

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY SCRIBAL CULTURE AND
 “A DIALOGUE BETWEEN KING JAMES AND KING WILLIAM”

BY ERIN KELLY

The latter portion of the seventeenth century saw the emergence of a number of institutions and practices whose existence we may take for granted in the modern era: the two-party parliamentary system pitted Whigs against Tories, the Royal Society formalized many aspects of empirical science, and the Stationers' Company lost their monopoly over publication rights, effectively paving the way for modern copyright law. These changes emerged out of a tumultuous political context: England had been plunged into civil war in the middle of the century, and even the restoration of the monarchy did not entirely stifle those in parliament who opposed the monarch's absolute power. The power struggle between the king and Parliament had a direct impact on England's book industry: the first Cavalier Parliament of 1662 – only two years after the Restoration – revived the Licensing Act in an attempt to exercise power over what material was allowed to be printed. Through the act, the king could appoint a licenser to oversee the publication of books who could deny a license to any books thought to be objectionable.¹ Roger L'Estrange, an arch-royalist, became Surveyor of the Presses, and later Licenser of the Press, and zealously exercised the power of these positions by hunting out unauthorized printing presses, suppressing seditious works, and censoring anti-monarchical texts.² This was a dramatic change from the state of affairs prior to the Restoration, which had seen an explosion in the printing trade, when Parliament ostensibly exercised control over licensing, but did so through inconsistent laws and lax enforcement.³

The struggle between Parliament and the monarchy thus played itself out in part through a struggle for control over the censorship of the press. Under these constraints, the scribal circulation of political satire flourished, among them the works of Charles Blount (1654–1693), a freethinking Deist, who penned his criticism of kings who disregard the populace from whom their power derives in “A Dialogue between K[ing] J[ames] and K[ing]

Journal of the Rutgers University Libraries, Volume LXV, pp.1–?.



JRUL is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 United States License

W[illiam],” a poem now housed in Special Collections at Rutgers’ Alexander Library, (MS Ac. 743). Blount was primarily a writer of prose tracts, but in this poem, he presents an imagined conversation between King James and King William after the former fled to Ireland in response to the advance of the latter in a conflict known as the Glorious Revolution of 1688. In Blount’s work, each monarch presents their view of what gives them the right to the throne. The power struggle between these two claimants to the throne was also a struggle between the crown and Parliament, since it was Parliament who invited fellow Protestant William of Orange to oust their Catholic monarch King James II. This conflict began to escalate during the Exclusion Crisis of 1678–1681, when a bill was debated in Parliament that would prevent the Catholic James from being named heir, a prospect that the fervently Protestant Parliament did not relish. Meanwhile, in March of 1679, the Licensing Act was allowed to lapse, ending L’Estrange’s tenure as licenser. This was not an intentional end to government censorship: the Licensing Act had only ever been a temporary measure, renewed by Parliament each time it was scheduled to lapse. But James’s brother, Charles II, dissolved the Cavalier Parliament in response to the Exclusion Crisis before they ever got a chance to renew the Act.⁴ Amidst this controversy, Blount also anonymously published an adaptation of Milton’s foundational text on the freedom of the press, *Areopagitica*. The *Just Vindication of Learning* argued in favor of complete freedom of the press and against the established practice of pre-publication censorship.⁵ However, neither this argument nor the Exclusion Bill succeeded, and in 1685 when James II succeeded the throne, the Licensing Act was renewed once again.

James’s kingship ended prematurely when, in November 1688, an envoy from Parliament invited William of Orange (grandson of Charles I) and his wife Mary (daughter of James II) to take his place on the throne in an event termed the “Glorious Revolution.” The pair were crowned in February of the next year. James fled the country, and was finally defeated in July 1690 in Ireland at the Battle of Boyne. During this period, the Licensing Act was continually renewed.

Because of the circumstances under which William and Mary came to the throne, there was some unease about the legitimacy of their rule. This became especially evident when in January of 1693 the Tory licenser, Edward Bohun, was ousted for permitting Blount’s (anonymously published) *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*

to be published—for reasons that still remain unclear. Since the tract was anonymous, the licenser had to take responsibility for its publication; it was accordingly speculated by Macaulay and others that Blount wrote ironically in a way that would frame Bohun.⁶ The tract argued that the King and Queen were legitimate monarchs by rule of conquest and not, as the King preferred to argue, by Act of Parliament. Prior to his appointment as licenser, Bohun had written a tract, *The History of the Desertion* (1690), advocating a similar position; namely, that Englishmen owed allegiance to William because his conquest in this just war granted him legitimacy according to Grotian *jus gentium*. Its views, espoused by others including the Whig churchmen William King, Gilbert Burnet, and William Lloyd, were controversial and neither universally popular nor unpopular among Tories or Whigs,⁷ but in 1690 the tract was allowed to be published by the Whig licenser, James Fraser, who was lax in his enforcement of censorship.⁸ Regardless of whether Blount intended to frame Bohun by publishing the text, Bohun's previously stated position on the subject may suggest that he agreed with the pamphlet's argument but found the political climate in 1693 less receptive to such views. Certainly, unlike Bohun's earlier text, this pamphlet's title alone immediately suggests its controversial content. As was conventional in post-publication censorship, the book was burned by the hangman for its subversive content.⁹

The controversy surrounding this text contributed to the perception that the position of licenser could be used as a tool to promote the views of whichever political party was in power.¹⁰ Probably because of this potential for abuse, as Joseph Lowenstein has convincingly argued, and because of the persuasiveness of the Miltonic rights-oriented arguments of tracts such as *Reasons Humbly Offered for the Liberty of Unlicens'd Printing* (dubiously linked to Blount),¹¹ the Licensing Act was ended once and for all on May 3, 1695. In place of the regulation of publication through the Stationer's Company and a state-approved licenser, copyright law was established in the early part of the eighteenth century.¹²

Even well after the invention of the printing press, scribal publication continued alongside print publication, and was often a preferred means of disseminating texts for a number of reasons, the most compelling in this context being that no apparatus existed for the regulation and supervision of manuscript texts as it did for printed material.¹³ Given the uneven application of censorship, of course, this cannot account for all instances of manuscript

publication. Another consideration, probably also at play in Blount's poem, was economic: scribal publication was preferable for small runs of a text (which could be sold at a higher price per copy), or in order to meet demand as it arose – the publisher need not worry about producing more copies than he could sell, and one need not share profits with a bookseller. And finally, manuscript publication had a certain social cachet: the hand-written copy had a more personal aura that suggested the work was being shared among friends or cognoscenti, as indeed many manuscripts were.¹⁴

There were also several means of disseminating manuscript texts. While commercial scriptoria existed where one could commission or purchase manuscript copies of a text (what Harold Love has dubbed "entrepreneurial publication"), manuscripts could also be disseminated incrementally through social networks, either by the author himself or simply someone who wished to share copies of a text they owned ("authorial" and "user" publication, respectively). Oftentimes, a work was disseminated through all of these means of publication, as Love describes:

In many cases scribal transmission hardens into the more self-conscious practice of scribal publication. A frequent pattern was for a new work to pass through an initial phase of dissemination under the author's personal supervision, then a second stage of uncontrolled private copying, then a third stage of copying for sale by commercial scriptoria; and only then, often after a lapse of years, would it make a (generally unauthorized) appearance in print.¹⁵

It is in this context of manuscript publication as an alternative to print that I will consider Blount's scribally published "Dialogue between K[ing] J[ames] and K[ing] W[illiam]."

Blount was educated at home by his libertine father, and began his career as a gentleman-writer at an early age.¹⁶ In 1678 he joined a political group of Whig propagandists, the Green Ribbon Club. Most of his writings, including his defense of the freedom of the press, appear in print in the period from 1679–1685 when the Licensing Act had lapsed. Even during period of lax censorship, however, nearly all of his works were published anonymously or under a pseudonym such as "Junius Brutus," after the founding Roman republican who overthrew the Tarquins, or "Philopatris,"

which seems to carry similar republican connotations.¹⁷ For instance, one of these political tracts, *An Appeal from the Country to the City* (1679), takes seriously the threat of the “Popish Plot” (a Whiggish myth wherein the Catholic Church was rumored to have laid plans to assassinate King Charles II to ensure the succession of Catholic James II), and paints a dire picture of England under Roman Catholicism. The printer of the text was seized and fined and the tract burned by the hangman. Given the treatment of Blount’s works by censors, and Milton’s reception by this generation of writers as a hero of Whig politics, it is no surprise that Blount turned to Milton’s *Areopagitica* as a source for his political tract, *A Just Vindication of Learning*. Blount’s religious views were also quite radical for his time: *Miracles, No Violations of the Laws of Nature* (1683) called into doubt the existence of miracles and identified the divine presence as analogous to—but not independent from—Nature. Not only were the book’s ideas radical, Blount was also lambasted for essentially plagiarizing them from Spinoza, Hobbes, and Burnet.¹⁸ This criticism has contributed to the modern perception that Blount was an unoriginal plagiarist; however, his transportation of material from a variety of texts was not entirely inconsistent with notions of authorship in Blount’s time.

In addition to directly arguing in favor of the freedom of the press, Blount seems to have been a savvy manipulator of the print medium, and his publications may well have contributed to the cessation of the Licensing Act in 1695. Blount did not, however, live to see this come to pass: despair over his inability to marry his dead wife’s sister seems to have driven him to commit suicide in 1693. After this event (and, notably, after the end of the Licensing Act), Blount’s friend, Charles Gildon, collected Blount’s works into *The Miscellaneous Works of Charles Blount* with an account of his life and a “Vindication of his death.”¹⁹ This is the first appearance of the “Dialogue” in print—its title here is “A Supposed Dialogue betwixt the late King James and King William on the Banks of the Boyne, the Day before that Famous Victory”—and the only evidence we have to link the text with Blount. Nevertheless, W. J. Cameron, the annotator of *Poems on Affairs of State; Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, believes that there is no reason to doubt the attribution, although no other external evidence exists to corroborate it.²⁰

This brings us, then, to the Rutgers manuscript of the “Dialogue.” The poem depicts an imagined dialogue between James II, the king ousted in the Glorious Revolution of 1688,

and William III, who seized the throne from him. In the poem, James argues on behalf of the law of "nature" and "blood" (3) that William cannot seize the crown from him. Nor can William claim right through his wife Mary (James' daughter), since, "Shee's too too early Queene, while I am King" (11). The only claim William does have is tenuous, he claims, because "you, who Crowns from contracts doe receive, / Are Kings at will, and govern but by leave" (37-38). Nevertheless, William has the last word when he explains not only that James has forfeited divine right - "Kings are no longer sacred than they'r strong" (22) - but also that William himself has won the throne through lineage and conquest: "I tooke but up the crown you durst not wear / And am no les your conqueror then Heir" (18-19). As Richard L. Donlan suggests in his reading of the poem, "The expression of this essentially elective view of the monarchy shows that even in the years immediately following the Glorious Revolution changing perceptions of the monarchy that would guarantee the security of the changes brought about by the Revolution were on the rise."²¹ The poem allows for a more nuanced reading than much of the satiric verse of the period precisely because it represents these changing perspectives on the constitution. It is remarkable that the poem voices King James' perspective in favor of divine right kingship, even though it does so only to rebut it in favor of constitutional monarchy: while James argues in favor his divine right, William ostensibly wins the argument, dismissing James' claim on the grounds that "titles to crowns from civil contracts spring" (25). Ultimately, however, even William owes his authority to the people themselves: "the peoples safety made their choice / Which Heaven approv'd of by the peoples voice" (49-50). Notably, of the many arguments in favor of William's right emerge in the poem, including his lineage, his conquest, and "the people's voice," it is this last argument with which the poem ends, strengthening the impression that even kings are subject to the will of the people they rule.

The poem is a separate, appearing on one folio page. The paper has a finely wrought "Staffordshire Lily" watermark: a crown atop a shield adorned with a *fleur de lis* above the initials "AJ," which indicate that the paper was produced at one of the French mills operated by the Abram Janssen.²² Janssen was the factor (the middleman who coordinated between the owner of the mill and the master paper-maker, responsible for providing funds for production)²³ at several mills in Angoumois, a region home to

some four-hundred mills in the seventeenth century, and known for producing the finest qualities of paper for export via Bordeaux and La Rochelle.²⁴ The bulk of paper in England, in fact, came from abroad: several manufacturers attempted to produce paper domestically in the seventeenth century, but fine white paper only began to be produced on a large scale in the latter part of the eighteenth century.²⁵ Until 1690, the importation of paper from France and Holland cost England £100,000 annually.²⁶ The watermark is identical to one found among newsletters sent to Sir Newdigate of Arbury, Warwickshire from Whitehall, London in February, 1689.²⁷ This, in addition to the influence of the Law of 1688 regulating paper manufacture, which stipulated that paper makers must include their initials in the watermark of every sheet of paper, suggests that the paper for "A Dialogue" was produced prior to or around that time, since it bears only one set of initials.²⁸ The paper is greyed around the edges as if it had been stored lying flat in a book, although the paper has been folded horizontally twice.

The poem is written in a small, but neat and widely spaced hand with only a few errors. On close examination, it is apparent that the scribe has inserted a letter once and a word in two places, and scratched out one word in order to replace it one more suitable. The substitution seems intentional, however, changing the descriptor for King William's faction from "weak" to "just" in the line, "Then twas the *just* submitted to the strong," a reading that echoes the repeated emphasis on law and justice in William's arguments, as seen in lines such as "if *jus divinum* does to crowns belong" (20) and "Titles to Crowns from civil contracts spring" (25). The manuscript's edits, errors, and omissions suggest that it is not an authorial version. The scribe has left out the published version's final two couplets (an omission that also appears in several other manuscript versions).²⁹ The poem as it appears here ends abruptly. This may be a space-saving measure, but is more likely an indication that the poem was copied from another, imperfect manuscript. The handwriting as well as the apparent effort to save space at the expense of neat presentation—the final six lines are written sideways in the margin—suggest that this is an individual copy by someone wanting personal possession of the text, not a scribal copy. To use Love's terminology, it is thus an example of user publication.

Even though the manuscript is largely identical to the published edition of the poem, in a few places it differs significantly

from the 1695 printed edition. Elsewhere, the title of the poem indicates that the setting is on the banks of the Boyne, the site of the battle where James was finally defeated on July 1, 1690.³⁰ The lack of reference to the battle in the Rutgers manuscript, in addition to the possible date of the paper's production, may suggest that the copy originates from before the battle (nearly two years elapsed between the November, 1688 Revolution and James's final defeat). However, the reference to the battle may simply have been omitted for brevity's sake in the same manner that James and William are referred to only by their initials. Still, the fact that their competing claims to the throne are the subject of debate suggests that the poem was composed during these years, when the debate was still topical.

Another significant departure from the published edition is the different reading of lines 21 and 22 of the poem. Where the published edition reads, "They lose that Right, when once the Kings do Wrong/ Them Justice sacred makes, Life makes 'em strong," the manuscript reads, "Where is the right when the Divine is gone/ Kings are no longer sacred than they'r strong."³¹ Notably, the published edition has more regular iambic meter in these lines: this may indicate that they were changed by the printer before publication, as sometimes happened when poems were published by someone besides the author.³² The fact that the meter throughout the poem is rather uneven supports this possibility. In terms of content, the phrasings are roughly the same, although the way that the MS edition carries over "divine" from line 20's "*jus divinum*" suggests an emphasis on the use of "divinity" as a pretext for force; the loss of strength reveals the bankruptcy of claims to divine sanction for kingship. The printed edition contains less criticism of religious arguments for kingship in favor of stressing the contractual aspect of kingship in "Justice sacred makes," an argument that emerges again in lines 49–50. It is possible that relying on this argument against James's claim would be more acceptable to a general print audience, as opposed to a coterie of manuscript readers. Despite the fact that the MS and the printed version contain different readings of these lines, in both cases they are bracketed in the margins, along with lines 7–9. Bracketing these lines seems to offer them as the clearest distillations of the poem's arguments, suggesting their function as a device to draw attention to their extractability (a practice which is confirmed in later publications that include these very excerpts); however, it might

also serve a poetic function, drawing attention to the lone tercets in a poem otherwise comprised of couplets. The fact that both print and manuscript editions offer the same bracketing may suggest a systematic attempt to disseminate the poem in a specific form.

Why would this very topical poem circulate in manuscript for so long before its publication in print? Its inclusion of a politically subversive argument about kingship, the claim that William III's monarchy is justified by conquest and not by act of parliament, is objectionable on the same grounds as the positions represented later in Blount's anonymous 1693 tract, *William and Mary, Conquerors*. Namely, this was not the view that William himself adopted, and so publishing such a viewpoint could prove dangerous, as the fate of the tract itself and its unwary licenser, Edward Bohun demonstrates. Yet this explanation alone does not entirely account for the extended use of manuscript publication for this poem, since—among other factors—prose and poetry were as different generically as they were in material form. Another factor that merits consideration therefore is the appeal of coterie manuscript publication itself: by circulating poems in manuscript, authors gave their work social cachet and could better control the networks through which their texts would circulate.³³ We might thus consider the possibility that the poem was intended for a smaller, select audience. Although seemingly more moderate than satirical verse that merely mocks James or sings William's praises, the poem is still likely intended for a Whig audience. Just in the manner that Love describes how some poems took a gradual path to publication, the fact that the poem is the only item among Blount's collected works that was not published prior to the posthumous 1695 miscellany suggests that Blount did not intend for it to be printed. The poem is the only one of its kind in the collection of Blount's works among a series of prose tracts, which may suggest that Blount preferred the latter genre and wrote poetry only for a smaller audience.

The later circulation of Blount's poem demonstrates the extent to which his once controversial perspective on the origins of kingly authority eventually became the predominant viewpoint. The poem itself or fragments of it appeared in print during a period spanning from only a decade after its first printing until as late as 1820. The first reprint, from 1705, found in *The Miscellaneous Works, written by His Grace, George, late duke of Buckingham* (which attributes the poem to Blount, despite what the book's title suggests) is advertised to be "Printed from Original Manuscripts that Give Light into the

Secret History of the Times," and indeed the poem contains some readings found in the Rutgers manuscript not present in the 1695 printed edition.³⁴ For instance, the contested line 20 reads (like in the manuscript), "If *jus divinum* does to crowns belong," and line 22, "Kings are no longer sacred than they'r strong." The poem is not identical to the Rutgers MS, however, and in a few cases includes readings consistent with the 1695 edition and not the Rutgers MS edition. The poem also appears in a printed commonplace book from 1714 (*British Parnassus*), attributed to Blount and grouped under the heading "King."³⁵ Later in the eighteenth century, a magazine includes the poem's full text (with a number of small changes), but attributes it to "JUVEN., Dronfield," an abbreviated pseudonym of the Roman satirist Juvenal, which thus identifies this poem as a piece of verse satire.³⁶ This is the sole instance of an attribution of the poem to anyone besides Blount, though it is obviously pseudonymic, and the location Dronfield may only indicate the source of the submission to the magazine.

The poem is remarkable for the longevity of its popularity. Appearances of the poem in the nineteenth century contain only fragments,³⁷ one of which includes only two lines (20–21 of the 1695 print edition). Nevertheless, the book containing this fragment contextualizes the lines in terms of the predominant view of monarchy:

The thinking world is now modelled *a la Republique*
 – it is quite the mode; the divine hereditary right
 of kings is justly considered ridiculous except their
divine right of being always suspected of tyrannical
 designs; or, "If right divine does ere to crowns
 belong / They lose that right when once the kings do
 wrong."³⁸

That this early nineteenth-century writer uses a late seventeenth-century poem (controversial in its own time) to present the predominant view of monarchy shows the striking way in which which Blount's once seditious views actually became the accepted perspective. The increasing prevalence of this viewpoint helps to explain the continued use of Blount's words through nearly 150 years following their composition.

Notes

1. For an account of the 1662 Licensing Act and those that followed up until 1695, see Michael Treadwell, "The Stationers and the Printing Acts at the End of the Seventeenth Century," in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, ed. John Barnard, D. F. MacKenzie, and Maureen Bell, vol. 4, 6 vols. (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 755.
2. George Sensabaugh, "Adaptations of *Areopagitica*," *Huntington Library Quarterly: A Journal for the History and Interpretation of English and American Civilization* 13 (1950): 203.
3. See D. F. MacKenzie, "The Business of Print and the Space of Reading," in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, ed. John Barnard, D. F. MacKenzie, and Maureen Bell, vol. 4, 6 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 552–567; and, for a more detailed account, D. F. MacKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
4. Treadwell, "The Stationers and the Printing Acts at the End of the Seventeenth Century," 769.
5. Sensabaugh, "Adaptations of *Areopagitica*" contextualizes the pamphlet, arguing, "Milton, through Blount, spoke his powerful arguments of thought and expression at a time when such arguments could have had a singular effect," 201.
6. T. B. Macaulay, *History of England* (London, 1967), III, 633–44. The question of Blount's sincerity in this pamphlet is the subject of some controversy, however. See also Randy Robertson, *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division* (Penn State Press, 2009), 173; Robertson, "Charles Blount, Plotter," *Notes and Queries* 51 (249), no. 4 (December 2004): 375–377 for a recent defense of Macaulay's claim that presents a thorough account of both sides of the debate. Robertson adds to Macaulay's argument the claim that Blount did not in fact author the pamphlet, but may have instead transcribed and circulated manuscript copies of it in order to jeopardize Bohun (376). Dario Pfanter's biography of Blount and Mark Goldie, "Edmund Bohun and Jus Gentium in the Revolution Debate, 1689–1693," *Historical Journal* 20 (1977), 569–586; Goldie, "Charles Blount's Intention in Writing 'King William and Queen Mary, Conquerors' (1693)," *Notes and Queries*, (1978): 527–532 dispute Blount's use of irony in the pamphlet, while Dorothy Auchter supports it. Auchter argues that Blount held

different views about the justification for William's kingship, and so the pamphlet must have been written tongue-in-cheek: see "King William and Queen Mary, Conquerors" in *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England* (Greenwood Press, 2001), 180.

7. Mark Goldie, "Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium*," mentions the appearance of both Grotian "Jus Gentium" arguments and arguments by conquest among Tories and Whigs alike in making the case that Blount was sincerely advocating this position.
8. Auchter, "King William and Queen Mary, Conquerors," 179.
9. Dario Pfanner, "Blount, Charles (1654–1693), Freethinker and Author," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004).
10. Auchter, "King William and Queen Mary, Conquerors," 179–183.
11. Pfanner, "Blount, Charles (1654–1693), Freethinker and Author," casts doubt on the attribution, popular at the time of publication.
12. Joseph Loewenstein, *The Author's Due: Printing and the Prehistory of Copyright* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 212.
 13. See Harold Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*, 2nd ed. (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998).
14. Peter Beal, *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Early Modern England*, (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1998), 136.
 15. Harold Love, "Oral and scribal texts in early modern England," in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, ed. John Barnard, D. F. MacKenzie, and Maureen Bell, vol. 4, 6 vols. (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 105.
16. Biographical information on Blount taken from Pfanner, "Blount, Charles."
17. Peter Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1987), 292, mentions that to be a "philopatris" (one who loves his city) was an ancient Roman ideal. The pseudonym was used by a number of writers in the seventeenth century, including the authors of works such as *A Humble Petition Offered to [...] Parliament* (1606), *The Advocate* (1652), *The Plot in a Dream* (a tract on the Popish Plot first published in 1681), *The Present State of Scotland* (1682) and *A Satyrick Poem against those Mercenary Wretches* (1682). *Philopatris* was

also the title of a dialogue critical of Christianity that was widely believed in the period to have been authored by Lucian.

18. Sir Thomas Browne, *Miracles works above and contrary to nature: or, an answer to a late translation out of Spinoza's Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* (London, 1683) qtd. in J. A. Redwood, "Charles Blount (1654–93), Deism, and English Free Thought." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 35, no. 3 (July 1, 1974): 490–498.
19. *The miscellaneous works of Charles Blount, Esq. ... to which is prefixed the life of the author, and an account and vindication of his death: with the contents of the whole volume.* [London: s.n.]. 1695.
20. William J. Cameron, *Poems on Affairs of State; Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*. Ed. George de Forest Lord. 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), Vol. 5, 235.
21. Richard L. Dolan, Jr., "Buttressing a Monarchy: Literary Representations of William III and the Glorious Revolution" (Dissertation, Georgia State University, 2005). http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/english_diss/1, 299–313.
22. W. A. Churchill, *Watermarks in Paper in Holland, England, France, etc., in the XVII and XVIII Centuries and their Interconnection*, 2nd ed. (Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1985) explains that "In addition to Janssen's various watermarks his initials AI or AJ always appear beneath the main watermark" (27).
23. *Ibid.*, 22.
24. *Ibid.*, 58. Churchill describes Janssen as a prominent Dutch factor, one of several who established themselves at Angoulême in Angoumois in 1635. Janssen, he explains, owned mills at Puy-moyen and Nersac, and employed paper-makers such as Jean Villedary, Claude de George, Jean and François Jardel, P. Salée, and Etienne Touzeau. He gained enough prominence to be appointed "Intendant des Finances de la Généralité de Limoges," and to be permitted to add a crown to his watermark (26).
25. *Ibid.*, 40.
26. *Ibid.*, 42. In 1690, the Paper Sellers petitioned Parliament against the passage of a law in support of domestic paper manufacture; four years prior the first trade guild of papermakers, The Governor and Company of White Papermakers, had been established, but the company disappeared by 1698 despite Parliament's efforts to protect them (41–42).

27. Folger Shakespeare Library MS L.c.1970; Daniel W. Mosser, Ernest W. Sullivan II, with Len Hatfield and David H. Radcliffe, *The Thomas L. Gravell Watermark Archive* (1996-2012-05-17). www.gravell.org, SLD.242.1
28. Churchill, *Watermarks in Paper*, 57. An example of Janssen's compliance with that act may be found in Churchill's illustration of the watermark of Janssen's paper-maker Claude de George, which bears the initials of both men (CCCVII).
29. British Library Additional MS 21094 (ff. 100v–101v), British Library MS Harley 7317 (ff. 107v–108v), Bodleian Library MS Eng. Poet. c18 (ff. 89r–90r; pp. 159–61), Bodleian Library, MS Eng. poet. d53 (pp. 32–5), University of Nottingham Library Portland MS PwV 46 (pp. 178–80) also omit the poem's final lines. Only one manuscript I have found reference to does not: British Library Additional MS 29497 (ff. 104v–105r; pp. 226–227).
30. Huntington Library MS Ellesmere 8770 (pp. 105–8), British Library Additional MS 21094 (ff. 100v–101v), British Library MS Harley 7317 (ff. 107v–108v), Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. Poet. c. 18 (ff. 89r–90r; pp. 159–61), Bodleian Library, MS Eng. poet. d53 (pp. 32–35), University of Nottingham Library Portland MS PwV 46 (pp. 178–80), and the published edition of the poem all bear some reference to the battle in their titles, although the wording of each is varied.
31. Charles Blount, "A Supposed Dialogue betwixt the late King James and King William on the Banks of the Boyne, the Day before that Famous Victory" in *The miscellaneous works of Charles Blount, Esq. ... to which is prefixed the life of the author, and an account and vindication of his death : with the contents of the whole volume.*, [London : s.n.], 1695 and Rutgers Special Coll. MS "A Dialogue between K[ing] J[ames] and K[ing] W[illiam]" Ac. 743.
32. See, for example, *Tottel's Miscellany* (1557), a collection of poetry that had circulated in manuscript, but which the publisher in many cases emended to regularize the meter.
33. Love, "Publication in the Scribal Medium" in *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*, 35–89.
34. *The Second Volume of the Miscellaneous works, written by His Grace, George, late duke of Buckingham, Containing a Key to the Rehearsal and Several Pieces of Prose and Verse Never before Printed, with a Collection of Poems, Satyrs, Letters, Dialogues, Essays, Characters, Maxims of State,*

Valuable Speeches in Both Houses of Parliament, by Several Lords and Commons: Printed from Original Manuscripts that Give Light into the Secret History of the Times, 2 vols. (London: Printed for S. Briscoe, and sold by J. Nutt, 1705).

35. Edward Bysshe, *British Parnassus Or, A Compleat Commonplace-book of English Poetry: Containing the Most Genuine, Instructive, Diverting and Sublime Thoughts... Alphabetically Digested, and Brought Down to the Present Time*, (London: J. Nutt in the Savoy: and sold by J. Pemberton and J. Morphew, 1714), 468. The same excerpt appears in a reprint from 1718 titled, *Art of English Poetry... Containing the Most Natural, Instructive, Diverting, and Sublime Thoughts*, (London: Printed for W. Taylor at the Ship in Pater-Noster Row, 1718). The excerpt contains only that portion of the poem from line 25 onward, and eliminates the headings for different speakers (but does distinguish them somewhat through indentations). Also, it skips lines 27–30 and 51–52, likely because the references were no longer topical. A number of small changes appear between this version and the 1695 publication (e.g. “Caesar” for “Cyrus”).
36. *The New lady's magazine, or, Polite and entertaining companion for the fair sex*, Volume 3; (Printed by royal authority, for Alex. Hogg at the King's Arms, no. 16, Paternoster-Row, and sold by all booksellers, stationers, and news carriers, in town and country, 1788), 706.
37. Eaton Stannard-Barrett, *The Rising Sun: A Serio-comic Satiric Romance By Eaton Stannard Barrett, Cervantes Hogg*. Printed for Appleyards, 1807. p 187. Original from Oxford University. Digitized Jul 13, 2007 on Google Books and from *The Cap of Liberty, A Political Publication*, vol. 1 from Sept 8, 1819 to Jan 4th, 1820 (London: Printed by and for Thomas Davison).
38. *The Cap of Liberty*, 278.