework of a "moral economy," wherein the crowd acted defensively to restore a violated norm.[27] Crowds held a "legitimizing notion" of their actions: "…the men and women in the crowd were informed by the belief that they were defending traditional rights or customs; and, in general, that they were supported by the wider consensus of the community."[28] This violence was limited in scope and directed against defined targets. Although the term "moral economy" was originally intended to elicit meaning from English bread riots, historian Natalie Z. Davis applies this framework to the French religious riot, stating, "When the magistrate had not used his sword to defend the faith and the true church and to punish the idolaters, then the crowd would do it for him."[29] Consider the Parisian parish of Saint-Médard in the fall of 1561. Protestants, suspecting an attack, orchestrated an assault on their Catholic counterparts and led them to the Châtelet.[30] According to the "moral economy" paradigm, the crowd's actions should be understood as a response to a perceived injustice that the rioters sought to correct.

Second, crowds actively carried out justice when they believed the authorities were dysfunctional or deficient. For example, in 1551, a group of masked Protestants kidnapped a goldsmith's journeyman who had been found guilty of heresy in Lyon. The group eventually released him to the local magistrate, convinced that justice would be done.[31] Other riots explicitly usurped the function of the magistrates, either in mimicking their official roles or doing their jobs for them. Thus, in October 1572, in Provins, after a Huguenot was hanged for

---

[27] Neil Smelser classifies this type of violence as a "value-oriented movement." *Theory of Collective Behavior* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), 315.

[28] Edward P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," *Past and Present* 50 (1971): 78.

[29] Davis, "Rites of Violence," 161.

[30] Ibid., 162.

[31] Ibid., 163.

theft and murder, a dispute broke out among a group of Catholic boys about which way the corpse was to be dragged. The boys elected lawyers and a judge from among the group to argue the case in front of a hundred spectators. Once the direction was determined, they dragged the corpse through the streets and set it on fire.[32] Rioters also regularly took convicted criminals from the prison and carried out their sentences. This happened to a man named Bosroger who, since he was accused of being a Huguenot, was beaten and then shot to death by a Catholic mob in Rouen, in 1562. The mob left his corpse on the pavement, where it lay for twenty-eight hours.[33]

Third, religious rioters attacked the authorities with whom they disagreed. When the king was the object of their angst, they attacked symbols of his power. This was especially true during the reign of King Henry III, who promulgated the Edict of Beaulieu, in 1576, that gave Huguenots the right of public worship. Then, in December 1588, King Henry ordered the assassination of Henry I Duke of Guise, an influential member of the Catholic League. The next year, Duranti, the president of the Parlement of Toulouse, died at the hands of a mob because they believed he supported Henry's assassination of the Duke of Guise. The crowd dragged Duranti through the streets, hanged him alongside a picture of the king, and then pillaged his home. It was even rumored that a portrait of the king was buried with Duranti, an obvious indication of the king's unpopularity.[34]

Fourth, the crowd sought to provide for "the defense of true doctrine and the refutation of false doctrine through dramatic challenges and tests."[35] In other words, the crowd's religious

---

[32] Ibid., 163.
[33] Potter, ed. and trans., *The French Wars of Religion*, 61-62.
[34] Beik, "The Violence of the French Crowd," 85.
[35] Davis, "Rites of Violence," 156.

violence can be understood by appealing to an underlying belief system.[36]  Recall Saint-Médard's parish.  In December 1561, the church began tolling its bells to interrupt a nearby Huguenot service.  When a Protestant delegation failed to convince the Catholics to silence their bells, a fight broke out.  In the ensuing struggle, the Huguenots stole Saint-Médard's chalices and destroyed its statues and crosses.[37]  In this case, the belief systems of both polemics provided the motivation to disrupt the other's service.  Consider another example: after the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, Catholic crowds from Normandy and Provence stuffed pages of the Protestant Bible into the mouths and wounds of Huguenot corpses, saying, "They preached the truth of their God.  Let them call him to their aid."[38]  According to the Catholics in the crowd, this effectively demonstrated the inefficacy of Protestantism.

It was common for these "dramatic challenges" to occur during important religious festivals, a characteristic of ritualized violence from the medieval period.  In his seminal work, *Communities of Violence*, David Nirenberg argues that popular violence expressed communal identity.[39]  In order to make his case, Nirenberg explores the interactions between Christian, Jewish, and Islamic communities in southern France and the territories of the Crown of Aragon during the Middle Ages.  Nirenberg discovers that the three groups frequently participated in a dialogue of violence that defined social boundaries.  He further argues that communal violence was common and ritualized, especially during Holy Week, and that coexistence for these groups

---

[36] Benedict, *Rouen during the Wars of Religion*, 60.
[37] Diefendorf, *Beneath the Cross*, 61-62.
[38] Davis, "Rites of Violence," 157.
[39] *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998), 9.

"was in part predicated on such violence."[40]   Nirenberg finds that popular violence always targeted specific individuals for particular reasons and that the violence was usually non-lethal.

Nirenberg's analysis suggests that popular religious violence in the medieval period enforced a status quo.  The same theoretical structure applies to Catholic riots in the Wars of Religion.  For example, on Palm Sunday in 1561, Toulousain Huguenots decided to express their faith by orchestrating a procession of palms through the streets, the city's first major manifestation of Protestantism.  A few days later, the authorities sentenced an apothecary and a bookseller from Geneva, who were accused of participating in the procession, to be burned at the stake.[41]   Violence with startlingly similar roots recurred five years later during Pentecost at Pamiers.  Catholics usually celebrated Holy Day by singing and dancing around a statue of St. Anthony, which they carried around town in a procession.  In previous years, local Protestants disrupted the festivities by throwing stones at the Catholics.  But in 1566, when the Catholic procession reached a Protestant neighborhood, they began shouting, "Kill! Kill!," resulting in three days of fighting.[42]   In both of these examples, the perpetrators of the violence sought to discredit the belief system of their targets, and the specific context of a religious festival allowed them to do so.  The same theme recurred in other religious riots.

Violence frequently revolved around the Eucharist, one of the major sources of division in the Reformation.[43]   This was especially true whenever a priest carried the Host outside of the confines of a Catholic church.  While Catholics paused to kneel in front of the priest—men also removed their hats—Protestants who wished to deny the validity of the sacrament would remain

---

[40] Ibid., 200-202; 9.

[41] Pierre-Jean Souriac, "Du corps à corps au combat fictif.  Quand les catholiques toulousains affrontaient leurs homologues protestants," in *Les affrontements: Usages, discours et rituels*, ed. Frédérique Pitou and Jacqueline Sainclivier (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2008), 26.

[42] Ruff, *Violence in Early Modern Europe*, 200.

[43] Jason Sager, "Devotion and the Political: Sermon and Devotional Literature in the Reigns of Henri IV and Louis XIII, 1598-1643" (PhD diss., Wilfred Laurier University, 2007), 133-150.

standing, a sign of disrespect in the eyes of Catholic partisans. On a Sunday in March 1571, in Rouen, a group of Huguenots were walking to their own service as they passed a priest carrying the Host to a sick person. Catholics yelled at the Huguenots because they would not acknowledge the sacrament, and the Huguenots replied by throwing stones at the Catholics. A fight broke out, and forty Huguenots were killed.[44] It was especially common for violence to accompany Corpus Christi, a holy day on which priests prominently carried the Host, displayed in a monstrance, in a procession throughout town. In August 1562, a Huguenot bookseller refused to kneel in front of the procession, and Parisian children seized him, killed him by "tearing him to pieces," and then set his corpse on fire at a garbage dump.[45]

Popular violence did not always occur as a direct response to a specific provocation. The fifth motivation for popular violence started with the shift from attacking "the other" because of his beliefs, to attacking "the other" because he was "the other." This shift can be seen in the association of "the other" with garbage and pollution. In 1560, Huguenots from Rouen threw garbage at a Corpus Christi procession, and during the spring of 1572, Catholics hurled mud and garbage at houses belonging to Protestants near the Pont Notre-Dame.[46] This analogy can also be found in the pamphlets that circulated around French cities. Federicus Morellus, a cleric who witnessed the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, wrote a treatise in which he blames the civil wars on Admiral Gaspard de Coligny and "a few others" (*paucis aliis*).[47] He repeatedly refers to

---

[44] Knecht, *The French Civil Wars*, 160-161.

[45] Potter, ed. and trans., *The French Wars of Religion*, 62-63.

[46] Benedict, *Rouen during the Wars of Religion*, 61; Mack P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562-1629* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 80.

[47] Federicus Morellus, "Ornatissimi cuisdam Viri, De Rebus Gallicis, Ad Stanislaum Eluidium, Epistola," (n.p., 1573), 43.

these Huguenots throughout his tract as "a stain" (*macula*), "filth" (*limus*), and "pollution" (*pollutio*).[48]

The association of the other with pollution was deeply rooted in the medieval period. In *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, the eminent historian R. I. Moore argues that from the tenth to the thirteenth centuries, clerics and courtiers invented a new "rhetoric and a set of assumptions and procedures" that made persecution "more likely to happen" and "more severe and sustained for longer."[49] Moore understands persecution as any violent action or verbal insult that separated a targeted individual from the community, either through death or by exile. In other words, Moore's thesis proposes that the authorities created an environment in which persecution could be committed against heretics and Jews, and that this environment continued to exist long after the thirteenth century. This persecution took the form of communal purification, in which the authorities eradicated specific targets lest they pollute the community.[50] Although Moore admits that this type of persecution was not "popular violence," the same motivation clearly manifested itself in early modern religious riots.[51]

Catholics associated Protestantism with sexual deviance and libertinism, a perception that was reinforced by the secrecy of their services.[52] Huguenots were suspicious of the secrecy of the Catholic Mass, which was performed in Latin with the priest facing away from the congregation. In addition, Catholics thought that Protestants were planning a coup against the French government. A former Huguenot who converted to Catholicism, Pierre Charpentier, vouched for this conspiracy in a letter to his friend and former colleague François Portus, stating,

---

[48] Ibid., 40, 43.
[49] *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, 145.
[50] Ibid., 94-95.
[51] Ibid., 106-111.
[52] Brandon Hartley, "War and Tolerance: Catholic Polemic in Lyon During the French Religious Wars" (PhD diss., The University of Arizona, 2007), 155-158.

"For what does the "Cause" [of the Huguenots] have in common? I have learned that it does not pertain to the true worship of God, but has rebellion as its object."[53] The pollution analogy and the mutual suspicions of secrecy, combined with rumors of a grand Protestant conspiracy, provided a key shift towards the dehumanization of the enemy, which supplied a rationalization for exceedingly bloody violence.[54]

Both Catholics and Protestants believed that the only way to rid a community of "the polluting other" was by violently eliminating it.[55] However, the violence in Catholic communal purification differed from that of Protestant's. Whereas Catholics typically committed acts of violence against the bodies of their enemies, Protestants focused their energies on vandalizing Catholic property. The common way of eliminating waste products was by dumping them into a river, which is how Catholic crowds discarded enemy corpses throughout the Wars of Religion. This happened to a Huguenot military leader at Sens, who was dragged through the streets by children. At each street corner they stopped to burn his body with oven spits, and then threw his body, along with several other dead Huguenots, into the river Yonne.[56] Similarly, Protestants sought to eradicate Catholic idolatry by desecrating symbols of Catholicism, especially the Host. Huguenot expressions of iconoclasm happened across France throughout the Wars of Religion.[57]

The identification of patterns in religious violence, however, needs to be qualified in order to remain valid—not every example of popular religious violence follows this division. Huguenots usually focused their energies on assailing Catholic priests when attacking the bodies

---

[53] Pierre Charpentier, "Epistola ad Franciscum Portum Cretensem," (n.p., 1572), 3. "Quid enim comune habuit Caussa? Comperi eam ad verum Dei cultum non pertinere, sed ad rebellionem spectare." For Charpentier's background: Donald R. Kelley, *The Beginning of Ideology: Consciousness and Society in the French Reformation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 288.

[54] Davis, "Rites of Violence," 181.

[55] Denis Crouzet, *Guerriers de Dieu: La violence au temps des troubles de religion, (vers 1525- vers 1610)*. vol. 1 (Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 1990), 692-699.

[56] Potter, ed. and trans., *The French Wars of Religion*, 51-53.

[57] Benedict, *Rouen during the Wars of Religion*, 61.

of their enemies. For example, an audacious Huguenot wrestled the pastor of Saint-Séverin's parish to the floor during Mass on December 22, 1563.[58] Huguenots occasionally committed acts of mass murder, which happened at Reims in 1567, when the Protestants killed eighty Catholics.[59] Protestant armies also contributed to massacres, such as those at Beaugency and Mornas, in 1563.[60] French Catholics typically sought personal, financial gain when they attacked Huguenot property. This was especially true for Catholic militias; they pillaged Huguenot houses at Troyes, in April 1568.[61]

The different forms of communal purification undertaken by Catholics and Protestants occurred for two main reasons. Catholic violence reflected behavioral patterns of early modern French and European societies. A growing volume of scholarship has revealed rates of reported homicide and assault far above late twentieth and early twenty-first century levels. Moreover, close studies of early modern societies reveal that physical violence was not confined to the poor and marginalized. Elites possessed as ready a recourse to violence as their social inferiors, and riots were as common in early modern society as are strikes in modern society.[62] The real question, thus, is not why Catholics frequently resorted to physical violence as why Protestants eschewed it much of the time. The answer seems to lie in the fact that Huguenots were in the minority throughout France, even if they constituted a majority in specific urban areas in the

---

[58] Carroll, *Blood and Violence*, 273.

[59] David El Kenz, "Massacres during the Wars of Religion," *Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence*, ed. Jacques Semelin, (2007), http://www.massviolence.org/Article?id_article=6.

[60] Stuart Carroll, *Martyrs and Murderers: The Guise Family and the Making of Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 163.

[61] Penny Roberts, *A City in Conflict: Troyes during the French Wars of Religion* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1996), 132.

[62] Ruff, *Violence in Early Modern Europe*, 117-140; Malcolm Greenshields, *An Economy of Violence in Early Modern France: Crime and Justice in the Haute Auvergne, 1587-1664* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994), 67-69.

southern part of the country.[63]  In other words, Protestants had insufficient numerical strength to commit widespread and prolonged massacres, so they usually destroyed Catholic property and attacked Catholic priests instead.

Catholic crowds, however, often did not simply "purify" their communities by killing Protestants—they frequently continued to mutilate their corpses long after death in paradoxical desecration.  Examples abound in the primary sources, and Beik states that, "Most of the real cruelty, when it occurred, was inflicted on corpses, not on living persons."[64]  For instance, in Rouen, in February 1563, a crowd assembled to witness the execution of two criminals, one Catholic and one Protestant.  While the Catholic criminal recanted his sins and died in communion with the Roman Church, the Protestant refused to renounce his beliefs.  Instead of allowing the Protestant to die by hanging, as the order of his execution stated, the crowd cut the rope and lit a bonfire underneath his heels.  But before he died, the crowd hacked his body into pieces, dragged it through the streets, and dumped it into the river Seine.[65]  In another case, after the Battle of Cognat, in 1569, the body of a Protestant captain was exhumed by his Catholic enemies and stabbed several times.  They dragged the rotting corpse through the streets and then fed it to farm animals.[66]

Catholic crowds mutilated corpses for three main reasons.  First, the crowd wished to deny their target the dignity of a Christian burial.  If the Huguenots were not worthy of life, then they did not deserve the solace of a proper resting place.  Second, the crowd's anger was not satiated with the death of their target.  This explains why the crowd continued to inflict violence

---

[63] Bernd Moeller, *Imperial Cities and the Reformation: Three Essays*, ed. and trans. H.C. Erik Midelfort and Mark U. Edwards, Jr. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 41-49; Janin Garrisson-Estèbe, *Protestants du midi, 1559-1598* (Toulouse: Privat, 1980), 14.
[64] Beik, "The Violence of the French Crowd," 88.
[65] Benedict, *Rouen during the Wars of Religion*, 111.
[66] Carroll, *Blood and Violence*, 178.

on corpses long after the body could be recognized.  Third, the mutilation of corpses was not an impulse—it was a pan-European form of violence that predated the Reformation.[67]  The practice was not exclusive to mobs; the authorities also ordered the corpses of criminals to be dragged and mutilated in order to make an example for the community.  For instance, the Parlement of Paris issued an edict in 1573 stating,

> To repair these crimes, [the Parlement] has ordered and orders that the body of Coligny if found may, if it is intact, be taken by the executor of high justice, led, taken & dragged on the dirt… to be hanged in the gallows which for this purpose will be built & erected in front of the city hall… hanging there in the most high & eminent place.[68]

Thus, the category of popular violence involved more than crowd actions: communal purification and the mutilation of corpses were ordinary forms of violence inherited from the medieval period.

## II. Private Violence: The Duel and Tyrannicide

Cruel man of blood, barbarous hand, and infamous
Animal without reason, what made you pollute?
If Satan could prevail, to such an extent on your soul,
Why treacherously kill your true Prince?[69]

Soldat François, On the assassination of King Henry IV, 1610

Collective violence constitutes only a part of religious violence in the Reformation, for the rise of French Protestantism also influenced the individual level of private violence.  Private

---

[67] For examples of corpse mutilations between Italian Catholics, see: Edward Muir, *Mad Blood Stirring: Vendetta and Factions in Friuli during the Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 168-169; 198-200.

[68] Michel Iouer, "Les arrests de derniere execution," (Lyon, 1573), 3-4.  "Et pour reparation desdits crimes, a ordonné & ordonne que le corps dudit de Coligny, si trouver se peut, sinon en figure, sera prins par l'executeur de la haute iustice, mené, conduict & trainé sur une claye… illec pendu en une potence qui pour ce faire sera dressee & erigee devant l'hostel de ville… pendu en iceluy au plus haut & eminent lieu."

[69] Soldat François, "La deploration de la mort lamentable de Henry," (n.p., 1610), 4.  "Cruel homme de sang, main barbare, & infame/ Animal sans raison qui t'a faict polluer?/ Mais si Satan a peu, tant giagner sur ton ame,/ Que de traistreusement ton vray Prince tuer?"

and collective violence can be difficult to distinguish. Although both categories could involve several accomplices, the difference lies in the nature of the violence; private violence always occurred between individuals. However, the term "private" is not meant to imply secrecy, for it often occurred in full view of the community.[70] Similar to popular violence during the Wars of Religion, an analysis of the French duel and tyrannicide reveals deep connections between medieval and early modern private violence.

One type of private violence that played a prominent role in Reformation France was the duel, a form of dispute resolution rooted in the medieval period. In his influential work, *Land and Lordship*, Otto Brunner develops an understanding of the medieval Austrian feud that provides a background for discussion of the French duel. Brunner rejects the notion that the feud was an archaic phenomenon, flourishing prior to the establishment of a law-abiding society.[71] He argues that the feud represented a deep commitment to a "moral or legal duty" to exact retribution for an evil done, and, thus, was an integral part of the medieval Austrian judicial system.[72] In Brunner's analysis, private violence was intimately connected to the conception of justice, which was itself predicated upon a man's honor.[73] After the Wars of Religion, Frenchmen also believed that the right to bear arms and defend one's honor was an essential aspect of justice. Since a similar honor system existed in Reformation France, the same framework that Brunner posited for medieval Austrian violence can be applied to the French duel.

---

[70] Markku Peltonen, *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness, and Honor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 2.

[71] *Land and Lordship: Structures of Governance in Medieval Austria*, trans. Howard Kaminsky and James Van Horn Melton (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 23-24.

[72] Ibid., 19-21.

[73] Ibid., 42-43.

Before the sixteenth century, it was common for French nobles to resolve conflicts by resorting to judicial combat, where the victor won the judicial case.[74] The last time a judicial duel occurred in France was in 1547, when François de Vivonne, seigneur de la Châtaigneraye, battled Guy Chabot, comte de Jarnac, in front of the king.[75] It was also commonplace for young nobles to prove themselves by participating in a tournament of arms.[76] Both of these practices declined as adult males entered the military service during the Wars of Religion. When battle-hardened men returned from the field around the turn of the century, however, dueling quickly became the most popular mode of conflict resolution; the weakened French state was left with less control over private warfare.[77]

The duel reached its zenith of popularity during its "golden age" of the 1620s.[78] Historian François Billacois defines the duel as "a fight between two or several individuals (but always with equal numbers on each side), equally armed, for the purpose of either proving the truth of a disputed question or the valor, courage, and honor of each combatant."[79] A man's honor depended on objective criteria such as birth, titles and privileges, and subjective criteria like the opinions of others.[80] The frequency of dueling declined as a man aged; although, the elderly could theoretically challenge someone to a fight. For example, a man named Zamet fought two duels at the age of sixty.[81] For the most part, the classic French duel was exclusive to middle-aged men of the upper classes.

---

[74] Ibid., 15

[75] Ruff, *Violence in Early Modern Europe*, 77.

[76] Walton, *Policing Public Opinion*, 16.

[77] Frederic J. Baumgartner, *France in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 260.

[78] Carroll, *Blood and Violence*, 260-261.

[79] François Billacois, *The Duel: Its Rise and Fall in Early Modern France*, ed. and trans. by Trista Selous (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 5.

[80] Charles Walton, *Policing Public Opinion in the French Revolution: The Culture of Calumny and the Problem of Free Speech* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 43.

[81] Billacois, *The Duel*, 73.

Duels typically followed a pattern: someone impugned a man's honor, he issued a challenge to the offender, both sides agreed upon a weapon, and the two dueled. The weapon of choice in the French duel was the rapier, a one-handed sword that nobles usually carried on their persons. It was less common for duelers to use pistols, but it was standard for the duelers to fight on foot, without armor, and in public. Once the authorities outlawed the duel, combatants moved away from public areas and into the woods. This partly explains the lack of sources regarding the lethality of the duel, but the best estimate is that between 300 and 500 people died during the first few decades of the seventeenth century.[82] Duels often ended before someone died—each combatant usually brought his own "second" to stop the duel at the sight of first blood.

Duels between noblemen often took the form of "quarrels over precedence."[83] An insult over precedence could involve a simple gesture, such as refusing to completely remove one's hat in the presence of another gentleman. This is exactly what happened between two noblemen, Deslandes and Duplessis-Châtillon, in 1640. The ensuing fight spilled into the streets, resulting in wounds for both men.[84] Not every insult necessitated a duel, especially if the insulter was of a lower social standing. For instance, the Duke of Elbeuf—an illegitimate member of the royal family—refused to participate in a duel after a "simple gentleman" insulted him.[85] Insults over religion, however, were a guaranteed way to impugn a man's honor and instigate a duel. Since honor was considered "as important as life itself," it is not surprising that accusing a Catholic of being a Huguenot resulted in violence.[86]

---

[82] Ruff, *Violence in Early Modern Europe*, 79.
[83] Billacois, *The Duel*, 77-79.
[84] Carroll, *Blood and Violence*, 87.
[85] Billacois, *The Duel*, 74.
[86] Ruff, *Violence in Early Modern Europe*, 76.

Even though dueling was technically outlawed after 1602, it remained a common form of dispute resolution until Louis XIV's reign; the king did not want his nobles killing themselves. Historians estimate that noblemen comprised only about two percent, or 380,000, of France's population during the sixteenth century, and the non-battlefield deaths of noblemen put a strain on the military's leadership.[87] The monopolization of force by the state and the inculcation of less-violent behaviors in young men were also important factors. The establishment of institutions, such as the Academie d'Equitation, founded by Antoine de Pluvinel, in 1594, taught politeness and manners to young noblemen. During the seventeenth century, it became the mark of a gentleman to be cultured in this sense, although it was still important for him to be able to defend his own honor when the occasion arose.[88] Thus, just as the Reformation inherited the duel from the medieval period, the duel was passed down to later generations.

Another form of violence inherited from the medieval period was tyrannicide, which both Catholic and Protestant scholars countenanced.[89] The philosophical origins of tyrannicide can be traced all the way back to pre-Socratic philosophers. Throughout history, distinguished thinkers, such as Aristotle and Cicero, approved of the practice.[90] In the medieval period, John of Salisbury, and later Thomas Aquinas, sanctioned the killing of a head of state under certain conditions.[91] Thomas Aquinas appealed to Cicero to justify this position, stating, "Then indeed

---

[87] This figure is perhaps a relatively high estimate; Davis Bitton, *The French Nobility in Crisis, 1560-1640* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969), 40.

[88] Baumgartner, *France in the Sixteenth Century*, 262-263.

[89] This was an extremely controversial issue because what was anarchic regicide to one man was lawful tyrannicide to another. Harald E. Braun, *Juan de Mariana and Early Modern Spanish Political Thought* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 81.

[90] Oscar Jászi and John D. Lewis, *Against the Tyrant: The Theory and Tradition of Tyrannicide* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1957), 3-5.

[91] Roland Mousnier, *The Assassination of Henry IV: The Tyrannicide Problem and the Consolidation of the French Absolute Monarchy in the Early Seventeenth Century*, trans. Joan Spencer (New York: Faber and Faber, 1973), 104-105.

he who kills a tyrant for the liberation of his country, is praised, and he receives a reward."[92]  By

the sixteenth century, Catholics such as Juan Mariana, a Spanish Jesuit, who taught in Paris from

1569-1574, stipulated that if a leader qualified as a tyrant, then private citizens had a moral

responsibility to assassinate him.[93]  For Mariana, the religious affiliation of the tyrant functioned

as the most important qualifying criterion.[94]  Protestants, such as Theodore Beza, advanced a

somewhat different argument, positing that lesser magistrates should lead a rebellion in defense

of the true faith against a tyrant.[95]  Although speculating about what might justify tyrannicide

greatly differs from actually killing the king, the manifestations of tyrannicide in Reformation

France must be understood within these traditions.[96]  A brief consideration of the assassinations

of Henry I Duke of Guise (1588), King Henry III (1589), and King Henry IV (1610) reveals the

unique status of tyrannicide as an innovation from the Wars of Religion.

Henry I Duke of Guise formed the Holy Catholic League in 1576, an organization that

unsuccessfully sought to prevent the ascension of Henry III to the French throne.  The League

drew most of its members from the Parisian bourgeoisie, not the *menu people*, which gave its

leader tremendous political power.[97]  French Catholics knew Henry as their champion on the

battlefield; he commanded several military victories over the Huguenots in the Wars of Religion.

He was also popular because it was rumored that he had ordered the assassination of Admiral

---

[92] *Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, 44.2.2, vol. 8 of *Opera Omnia* ed. Stanislas Édouard Fretté and Paul Maré (Paris: Vivès, 1889), 591.  "Tunc enim qui ad liberationem patriae tyrannum occidit, laudatur, et praemium accipit."

[93] Alan Soons, *Juan de Mariana*, (Boston: Twayne, 1982), 59.  Most Jesuits disagreed with Mariana, and many thought tyrannicide was inherently unjustifiable; Harro Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540-1630* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 315-318.

[94] Richard Dessens, *La pensée politique de Jésuite espagnol Juan de Marian* (Lille: Atelier national de reproduction des thèses, 2003), 147-149.

[95] Robert D. Linder, *The Reformation Era* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2009), 133.

[96] J.W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1951), 304-308.

[97] Robert Descimon, *Qui etaient les seize? Mythes et réalités de la Ligue parisienne, 1585-1594* (Paris: Fédération des Sociétés Historiques et Archéologiques de Paris et de l'Ile-de France, 1983), 19.

Gaspard de Coligny, his Huguenot counterpart. The Duke of Guise also had designs on the throne. On May 12, 1588, the Day of the Barricades, the duke arrived in Paris, incited a revolt, and forced the king to flee the city, which left the Catholic League in control of France.

King Henry needed to act boldly if he was to reassert control over the country, so it is not surprising that the Duke of Guise met a violent end. On December 23, the king summoned the duke to the royal court and had him promptly assassinated. Interestingly, in order to preserve the honor of each individual present, multiple assassins killed the duke in a "collective act," stabbing him at the same time.[98] As a result, no single person could be blamed for the murder. King Henry also ordered the assassination of the duke's brother, Louis II, Cardinal of Guise, the next day. In the aftermath of two assassinations in which he was complicit, the king could not remain in control of the government, and he was forced to move with his Parlement to Tours. But the Duke of Guise's death carried far-reaching consequences. For the first time, a French king used religion as the state-sanctioned rationalization for murder, which qualified him as a tyrant in the eyes of many French Catholics, leading to the downfall of King Henry.

King Henry III was unpopular before the assassination of the Duke of Guise because he had aligned himself with Henry of Navarre, a Huguenot and future heir to the throne. After the duke's death, only a handful of cities remained loyal to the king, so he spent the remainder of his reign attempting to gain control of France.[99] On July 31, 1589, the king spent the night outside of Paris, at Saint-Cloud, planning to assault the capital.[100] On the next day, Jacques Clément, a twenty-two year old Dominican lay brother, pretended to have a confidential message for the king. Once he was close enough, Clément mortally wounded the king with a dagger that he had

---

[98] Orest Ranum, "The French Ritual of Tyrannicide in Late Sixteenth Century," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 11 (Spring 1980): 66.

[99] Nicolas Le Roux, *Un régicide au nom de Dieu: L'assassinat d'Henri III* (Paris: Gallimard, 2006), 224.

[100] Mousnier, *The Assassination of Henry IV*, 11.

concealed underneath his cloak.  The royal guards immediately killed Clément, and the king died the next day.[101]

The first case of tyrannicide in the Reformation sparked a joyous outburst amongst French Catholics.  This was understandable for Parisians, whose city was under siege by the king's army.  Jacques Clément's portrait was placed on the altars of several monasteries, Pope Sixtus V praised his actions, and many French churchmen even lobbied for his canonization.[102] Many Catholics saw the killing as a "miracle."[103]  The death of the king portended danger for future French monarchs.

Henry of Navarre, the future King Henry IV, was a Huguenot before he ascended to the throne, a serious concern for many Frenchmen.  After the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, Henry was compelled to nominally become Catholic, but he remained a Protestant at heart.[104] Pope Sixtus V passed a papal bull in 1585, dispossessing Henry of his rights to the crown because of his Protestant sympathies.[105]  As a result, several *politique* advisors urged Henry to publicly embrace Catholicism and submit to the pope's wishes, which André Maillard argued in a work published in 1585.[106]  Not only would the traditional ceremonies of royal succession have to be adjusted if the prince remained a Huguenot, but a Huguenot monarch would send confusing signals about national unity.[107]  On July 25, 1593, Henry publicly accepted the Roman faith at the abbey of Saint-Denis in the presence of several French bishops.[108]

---

[101] Victor Duruy, *A History of France*, trans. M. Carey (Boston: Wright and Potter, 1896), 363.

[102] Mousnier, *The Assassination of Henry IV*, 174.

[103] Crouzet, *Guerriers de Dieu*, vol. 2, 485.

[104] Ronald S. Love, *Blood and Religion: The Conscience of Henry IV, 1553-1593* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001), 66.

[105] Mousnier, *The Assassination of Henry IV*, 110.

[106] André Maillard, "Advertissement au Roy de Navarre de se reunir avec le Roy & la foy Catholique," (n.p., 1585), 4.  For Maillard's background, see: Baumgartner, *Radical Reactionaries*, 70-71.

[107] Ibid., 27; 30.

[108] Mousnier, *The Assassination of Henry IV*, 111.

Despite the eventual conversion of Henry and his ascension to the throne, other members of French society loathed the king for giving limited freedom of worship to the Huguenots in the 1598 Edict of Nantes. Catholic fundamentalists argued that the king embodied the definition of a tyrant, necessitating his assassination.[109] Catholic zealot, François Ravaillac believed that if the king was murdered, then the Wars of Religion would resume and France would be purged of Protestantism once and for all. On May 14, 1610, Ravaillac successfully entered the king's carriage—which was fortuitously exposed due to slow traffic—and stabbed him to death.[110] Although he never admitted to having any accomplices, the logistics of Ravaillac's attack suggest a wider conspiracy to murder the king.[111] Ravaillac was tortured with "pincers, molten lead, boiling oil, burning pitch, and molten wax" before he was "dismembered by four horses" and his remains were "reduced to ashes and thrown to the wind."[112] This punishment was unprecedented only because it combined several pre-existing methods of torture within one victim.[113] Just as the ideology supporting tyrannicide predated the sixteenth century, so too did the punishments for it.

### III. Coexistence and Toleration

Certainly not every Frenchman participated in religious violence, and many were vehemently opposed to the civil wars.[114] For example, one pamphlet written in 1568 by an anonymous author states, "Of all the evils that the civil wars have brought to France, certainly the most deplorable and the most pernicious is… violence…. Unto whom God has given the

---

[109] Ibid., 158-183.
[110] Ibid., 24.
[111] Ibid., 28.
[112] Simon H. Cuttler, *The Law of Treason and Treason Trials in Later Medieval France* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 116.
[113] Ibid., 117-119.
[114] This is a general characteristic of popular violence. Charles Tilly, *The Politics of Collective Violence*, 12.

grace to see and to know the proper remedies for the [war], the consequence of dubious weapons, closes their mouths and ties their hands."[115] Even during the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, a relatively small minority of Parisian Catholics carried out the bloodletting while the vast majority of Catholics remained at home.[116]

At the same time, not every Frenchman supported the cessation of the Wars of Religion. Some Catholics despised Henry IV's policies of religious coexistence so much so that they decided to exile themselves from France. The majority of these people came from the Parisian wing of the Catholic League, and found a home in the homogenously Catholic city of Brussels.[117] Historians Robert Descimon and José Javier Ruiz Ibáñez, when discussing reasons for the Leaguer's exodus, state, "The Leaguers were Christians who struggled to reform themselves, they were not unconditional Tridentines; they became so out of necessity, because the Catholic Reformation was the only credible response to the Protestant Reformation…."[118] Once it became apparent in the 1590s that Protestantism was a permanent part of France, Catholic Leaguers were forced to choose between a multi-religious community or exile.

Given the endemic violence of the Wars of Religion, it is perplexing that early modern France produced the first European experiment with religious coexistence. The Edict of Beaulieu (1576), the Edict of Poitiers (1577), and the Edit of Nantes (1598) gave Protestants unprecedented, although qualified, rights to freedom of worship. And yet, religious violence did not simply fade into the past after the Edict of Nantes. The mutilation of corpses persisted

---

[115] "Exhortation à la Paix," (n.p., 1568), 2. "Entre les maux, que les guerres civiles ont apportez à la France, cestuicy le plus deplorable & le plus pernicieux est…violence…. Ausquels Dieu ait fait la grace de voir & cognoistre les remedes propes pour c'est effect, le douteux evenemet des armes les rend irresolus, & le peu d'asseurance qu'ils ont, leur ferme la bouch, & leur lie les mains."

[116] Diefendorf, *Beneath the Cross*, 104-105.

[117] Robert Descimon and José Javier Ruiz Ibáñez, *Les Ligueurs de l'exil: Le refuge catholique français après 1594* (Seyssel, France: Champ Vallon, 2005), 67-68.

[118] Ibid., 46.

throughout the early modern period, noblemen continued to duel into the twentieth century, and the speculative justifications for regicide remained powerful after the Wars of Religion.[119] Religious tolerance was not always assured; in the 1685 Edict of Fontainebleau, King Louis XIV revoked the rights granted to Huguenots almost a century earlier. Thus, just as the patterns of violence inherited by Frenchmen in the Protestant and Catholic Reformations derived from the medieval period, the same forms of violence persisted throughout France long after the sixteenth century. Violence from the Reformation, in particular, is susceptible to categorization. If this typology is applied to other periods of history, then historians could analyze and understand individual acts of violence within a broader conceptual framework.

---

[119] William Beik, *Urban Protest in Seventeenth-Century France: The Culture of Retribution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres, 1997), 68-69; Billacois, *The Duel*, 182-188.

Bibliography

*Primary Sources*

Aquinas, Thomas.  *Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, 44.2.2, vol. 8 of *Opera Omnia*, edited by Stanislas Édouard Fretté and Paul Maré.  Paris: Vivès, 1889.

Charpentier, Pierre.  "Epistola ad Franciscum Portum Cretensem, in qua docetur persecutiones Ecclesiarum Galliae, non culpa eorum qui religionem profitebantur, sed eorum qui factionem & conspirationem (quae caussa appellabatur) fovebat, accidisse."  N.p., 1572.  Newberry Library.

"Exhortation à la paix."  N.p., 1568.  Newberry Library.

François, Soldat.  "La deploration de la mort lamentable de Henry le Grand Roy de France & de Navarre, monstreusement assassiné par un garnement parricide endiablé, le 14 May 1610."  N.p., 1610.  Newberry Library.

Iouer, Michel.  "Les arrests de derniere execution, contre Gaspar de Coligny qui fut Admiral de France, François Briquemault, & Renauld de Cauaignes."  Lyon, 1573.  Newberry Library.

Maillard, André.  "Advertissement au Roy de Navarre de se reunir avec le Roy & la foy Catholique."  N.p., 1585.  L. Tom Perry Special Collections at Brigham Young University.  http://contentdm.lib.byu.edu/cdm4/document.php?CISOROOT=/FrenchPolPa&CISOPTR=15895&REC=1 (accessed October 15, 2009).

Morellus, Federicus.  "Ornatissimi cuiusdam Viri, De Rebus Gallicis, Ad Stanslaum Eluidium, Epistola."  N.p., 1573.  Harvard College Library.

Rigaud, Benoist.  "Discours contre les Huguenotz, auquel est contenue & declaree la source de leur damnable religion.  Aussi est fait metion de la iuste vengeance que Dieu a prins d'eux & qu'il prendra à l'aduenir, s'ils ne font penitence.  En iceluy est d'auantage cotenue vne admonition à tous fidelles Chrestiens pour les aduertir de rendre graces à Dieu & au Roy d'vne telle victoire."  Lyon, 1573.  L. Tom Perry Special Collections at Brigham Young University.  http://contentdm.lib.byu.edu/cdm4/document.php?CISOROOT=/FrenchPolPa&CISOPTR=5491&REC=1 (accessed October 21, 2009).

Roigny, Michel.  "Discours sur les occurrences des guerres intestines de ce Royaume, et de la iustice de Dieu contre les rebelles au Roy, & comme de droict diuin, est licite à sa maiesté punir ses subiets, pour la religion violée."  Paris, 1572.  Newberry Library.

*Secondary Sources*

Allen, J.W.  *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*.  London: Methuen, 1951.

Baumgartner, Frederic J.  *France in the Sixteenth Century*.  New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

-----.  *Radical Reactionaries: The Political Thought of the French Catholic League*.  Genève: Droz, 1975.

Beik, William.  *Urban Protest in Seventeenth-Century France: The Culture of Retribution*.  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

-----.  "The Violence of the French Crowd from Charivari to Revolution."  *Past and Present* 197 (2007): 75-110.

Benedict, Philip.  *Rouen during the Wars of Religion*.  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

-----.  "*Un roi, une loi, deux fois*: Parameters for the History of Catholic-Reformed Co-existence in France, 1555-1685."  In *Tolerance and Intolerance in Reformation Europe*, edited by Ole Peter Grell and Bob Scribner.  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Billacois, François.  *The Duel: Its Rise and Fall in Early Modern France*.  Edited and translated by Trista Selous (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990)

Bitton, Davis.  *The French Nobility in Crisis, 1560-1640*.  Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969.

Braun, Harald E.  *Juan de Mariana and Early Modern Spanish Political Thought*.  Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.

Brunner, Otto.  *Land and Lordship: Structures of Governance in Medieval Austria*.  Translated by Howard Kaminsky and James Van Horn Melton.  Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.

Carroll, Stuart.  *Blood and Violence in Early Modern France*.  Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

-----.  *Martyrs and Murderers: The Guise Family and the Making of Europe*.  Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Crouzet, Denis.  *Les guerriers de Dieu: La violence au temps des troubles de religion (vers 1525 vers 1610)*.  Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 1990.

-----.  *La nuit de Saint-Barthélemy: Un rêve perdu de la Renaissance*.  Paris: Fayard, 1994.

Cuttler, Simon H.  *The Law of Treason and Treason Trials in Later Medieval France*.  New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Davis, Natalie Z.  "The Rites of Violence."  In *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*, 152-187.  Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975.

Descimon, Robert.  *Qui était les Seize? Mythes et réalités de la Ligue parisienne, 1585-1594*, (34).  Paris: Fédération des Sociétés Historiques et Archéologiques de Paris et de l'Ile-de France, 1983.

Descimon, Robert and José Javier Ruiz Ibáñez.  *Les Ligueurs de l'exil: Le refuge catholique français après 1594*.  Seyssel, France: Champ Vallon, 2005.

Dessens, Richard.  *La pensée politique de Jésuite espagnol Juan de Marian*.  Lille: Atelier national de reproduction des thèses, 2003.

Diefendorf, Barbara. *Beneath the Cross: Catholics and Huguenots in Sixteenth-Century Paris*.  New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Duruy, Victor.  *A History of France*.  Translated M. Carey.  Boston: Wright and Potter, 1896.

El Kenz, David.  "Massacres during the Wars of Religion."  *Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence*, edited by Jacques Semelin.  2007.  http://www.massviolence.org/Article?id_article=6

Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*, translated by Edmund Jephcott.  Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

-----.  *Power and Civility: The Civilizing Process: Volume II*, translated by Edmund Jephcott.  New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

Garrisson-Estèbe, Janine.  *Protestants du Midi, 1559-1598*.  Toulouse: Privat, 1980.

Greenshields, Malcolm.  *An Economy of Violence in Early Modern France: Crime and Justice in the Haute Auvergne, 1587-1664*.  University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994.

Hanlon, Gregory.  *Confessions and Community in Seventeenth-Century France: Catholic and Protestant Coexistence in Aquitaine*.  Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

Hartley, Brandon.  "War and Tolerance: Catholic Polemic in Lyon during the French Religious Wars."  PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2007.

Holt, Mack P. *The French Wars of Religion, 1562-1629*, 2nd ed.  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Höpfl, Harro.  *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540-1630.*  New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Jászi, Oscar and John D. Lewis.  *Against the Tyrant: The Theory and Tradition of Tyrannicide.*  Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1957.

Kelley, Donald R.  *The Beginning of Ideology: Consciousness and Society in the French Reformation.*  New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Knecht, Robert J.  *The French Civil Wars, 1562-1598.*  New York: Longman, 2000.

Le Roux, Nicolas.  *Un régicide au nom de Dieu: L'assassinat d'Henri III.*  Paris: Gallimard, 2006.

Linder, Robert D.  *The Reformation Era.*  Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2009.

Love, Ronald S.  *Blood and Religion: The Conscience of Henry IV, 1553-1593.*  Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid.  "The Second Pillar: Papal Primacy."  In *The Reformation: A History*, 26-34. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.

Moeller, Bernd.  *Imperial Cities and the Reformation: Three Essays*, edited and translated by H.C. Erik Midelfort and Mark U. Edwards, Jr.  Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.

Monter, William.  "Heresy Executions in Reformation Europe, 1520-1565."  In *Tolerance and Intolerance in Reformation Europe*, edited by Ole Peter Grell and Bob Scribner, 48-64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Moore, John C.  *Pope Innocent III (1160/61-1216): To Root up and to Plant.*  Boston: Brill, 2003.

Moore, R.I.  *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250*, 2nd ed.  Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Mousnier, Roland.  *The Assassination of Henry IV: The Tyrannicide Problem and the Consolidation of the French Absolute Monarchy in the Early Seventeenth Century.*  Translated by Joan Spencer.  New York: Faber and Faber, 1973.

Muir, Edward.  *Mad Blood Stirring: Vendetta and Factions in Friuli during the Renaissance.*  Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Nirenberg, David.  *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages.*  Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Pegg, Mark Gregory.  *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom*.  Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Peltonen, Markku.  *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness, and Honor*.  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Potter, David, editor and translator.  *The French Wars of Religion: Selected Documents*.  New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Racaut, Luc.  "Religious Polemic and Huguenot Self-Perception and Identity, 1554-1619."  In *Society and Culture in the Huguenot World, 1559-1685*, edited by Raymond A. Mentzer and Andrew Spicer, 29-43.  New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Ranum, Orest.  "The French Ritual of Tyrannicide in Late Sixteenth Century."  *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 11 (Spring 1980): 63-82.

Roberts, Penny.  "Calvinists in Troyes 1562-1572: The Legacy of Vassy and the Background to Saint Bartholomew."  In *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620*, edited by Andrew Pettegree, Alastair Duke, and Gillian Lewis, 100-118.  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

-----.  *A City in Conflict: Troyes during the French Wars of Religion*.  Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Ruff, Julius R.  *Violence in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800*.  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Sager, Jason.  "Devotion and the Political: Sermon and Devotional Literature in the Reigns of Henry IV and Louis XIII, 1598-1623."  PhD diss., Wilfred Laurier University, 2007.

Sauzet, Robert.  *Contre-réforme et le réforme catholique en Bas-Languedoc: le diocèse de Nîmes au XVII$^e$ siècle*.  Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1979.

Smelser, Neil J.  *Theory of Collective Behavior*.  New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Soons, Alan.  *Juan de Mariana*.  Boston: Twayne, 1982.

Souriac, Pierre-Jean.  "Du corps à corps au comabt factif.  Quand les catholiques toulousains affrontaient leurs homologues protestants."  In *Les affrontements: Usages, discours et rituels*, edited by Frédérique Pitou and Jacqueline Sainclivier, 23-43.  Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2008.

Thompson, Edward P.  "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century."  *Past and Present* 50 (1971): 76-136.

Tilly, Charles.  *The Politics of Collective Violence.*  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Walton, Charles.  *Policing Public Opinion in the French Revolution: The Culture of Calumny and the Problem of Free Speech.*  New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

*Albuquerque Remembered*. **By Howard Bryan. (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2006. Paperback, Pp. 296, $19.95)**

Although New Mexico is among the most recent states admitted to the Union, it has a rich history that predates the earliest New England colonial settlements. In 2006, the state's largest town, Albuquerque, celebrated its 300th anniversary. In his detailed history of the Duke City, *Albuquerque Remembered*, Howard Bryan leads the reader through the 400 years of tumultuous events that shaped the city now adorning the Rio Grande. In a way that only a newspaper reporter of forty-two years can convey, Bryan tells Albuquerque's many stories through the personalities and events that make the city all that it is today.

Present-day New Mexico is heralded for its cultural diversity; a direct result of the chapters of history through which the pueblos, then the territory, and now the state have traveled. Bryan's lineage begins in the mid 16th Century, when Spanish conquistador Francisco Vasquez de Coronado first explored the Native American civilizations residing in the American Southwest, in search of Cibola: the Seven Cities of Gold. Amid a series of brutal racial wars between the Spaniards and the native Pueblo Indians, European culture took root in Santa Fe, and later Albuquerque, spread by the work of Catholic missionaries. As power changed hands, Spanish flags were replaced with the Star-Spangled Banner, and Catholic missionaries gave way to the racy cultures of the Wild West. Through wealthy merchants and civic-minded benefactors, Albuquerque became an economic engine for the state and the Southwest, and grew into the cultural center it is today.

Bryan's journalistic style provides for a detailed, unbiased perspective of the rough history of New Mexico and Albuquerque. His book is an important account of the unique and multi-faceted culture of the American Southwest.  The photos Bryan includes save the reader a trip to the Albuquerque Museum and tell intricate stories about the economic activities and civic leaders that transformed Albuquerque from a Spanish villa, to an American railroad town, to its present day cultural center. Although some accounts seem superfluous, Bryan pulls the multitude of stories and events together to provide a larger picture of Albuquerque's evolution. Bryan's descriptions explain many of the Duke City's prized attributes, including the introduction of hot air ballooning by Park Van Tassel, the development of a city around a railroad station, and, of course, the events of the annual state fair (which began as a territorial fair).

*Albuquerque, Remembered* gives residents, and tourists alike, a context with which to explore the current city. Traces of New Mexico's varied ancestral influences can be found today in the pueblos surrounding Albuquerque, in Albuquerque's Old Town, and at the annual International Balloon Fiesta. The city is inviting and intriguing, but before you visit, read the story behind the city.

Jake Wellman
University of New Mexico

***Cherokee Removal: Before and After*. Edited by William L. Anderson. (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1991. Paperback, Pp. 176, $22.95)**

William L. Anderson's book *Cherokee Removal: Before and After* does not offer new information about one of our nation's largest and most influential tribes. However, it does provide the reader with an understanding of the history of the Cherokee Nation, one whose importance is rarely stressed in secondary or collegiate education.

Anderson, who serves as Editor of the work, compiles six essays from experts in the study of the history of the Cherokee Nation. His compilation provides an interdisciplinary review of the life of the Cherokee Indians from roughly the seventeenth century to the time following *Nunna dual Isuny*, or, as translated into English, The Trail Where We Cried.

The Cherokee Nation, which originally consisted of a large portion of the Southeast United States, eventually shrunk to only small pieces of a few Southern states. The first chapter of *Cherokee Removal* documents the manner in which the Cherokee utilized their land. Throughout the course of this chapter, the reader understands that the Cherokee adopted Anglo culture and agrarian methods in order to survive a loss in wild game, and to assimilate to Euro-American culture, one way to avoid removal. The chapter includes maps and figures that help the reader understand the Cherokee's transition to a more agricultural-based society.

Subsequent chapters center on the political and social methods that led to the removal of the Cherokee by the federal government. This study focuses on the policies of President Andrew Jackson, and examines the theory that Jackson was a devil with a deep-seeded hatred of Indians. The book also discusses the eventual split of the political and social culture in Cherokee Country, and the unauthorized individuals who signed the Treaty of New Echota on behalf of the Cherokee Nation, which effectively removed the Cherokee from their homeland, forcing them west.

Importantly, *Cherokee Removal* examines the Trail of Tears and the federal government's inhumanity, which resulted in the deaths of at least four thousand Cherokee, a number that the author argues, may be much higher. In order to help the reader grasp the magnitude of the proceedings, Anderson includes personal accounts, maps, and other information. Finally, Anderson incorporates two chapters that discuss the outcomes and consequences of the Trail of Tears on Cherokee life in what is now Oklahoma.

*Cherokee Removal: Before and After* includes historical information for readers of all academic backgrounds and interests; although many readers may find multiple portions of this book uninteresting. Because the book is a compilation of multiple authors, the text sometimes repeats itself and reads like a textbook.

That being said, I would recommend anyone who lives in the Southern United States to read this book. The culture and history of the Cherokee people is one that is historically significant to the creation of this country, our states, and even some of our families. There are so many questions about the Cherokee Nation; expect many of these to be addressed in subsequent texts. Moreover, although this book is not lengthy, it could be used for study in a secondary or collegiate level classroom. To say the least, *Cherokee Removal: Before and After* is an important read about American history.

Kenneth E. Barton III
Hampton University

**Glazed America: A History of the Doughnut by Paul R. Mullins. (Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 2008. Cloth cover, Pp. 224, $24.95)**

In 1941, a surgeon named J. Howard Crum proposed an unusual weight loss plan—the eight-doughnut-a-day diet. Crum claimed that the doughnut was "a nutritious healthful food…enjoyed and relished by most people" (Mullins, 124). Crum was a shill, of course, bought and paid for by the Doughnut Corporation of America. But, the fact that even a few people took him seriously is proof that America is madly in love with doughnuts—an infatuation that Paul R. Mullins explores in his engaging book *Glazed America: A History of the Doughnut*.

Mullins begins with a brief history of the doughnut. He traces the treat back to the ancient Hebrews, citing a Biblical passage about "cakes mingled with oil, of fine flour, fried" (34). The grandfather of the modern doughnut was the Dutch *oly-koek*, a fried dough lump sprinkled with nuts or raisins. Eventually, the *oly-koek* gave way to American "crullers" and "dough-nuts." These early doughnuts were not ring-shaped; they were often cut into fanciful patterns, and one cookbook offered the vague instruction to "make them into what form you please" (46). Twentieth-century technological advances—such as the invention of doughnut-making machines and the introduction of premixed doughnut flour—allowed for the dessert's mass production. The rise of American commuter culture led to a proliferation of roadside doughnut stands in the 1940s and 50s. What better way to enjoy a family outing than with a box of glazed doughnuts?

The next three chapters of *Glazed America* provide an analysis of the doughnut's role in American culture. Mullins describes how the doughnut has become an unlikely political battleground. Some see it as a manifestation of everything wrong with America. To these critics, the doughnut symbolizes greed, laziness, and obesity. Doughnuts, Mullins writes, "have been transparently moralized as 'bad' foods symptomatic of a variety of individual and social evils" (121). Others take pride in the humble doughnut. Eating doughnuts has become an act of resistance against "food Nazis," a celebration of the right to do what one pleases, calories and cholesterol be damned. Whether good or evil, doughnuts are almost impossible to avoid in American life. Mullins chronicles the various venues of doughnut consumption: in doughnut shops, in cars, in churches and schools and offices and at weddings…the list continues.

To back up his arguments, Mullins draws on a rich variety of sources, ranging from nineteenth-century cookbooks to episodes of *The Simpsons*. Though his case is convincing, it is also limited. Mullins links the doughnut with mass-produced comfort foods like hamburgers and ice cream. Doughnuts, after all, came of age during the drive-in era that also gave us the Big Mac. So, how is the doughnut any different than, say, a McDonald's burger? Why does it merit a book all its own? Mullins writes, "doughnuts provide an insight into who we want to be and who we think we are" (5)—one of the few instances where he slips into turgid sociology-speak—but the same could be said for any fast food.

Mullins also spends too much time on a doughnut culture that may not even exist anymore. In recent times, the doughnut has shed the blue-collar image that Mullins spends pages dissecting. Nowadays, doughnuts are more associated with white-collar drones than with lunchpail-toting hardhats. Mullins gestures in that direction, including a quote about how doughnut-related obesity is not a disease of "working-class stiffs" but rather the result of "highly educated people dunking doughnuts…while hunched over a computer screen" (148). Yet, he goes no further in this regard. It is a blind spot in an otherwise scrupulously thorough book.

*Glazed America* is not a filling book. At less than 250 pages, it goes down quickly. Nor is it particularly substantial. It is, however, light and enjoyable, the literary equivalent of a Krispy Kreme served piping hot from the oven.

Will Schultz
University of North Carolina

***School Resegregation: Must the South Turn Back?*** **Edited By John Charles Boger and Gary Orfield. (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2005. Paperback, Pp. 380, $24.95)**

Initially presented at a 2002 University of North Carolina symposium, the research contained in *School Resegregation: Must the South Turn Back?* provides a comprehensive collection of the scholarly works discussed at the conference. While these collective works focus primarily on trends in school demographics, the researchers also explore secondary influences of school assignment patterns, including the expanding and contracting role of the federal judiciary; the potential correlation to changing housing demographics; and varying elements alleged to influence student achievement in minority schools. *School Resegregation* establishes the obstacles plaguing public school integration, initially identifying the role of the courts. Opening with a historical perspective, former Duke University Professor of Law Erwin Chemerinsky is heavily critical of the declared unitary public school districts that have resulted in a reduced judicial presence during the development of integration policies and a failure to sustain the long-term desegregation progress that began in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* (1971) (32-38). Specifically, Chemerinsky uses current resegregation trends to attack the Court's decisions in *Milliken v. Bradley* (a decision overruling inter-district remedies to segregation), *San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez* (1973) (a decision upholding disparities in education funds obtained through property taxes), and *Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver Colorado* (1973) (a decision shifting the burden of proof to plaintiffs alleging intentional acts of segregation).

Subsequent entries attempt to support findings through methodically designed empirical research, evaluating competing educational theories to find numerical trends and substantive data. Through multiple case studies, Roslyn Arlin Mickelson, a Professor of Sociology at University of North Carolina at Charlotte, and Luis M. Laosa, former chief psychologist of a large Texas school district, find support for claims of resegregation by exploring school composition in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School District and the Texas public school system, respectively. By identifying trends of resegregation between school districts, within school districts, and among various academic tracks within the classroom, the researchers identify the problem through comprehensive analysis. Additionally, the research explores the association of public school segregation trends with standardized testing scores and residential housing patters. Russell W. Rumberger, a Professor of Education at the University of California at Santa Barbara, and Gregory J. Palardy, an Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Georgia, find that Southern schools differ from non-Southern schools, illustrating that in southern schools "with whom children go to school rather than where they go to school matters" (145). Drawing upon these conclusions, Rumberger and Palardy suggest the implementation of correctional policies, designed to redistribute students or increase the quality of low-performing schools. *School Resegregation* concludes with Susan Leigh Flinspach, a researcher at the University of California at Santa Cruz, and Karen E. Banks, an assistant superintendent for the Wake County Public School System, evaluating the race-neutral policies of the Wake County Public School System, and noting the achieved success through school assignment policies based on student achievement and socioeconomic factors.

At times, the writing deviates from the research and makes politically charged allegations without evaluating the opposing view. Additionally, elements of individual pieces of research fail to identify practical benefits associated with the findings, leading to inconclusive assumptions that the findings would improve student achievement results. Nevertheless, the

collection of research presented in *School Resegregation* is both comprehensive in nature and sound in argument, providing necessary historical background information, establishing a problem and illustrating its negative effects, and assessing solutions attempted since *Brown v. Board of Education*. I recommend this book for anyone seeking to gain comprehensive knowledge of trends in education and the effects of current educational policies.

Benjamin W. Lynch
Wake Forest University