Writing the History of the English Monarchy: Franco-British Historiographical Cultures 1688-1788

Alexandra Marie Anderson

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds

School of History

January 2018

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to my supervisors Dr Alex Bamji and Dr Richard De Ritter, for whom I cannot thank enough for their guidance, support, and encouragement. I would especially like to express my sincerest thanks to Alex, who helped me fall in love my thesis all over again.

I would then like to thank Professor Simon Burrows, who helped me create and hone my thesis in its early stages. I thank also the Library staff at the Brotherton Library and Special Collections, for their kindness and help throughout my thesis.

Completing this work would have been all the more difficult were it not for the support and friendship provided by other postgraduate students, including Rachael Johnson, Juliette Reboule, Louise Seaward, Joanna Phillips, and especially Rebecca Bowd, Phoebe Ryan, Kayleigh Hook and Sarah Mawby.

A particularly big thank you to my parents, for their steadfast, unconditional support in my choice to leave Canada and study my MA and PhD at the University of Leeds. Their encouragement, patience and confidence in my abilities throughout the thesis was invaluable. My sincerest thanks to my three sisters and best friends, Catherine, Erika and Michelle whom I would be lost without. I also thank my incredibly kind and supportive family-in law, who have been my home away from home, and the rest of my friends and family whose continuous encouragement has helped me throughout my post-graduate studies.

And lastly I would like to thank my husband, whose unwavering support and positivity made me believe I could take on, and complete, this endeavour.

Abstract

This thesis examines the historiographical cultures of the period of 1688-1788 through an exploration of French historical accounts of English history. At its centre are the French historians Paul de Rapin-Thoyras (1661-1725), Abbé Millot (1726-1785), and Abbé Raynal (1713-1726), whose works were translated into English and published and circulated widely in Britain. The thesis discusses these and other French historians of English history as well as several British historians of English and French history. Through a series of comparative readings, this study illuminates the shared historiographical practices of Britain and France. It is particularly concerned with how historians wrote in the grand manner about English monarchs, from the Norman Conquest in 1066 to the execution of Charles I in 1649. These historians wrote in a neoclassical manner by organising their texts around the lives of key historical figures and presenting them as models of behaviour, using ideas of virtue and vice. This thesis argues that while French historians looked back to the neoclassical mode, they employed it to connect with a British audience by reflecting on contemporary ideals of politics, gender norms, and moral virtues. In the comparative study of these historical texts, this thesis provides new evidence of French and British historiographical cultures in the eighteenth century through its exploration of the exchange of neoclassical historiographical practices across the channel.

Table of Contents

Introduction

This thesis examines French historical accounts of English monarchs written in the eighteenth century. By analysing the published work of Paul de Rapin-Thoyras (1661-1725), Abbé Millot (1726-1785), Abbé Raynal (1713-1726) and other French historians writing between 1688 and 1788, my thesis focuses on how the French wrote the history of England from the Norman Conquest in 1066 to the execution of Charles I in 1649. It will provide insight into how French historians employed contemporary cultural ideals of vice and virtue to create historical accounts that resonated with a British audience. In doing so, my research demonstrates how French historical accounts of the past were inflected by eighteenth-century British notions of ideal kingship, moral virtue, gender, and cultural norms. The examination of these accounts will provide new evidence of the relationship between British and French historiographical cultures in the eighteenth century. Moreover, it will contribute to the discussion of how the genre of history writing developed during the period.

Focusing on historical writing about specific monarchs involved in significant historical events, such as the establishment of Magna Carta or the Hundred Years War, this thesis will explore how French historians writing English history contributed to British historiographical cultures. My thesis incorporates a British historiographical perspective of the same events by comparing these works with David Hume's (1711-1776) *History of England* (1754-1761) and selected works of French history written by British historians.

Section 1: Eighteenth-Century British Historiography and the Role of the French Historian

The geographical position of France and England led to a long and tumultuous relationship between the two countries. This relationship was particularly volatile during the eighteenth century, as Jeremy Black notes. Black argues that the xenophobia in Britain towards France in the eighteenth century even affected Britain's intellectuals.[1] This thesis refutes Black's perspective as overly simplistic and argues that the period was also characterised by important cultural exchanges and links between the two countries, including those fostered by historical texts. The introduction to Richard Johnson's (1733-1793) *The History of France* (1786) summarised the relationship between French and British historiographical cultures during this period. Johnson wrote:

> The Histories of England and France are so closely connected, that, in order to understand the one properly, we must not be wholly [sic] unacquainted with the other. Indeed, France is not only a Neighbour of England, in point of situation, but in a great measure similar in their fashions, customs and manners.[2]

Johnson's text, the latest of the works which is examined in this thesis, outlined the interests of British audiences in their French neighbours, as their past and present 'fashions, customs and manners' were so intertwined. Johnson's statement highlights the need for my exploration of the effect of this tangled relationship on eighteenth-century historiographical cultures. As Johnson explains, the histories of Britain and France were closely connected, and this thesis argues that they shared historiographical cultures as a result.

British eighteenth-century historiography has received considerable attention in recent years. Modern scholars, however, tend to focus either on British culture and British historiography, or French culture and French historiography. Both groups aim to

---

[1] Jeremy Black, *Natural and Necessary Enemies: Anglo-French Relations in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Duckworth, 1986), pp. 159-184.
[2] Richard Johnson, *The History of France, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (London: E. Newbery, 1786), p. i.

shed light on the historiographical practices within one nation's cultural and linguistic spheres. My thesis demonstrates, however, that historiographical cultures did not develop in isolation within a single country, and that they were made of shared historiographical practices. In the eighteenth century, a number of French historians wrote about the English and their works were translated, published and circulated within Britain itself. Existing scholarship has explored the transnational dimensions of Enlightenment cultural exchange, particularly with reference to the 'Republic of Letters', and the dissemination of the writings of figures such as Voltaire (1696-1778) and Montesquieu (1689-1755) in eighteenth-century Britain.[3] The ways in which historiographical cultures spanned the channel have not hitherto been charted thoroughly. My thesis contributes to our understanding of the complicated relationship between France and Britain in the eighteenth century by highlighting the importance of shared ideas about the writing of history, especially the use of neoclassical ideas.

A great deal of work has been done on how the British wrote about the history of England during the eighteenth century, but little attention has been paid to how foreign authors contributed to historiographical cultures.[4] By comparing French perspectives on the history of England with current scholarship, this thesis will demonstrate great similarities in the way that writers from both countries wrote about England's past. These historical parallels suggest that the French and British held similar views of history writing, despite hostilities between the two countries during the period. This thesis will explore the rhetoric and content of French historical accounts of England that were translated and circulated within Britain between 1688 and 1788 in order to further understand the development of historical reading and writing in these two nations, especially Britain.

Several modern scholars of eighteenth-century historiography have proved influential for this thesis. Laird Okie's study of previously neglected British historical

---

[3] Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994); André Michel Rousseau, *L'Angleterre et Voltaire*, 3 vols (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation at the Taylor Institution, 1976).

[4] For the contemporary discussion of eighteenth-century British historiography, see pp. 3-11 of this thesis.

accounts published between 1714 and 1770 provides insight into the role of politics in contemporary history writing, most notably the two-party system of the Whigs and the Tories in the Hanoverian period.[5] Okie has proved especially helpful for my understanding of eighteenth-century historical interpretations of Britain's ancient constitution; this was invaluable for the analysis of the portrayal of kingship, and the monarch's respect for his people's laws and liberties, that will be explored in Chapter 1. Prior work on Paul de Rapin-Thoyras' *History of England* has also been an important foundation for my project. Okie's explanation of Rapin's rhetoric, scholarly rigour and use of source materials illuminates how Rapin's work influenced other historians in the eighteenth century, including David Hume. In a different manner, Philip Hicks' study of neoclassical history outlines the 'weakness in English historical writing', as he titles his first chapter, to explain the circumstances in which a French Huguenot historian penned the most popular history of England in the second quarter of the eighteenth century.[6] Both Okie and Hicks provide useful insights into how the party politics of the early eighteenth century contributed to the success of a foreigner who appealed to readers as an outsider historian, able to rise above national prejudices.[7] Hicks' analysis of neoclassical history writing, and the desire of early eighteenth-century historians to emulate the grand narrative historical accounts of authors on the continent, provides further valuable context.[8]

D.R. Woolf's numerous studies of British historiography and historical readership have also proven influential for this thesis.[9] Woolf examines the reception of history in the early modern period, and draws attention to a transformation in historical reading practices during the period prior to that covered by this study. Woolf sheds light

---

[5] Laird Okie, *Augustan Historical Writing: Histories of England in the English Enlightenment* (New York; London: University Press of America, 1991), pp. 1-14, 47-74.
[6] Philip Hicks, *Neoclassical History and English Culture: From Clarendon to Hume* (London: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 1-22.
[7] Okie, pp. 47-74; Hicks, pp. 146-150.
[8] Hicks, pp. 143-146.
[9] D.R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); D.R. Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The light of truth' From the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto; London: University of Toronto Press, 1990).

on different forms of historical reading, highlighting the process of publication, lending libraries and personal book ownership, as well as the processes of promotion, advertising and distribution of history books. Woolf's insight into the foreign book trade sheds light on the reasons why French authors were mindful of a British audience as they were writing their texts.[10] Woolf's exploration of the nature of truth in history writing, and the workings of providence and chance in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, provides a backdrop for later histories which considered the inner motives and actions of the specific individuals, and the effect of such individuals on historical change.[11]

Recent studies of eighteenth-century historiography have shown that history writing encompassed multiple genres at this time. Hayden White first argues that history written during the period was conceived to be either fabulous, true or satirical by contemporary historians. Yet, these historians used what they believed to be 'the truth of the facts' to pursue personal enquiries.[12] Historians were thusly inflecting their own interpretations and opinions into their rhetoric and views of history, creating a variety of historical works. Eighteenth-century history did not therefore encompass one single genre. Mark Salber Phillips considers eighteenth-century British historiography during the long eighteenth century to be a 'family of related genres' that includes memoirs, diaries, literary histories, antiquarian writings, biography, diaries, memoirs, and even some fictional genres.[13] Arguing that 'history by nature is a contrastive category', Phillips suggests that history can only be understood if we acknowledge that genres 'combine and recombine' and accept that, essentially, history in the long eighteenth century was 'a cluster of competing genres'.[14] Phillips' study of the genres of history in the long eighteenth century reveals how narratives of the past were reshaped to fit new

---

[10] Woolf, *Reading History*, pp. 269-273.
[11] Woolf, *The Idea of History*, pp. 4-8, 247, 262-263.
[12] Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), pp. 49-53.
[13] Mark Salber Phillips, *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain, 1740-1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 10, 343; Noelle Gallagher, *Historical Literatures: Writing about the Past in England, 1660-1740* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), p. 6.
[14] Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, p. 21; Mark Salber Phillips, *On Historical Distance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), p. 60.

societal and sentimental needs, and no longer simply focused on great political events. Instead, he argues, historical accounts drew upon the generic conventions of biography, memoir and novel to present history in what Phillips refers to as 'more inward or affective' terms.[15] Similarly, Woolf argues that in the eighteenth century, the genre of history 'straddled the worlds of scholarship and literary culture' as a result of a new historical revolution inspired by new notions of 'sensibility, taste, and manners'.[16] These notions meant that the writing of history was no longer led by chroniclers and civic officials, but transformed into a pursuit for lawyers, intellectuals, and aspiring courtiers.[17] Moreover, the writing of history was undertaken by historians who were also considered to be political pamphleteers, churchmen, academics, journalist and philosophers, as it had not acquired the institutional structures and independent identity established in the nineteenth century.[18] These varied influences also contributed to the diversity of historical genres in the period.[19] Eighteenth-century history writing did not have a single philosophy, purpose, or audience. The diversity of genres and the range of people who wrote history created interpretations that appealed to audiences for multiple reasons, including education, personal entertainment, leisure, and sociability. History was no longer written solely for the traditional audience of elite statesmen. My thesis extends existing studies of the expansion of the readership of historical writing by analysing how French historians used a neoclassical style to connect to a wider and more diverse readership. Through the analysis of the way historians portrayed of English and French monarchs, and how they were presented them as figures for moral contemplation, I will build upon current ideas about genre, the democratization of history writing and reading, and the significance of sensibility and sentimentalism for the eighteenth-century historian.

---

[15] Mark Salber Phillips, '"If Mrs Mure Be Not Sorry for Poor King Charles": History, the Novel, and the Sentimental Reader', *History Workshop Journal*, 43 (1997), 110-131 (pp. 111-113).
[16] Woolf, *Reading History,* p. 7.
[17] Woolf, *Reading History,* p. 7.
[18] Okie, p. 9.
[19] Benjamin Dew and Fiona Price, 'Introduction: Visions of History', in *Historical Writing in Britain, 1688-1830: Visions of History*, ed. by Benjamin Dew and Fiona Price (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), pp. 1-14 (pp. 2-7).

The French historical accounts examined in this thesis constructed grand narratives in the traditional style of historical writing, but were also influenced by other genres. The second chapter of my thesis highlights the resonance of the epic genre in historical accounts of war and ideal kingship. The epic was the most esteemed of verse genres, whereas history was the most esteemed type of prose.[20] Phillips argues that 'classical conventions of historical writing had been devised to narrate the deeds of warriors and statesmen'.[21] The education received by the social elite affected the writing of history and as Joseph Levine states, 'classical education meant classical imitation'.[22] Eighteenth-century historical writing, however, also placed a new emphasis on empiricism and on an accessible but authoritative voice.[23] These recent findings have implications for how historical texts, even when imparting a grand narrative in the neoclassical format, were also transformed. As Noelle Gallagher argues, 'historiography in practice often focused on individual historical episodes and individual psychological portraits'.[24] My thesis contributes to this historiographical development by arguing that even though French historians of English history followed the traditional advice-to-statesman format they targeted a more general audience in their use of contemporary ideals and virtues to describe historical figures and events.

By the middle of the eighteenth century the novel overtook prose romance in respectability and popularity and began to compete with the historical genre. The novel's fictive contemporary history, usually illustrated in present and domestic, rather than past and foreign, settings, provided many of the same benefits of histories, with the added benefit that the events described were could connect to the common reader.[25] Karen O'Brien suggests that fiction and historical writing were the leading narrative

---

[20] Noelle Gallagher, 'Historiography, the Novel, and Henry Fielding's Joseph Andrews', *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 52:3 (2012), 631-650 (p. 635).

[21] Phillips, *On Historical Distance*, p. 65.

[22] Joseph M. Levine, *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern Historiography* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1987), p. 181.

[23] Karen O'Brien, 'History and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 98:5 (2005), 397-414 (p. 397).

[24] Noelle Gallagher, 'The Beginnings of Enlightenment Historiography in Britain', in *A Companion to Enlightenment Historiography*, ed. by Sophie Bourgault and Robert Sparling (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2013), pp. 343-373 (pp. 346-347).

[25] D.R. Woolf, 'A Feminine Past? Gender, Genre, and Historical Knowledge in England, 1500-1800', *American Historical Review*, 102:3 (1997), 645-679 (p. 665).

forms in the eighteenth century and argues that they both played a prominent role in the depictions of social identities which initiated new styles of historical awareness as they allowed readers to comprehend the effects of 'their own experience in history'.[26] In the second half of the eighteenth century, historical and novelistic narratives occupied the dominant positions in literature, comparable to the popularity of the satiric novel in the first quarter of the eighteenth century.[27] During this period, historians such as Hume, Robertson and Gibbon started to incorporate sentimental techniques from the novel that made their own accounts more emotionally engaging to the reader.[28] David Hume contended that history, with its 'thousand other passions', engaged readers due to its central position between the novel and the didactic text. History, he argued, employed sentimental passions which could entertain readers, whilst simultaneously imparting valuable instructions on life.[29] In the eighteenth century, writers of fiction often asked their audience to relate their fictitious works to the greater discourse of history.[30] This approach dated back to the Middle Ages, where the boundaries between history and fiction were often blurred.[31] Novelists often tried to present themselves as historians, as Daniel Defoe did with *Robinson Crusoe*.[32] The entertainment value of history and its capacity to explore human emotions led to the eventual combination of history and fiction in the nineteenth century in the widely popular historical novel.[33] My thesis argues that eighteenth-century French historians commented on ideas of virtues and behaviour in their descriptions of monarchs, and aimed to be more entertaining like the

---

[26] O'Brien, 'History and the Novel', p. 397.

[27] Frank Palmeri, *Satire, History, Novel: Narrative Forms, 1665-1815* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003), pp. 12-13.

[28] D.R. Woolf, 'A Feminine Past', p. 665; Patricia Craddock, 'Contemplative Heroes and Gibbon's Historical Imagination', in *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800*, ed. by Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 343-360
(p. 348); Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, pp. 103-128.

[29] David Hume, 'On the Study of History', in M.G. Sullivan, 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity of the Historian in Eighteenth-Century England', *History of European Ideas*, 28 (2002), 145-162 (p. 157); Woolf, 'A Feminine Past', p. 666.

[30] Robert Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel: Matters of Fact from Bacon to Defoe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 2-3; Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 6.

[31] Levine, *Humanism and History*, pp. 19-20.

[32] Mayer, pp. 2-3.

[33] Woolf, 'A Feminine Past', p. 666; Leo Braudy, *Narrative Form in History and Fiction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), pp. 144-180; O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment*, p. 115.

novel, as well as educational. By engaging with sentimental passions though the characterization of English monarchs, Rapin, Raynal and Millot wrote histories with the intention of engaging with British readers on an emotional level.

In the eighteenth century, historical accounts sought to include contemporary politics and ideals that connected with a new, wider readership. Woolf argues that during this period, history held value for its higher status as a 'socially circulated commodity', as it was viewed to be a subject of polite discussion, a source of entertainment and a means of education.[34] History held an elite status as a form of literature, and its subject matter of courts and battlefields meant that it garnered an affluent audience who were willing to pay for luxurious folio editions.[35] O'Brien, however, argues that even cheaper versions allowed readers to feel they were participating in a 'sophisticated culture of readership'.[36] As a result, booksellers and publishers were able to market narrative histories to a diverse readership without compromising the prestigious image of the genre and in turn encouraged historians to adopt a traditional, classical rhetoric. Historians continued to impart lessons to readers by teaching with examples.[37] Benjamin Dew and Fiona Price argue that in the eighteenth century, 'historical discourse was shaped by pressures to engage with contemporary concerns and issues, even while it aimed to maintain the seriousness appropriate for a well-established literary genre'.[38] My study of French historical accounts of England will contribute to this argument that eighteenth-century formal histories sought to uphold a certain traditional rhetoric, but included contemporary virtues and morals in descriptions of English monarchs. By imparting contemporary lessons to their readers, French historians Rapin, Raynal and Millot were able to write formal texts that responded to developments in the ways in which eighteenth-century British history was written and read.

---

[34] Woolf, *The Social Circulation*, p. 392; Levine, *Humanism and History*, pp. 169-170.
[35] Dew and Price, p. 3.
[36] Karen O'Brien, 'The History Market in Eighteenth-Century England', in *Books and Their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England*, ed. by Isabel Rivers (London: Bloomsbury, 2003), pp. 105-134 (p. 105).
[37] O'Brien, 'The History Market', p. 106.
[38] Dew and Price, p. 6.

The main texts discussed in this thesis emerged from the neoclassical history genre. Early eighteenth-century ideas about history drew inspiration from the Renaissance tradition, which had presented history as a practical and moral guide for its readers.[39] In the same way, neoclassical history provided guidance for both private citizens and public statesmen, offering lessons on virtue and morality.[40] Hicks argues that David Hume is the exemplar of the eighteenth-century neoclassical historian, noting that his *History of England* 'represents a profound encounter between the modern world and this ancient literary genre, demonstrating both the versatility and durability of neoclassicism'.[41] The establishment of a neoclassical historical genre, which Hicks notes 'put great men and ennobling events on centre stage and possessed exacting rules of evidence and decorum', was a result of the elite trying to undermine the 'secret history' genre, which sought to expose the private lives of public men, or provide an alternative version of history which undermined previous accounts of the past.[42] Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, Abbé Raynal and Abbé Millot, who were writing history before and after Hume, also employed this mode, in the way they emulated the classical tradition of providing historical figures for moral instruction while acknowledging contemporary concerns related to politics, gender and morality.

In the eighteenth century, the grand narrative became the preferred way of presenting history, at least for the most formal accounts.[43] History written in the grand manner was a narrative account of military and political deeds.[44] As Gallagher notes, this form was the most favoured in the 'hierarchy of prose genres'.[45] In the formal writing of history, the grand narrative emerged from the ancient ideals of writing history. Eighteenth-century historians drew inspiration from ancient texts. For example, the Roman historian Livy (59 BCE-17) recorded the rise of Rome from city-state to empire, and Tacitus' (58-120) *Histories* covered the history of the Roman Empire from

---

[39] Okie, p. 8.
[40] Okie, p. 8.
[41] Hicks, p. 171.
[42] Hicks, p. 214; Rebecca Bullard, *The Politics of Disclosure, 1674-1725: Secret History Narratives* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009), p. 183.
[43] Okie, p. 5.
[44] Hicks, pp. 1-2.
[45] Gallagher, *Historical Literatures,* p. 5.

the death of Augustus to the Year of Four Emperors, while Thucydides' (460 BCE-395 BCE) historical account tried to make sense of the Peloponnesian War. In the eighteenth century, the ancients were revered by many as creators of the modern institution of fair government. As a result, they were heralded as exemplary figures by many eighteenth-century men of letters. Others sought to highlight the distinctiveness of eighteenth-century culture. These divergent perspectives were debated, especially in France but also in Britain, in what was known as the *querelle des Ancients et des Modernes*. Intellectuals questioned whether contemporary writings surpassed those written by classical authors and philosophers.[46] According to Hicks, the neoclassical historian, following this ideal, wrote a grand narrative style of history that contained rhetorical features for which classical historians were renowned, such as political maxims, invented speeches and character sketches. As Hicks notes, at the turn of the eighteenth century political figures and men of letters lamented the absence of such historians in England.[47] Okie asserts that this absence accounts for the success of Rapin's *History of England*, because it satisfied a specific demand for a particular mode of history writing.[48] For the previous two centuries, neoclassical historians on the continent such as Machiavelli, Sarpi, Mezeray, and Daviana had established themselves as figures who were respected as equals of the ancient historians.[49] The first British neoclassical historian to find success in Britain was David Hume in the middle of the eighteenth century.[50]

Foreign texts had circulated widely in England since the mid-sixteenth century. By the mid-seventeenth century, churchmen, scholars and booksellers imported large quantities of foreign books, with many attending annual book fairs on the continent.[51] The trade in foreign books continued into the eighteenth century.[52] Earlier in the

---

[46] J.G.A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion Volume 2: Narratives of Civil Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 169. For more on the debate between the ancients and moderns, see Joseph M. Levine, *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1991).
[47] Hicks, pp. 1-2.
[48] Okie, pp. 1, 47.
[49] Hicks, pp. 1-2.
[50] Hicks, pp. 170-202; Okie, p. 1.
[51] Woolf, *Reading History*, pp. 269-270.
[52] Woolf, *Reading History*, pp. 270-271.

century, historical accounts of British history were often written by French and Italian authors and translated into English.[53] F. Smith Fussner notes that during the period, 'foreign histories in translation found interested readers'.[54] This esteem for foreign histories facilitated Rapin's integration into British historiography. Following Rapin, other French writers such as Raynal and Millot achieved a level of success by producing historical works that connected with British ideals of morality and virtue. As I will suggest, these French historians, all of whom wrote on English history, were aware of their potential British reading audience. Jeremy Black argues that during the eighteenth century, 'history was of course a very open quarry for commentators on Anglo-French relations'.[55] This thesis argues, instead, that many French historical works of English history did not critique or pass judgement on Britain's past, and had other aims. Black's reliance on British source material has distorted his perspective. Instead, I argue that France and Britain shared historiographical cultures during this period. Britain often looked across the channel for historiographical inspiration. Hicks contends that in the early eighteenth century, 'Englishmen only seemed to become fully aware of the weakness in their historiography when they compared their histories to those of other nations'.[56] Hume and Bolingbroke also lived in France for years at a time, which Hicks suggests led to their '[imbibing of] French historical thinking'.[57] This French influence suggests that contemporary French historical accounts contributed directly to eighteenth-century British historiography. It also suggests that French historians were aware of their place within this historiography. In the direct examination of the historiographical cultures of French historians of English history, this thesis aims to shed further light on cross-channel historiographical practices in the eighteenth century. This thesis provides evidence of the inclusion of contemporary British political and cultural ideals in the French historical depiction of English monarchs. French historians promoted themselves as disinterested observers and capitalized on the success of

---

[53] John Feather, 'British Publishing in the Eighteenth Century: A Preliminary Subject Analysis', *Library*, 8 (1986), 32-46 (pp. 42-43).
[54] F. Smith Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought 1580-1640* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), pp. 302-303.
[55] Black, p. 163.
[56] Hicks, p. 212.
[57] Hicks, p. 212.

previous foreign works in order to insert themselves into the eighteenth-century British neoclassical genre.

Section 2: Sources

The thesis examines sources written from 1688 to 1788. The chosen starting point permits reflection on the impact of the Glorious Revolution on historiographical cultures. In 1688, English elites replaced a system which was effectively absolutist with a limited monarchy.[58] The shift in political structures had important consequences for the writing of history in subsequent decades. The period covered by this thesis ends in 1788 since the French Revolution had a major impact on both French and British historiographical cultures, an impact that cannot be adequately explored within the parameters of this study.[59]

This thesis examines a number of little-studied primary texts. Some works of English history by French historians were translated and published in Britain; others were not.[60] The following chapters look at both groups, as well as those by British historians of French history, in order to compare the views of the British and the French about each other's past.[61] The thesis pays close attention to the works of four historians

---

[58] Shelley Burtt, *Virtue Transformed: Political Argument in England, 1688-1740* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1992), p. 15.

[59] Histories of France published in the early 1790s as a result of turmoil across the channel would make an interesting topic for further study. A few examples are: Charles John Ann Hereford, *History of France* (1791); John Gifford, *History of France* (1793); William Beckford, *History of France* (1794); and Sir Nathaniel William Wraxall, *History of France* (1795).

[60] French historical accounts of English history that will be examined in this thesis include: Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, *The History of England*, trans. by Nicolas Tindal, 15 vols (London: James and John Knapton, 1725-1731); Abbé Raynal, *The History of the Parliament of England*, trans. by [Anon] (London: T. Osbourne, 1751); Abbé Millot, *Elements of the History of England*, trans. by Mr Kenrick, 2 vols (Dublin: James Williams, 1771); Isaac de Larrey, *Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse, et d'Irelande,* 3 vols (Rotterdam: Reiner Leers, 1707-1713); Pierre Joseph d'Orléans, *Histoire des revolutions d'Angleterre depuis le commencement de la monarchie jusqu'à present,* 3 vols (Paris: Daniel Horthemels, 1689); Gabriel Henri Gaillard, *Histoire de la rivalité de la France et de l'Angleterre*, 10 vols (Paris: Saillant and Nyon, 1771-1777).

[61] British historical accounts of French history that will be examined in this thesis include: David Jones, *The History of France from the Origin of that Nation to the* Year *1702,* 2 vols (London: D. Brown and A.

to facilitate depth of analysis. Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, Abbé Raynal and Abbé Millot were esteemed historians who were well known and widely-read in both France and England. Rapin's *History of England* is a focal point for analysis in particular. As Okie argues, Rapin's history was the most popular history of England in the eighteenth century until the arrival of David Hume's account.[62] David Hume's *History of England* will therefore be a central reference point.[63]

This thesis will also examine French historical accounts of England that were not translated and published in Britain in part or full, in order to provide a greater understanding of the historiographical practices of French authors writing English history. I will therefore make use of the accounts of Isaac de Larrey (1639-1719), Pierre-Joseph d'Orléans (1641-1698) and Gabriel Henri Gaillard (1726-1806). Their grand narrative histories of England, which were published between 1688 and 1788, provide useful insights into the content and nature of texts that were not widely received within Britain. I will also draw upon the work of Henri Griffet (1698-1771), a leading Jesuit writer, in the last chapter of this thesis. His work, *New Lights Thrown Upon the History of Mary Queen of England, Eldest Daughter of Henry VIII. Addressed to David Hume*, first published in France in 1769 and then in Britain in 1771, provides a useful commentary on the contemporary anti-Catholic historiographical sentiments within eighteenth-century Britain.[64]

Only a few grand narrative histories of France were published from 1688-1788 from original British authors, while the rest were translations from the original French

---

Bell, 1702); Richard Rolt, *A New History of France, by Question and Answer* (London: W. Owen, 1754); Richard Johnson, *The History of France: From the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (London: E. Newbery, 1786).

[62] Okie, pp. 1, 47.

[63] David Hume, *The History of England,* 2nd edn, 8 vols (London: A. Miller, 1763).

[64] Henri Griffet, *Nouveaux éclaircissements sur l'histoire de Marie, reine d'Angleterre, fille aînée de Henri VIII. Adressés à M. David Hume* (Amsterdam et Paris: Delatour, 1766); Henri Griffet, *New Lights Thrown Upon the History of Mary Queen of England, Eldest Daughter of Henry VIII. Addressed to David Hume*, trans. by [Anon] (London: J. Wilkie, 1771)

accounts.[65] The three historical accounts of France written by British authors included in this thesis are useful for their varied formats, writing styles and targeted audiences. They were also published in completely different periods of the eighteenth century. The first of these works is *The History of France* by David Jones (1676-1720). Published in 1702, Jones' multi-volume historical account is the largest and most detailed of three French histories by British authors examined in this thesis. I will also explore Richard Rolt's (1724-1770) *A New History of France* (1754). A children's history, it was described as suitable 'for the instruction of the children of a noble family' in its title page. The text is in question and answer format, and its brief and direct answers sheds light on contemporary British historical opinions of French history. The third and final text, Richard Johnson's *The History of France* (1786), was 'designed for the use of young ladies and gentlemen', according to its author. The text was published over thirty years later and aimed at an older audience. Johnson wrote a lengthier text written in the more traditional narrative prose that did not follow the question and answer format. These three assorted texts, from three distinctive periods in the eighteenth century, will shed light on contemporary British historiographical cultures, and the ways in which these cultures affected the interpretation of the past of their French counterparts.

The most important figure in this thesis is Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, whose *History of England*, originally *Histoire D'Angleterre*, was the most popular history of England until David Hume's was printed in 1754. Rapin was born in 1661 in Castres, France. He came from a family with a strong legal background which likely influenced his decision to train as an advocate. A Huguenot, he went to London after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, and later moved to Utrecht. Rapin spent several years as a tutor in England before settling in Wesel in 1707. Ten years later, he published his *Dissertation of the Whigs and Tories*, which aimed to explain England's constitution to non-English readers. It became very well-regarded, even in Britain itself. Originally planned as a sequel, Rapin's *Histoire d'Angleterre* was published in The Hague between 1724 and 1727. The scope of this work allowed Rapin to expand on the English mixed

---

[65] This scarcity was a result of several possibilities: that the publishing market did not call for it, no one was interested in penning their own version, or the English simply trusted the French to tell their own history.

constitution in a grander historical context. Rapin died in 1725, shortly after the work was completed; his death, coupled with the fact that the work was in French, meant that it was outside of copyright law and allowed it to be printed in Britain and distributed easily.[66] Rapin's *History* remained popular throughout the eighteenth century. Six new French editions and five English translations were published in the thirty years after the first edition in French of 1724-1727.[67] The prevalence of Rapin's works in both countries gives an indication of the close literary relationship between the two nations and their shared historiographical practices.

The impact of Paul de Rapin-Thoyras' historical work has been acknowledged in contemporary scholarship, but mostly with regard to his role as a precursor to David Hume. M.G. Sullivan argues that the *History of England* had a formative influence on the development of the eighteenth-century culture of writing and reading history.[68] Sullivan contends that David Hume's *History of England* (1754-1763), as well as other works and personal letters, display a direct and critical engagement with Rapin's work. In addition, Sullivan asserts, Hume shaped his own authorial identity in relation to Rapin.[69] Hugh Trevor-Roper's study of Rapin emphasises the status of the French historian as an important Huguenot émigré scholar, and discusses his role as an intermediary between the two cultures of England and France. Trevor-Roper argues that Rapin's influence can be found in the footnotes of Edward Gibbon and in the 'easily-flowing prose of Voltaire'.[70] Trevor-Roper's study informs us of Rapin's life, as well as his success over his Huguenot competitor in his field, Isaac de Larrey, whose contemporaneous history of England was not met with the same acclaim.[71] Okie's study of Rapin views the French historian as an important figure in the development of the secular tone in eighteenth-century history writing.[72] Okie argues that 'no historian […]

---

[66] Sullivan, 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity', p. 149.
[67] Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'A Huguenot Historian: Paul Rapin', in *Huguenots in Britain and their French Background 1550-1800*, ed. by I. Scoulaudi (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1987), pp. 3-20 (p. 14).
[68] Sullivan, 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity', p. 145.
[69] Sullivan, 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity', p. 147.
[70] Trevor-Roper, p. 4.
[71] Trevor-Roper, p. 10. For more details on Rapin's life, see M. Raoul de Cazenove, *Rapin-Thoyras, Sa Famille, Sa Vie, et Ses Oevres* (Paris: A. Aubry, 1866); Hicks, pp. 146-150.
[72] Okie, p. 47.

was referred to as frequently and favourably as Rapin-Thoyras'.[73] His study asserts that Rapin's works influenced the Court-Country historical debate, and that his philosophy of history writing influenced the texts of many British writers, including Bolingbroke.[74] This thesis aims to build upon the work of Sullivan, Trevor-Roper and Okie, through a close analysis of the content of Rapin's *History of England*. It will note the French historian's role in eighteenth-century British historiographical practices, by drawing attention to Rapin's use of popular British politics and ideals, and notions of virtue and vice, to explain the motives and behaviours of English monarchs. It will explore Rapin's significant contribution to historiographical cultures in both France and Britain, by highlighting his engagement with English monarchs and their portrayals as figures for readerly engagement and contemplation, setting the stage for eighteenth-century neoclassical accounts of English history.

In the early eighteenth century, a growth of interest in histories written in an impartial style, avoiding Whig or Tory interpretations of the past, led to historians emphasizing their political objectivity.[75] Factional disputes within history writing had been significant since 1641.[76] By contrast, Rapin advertised his impartiality in his writing, and his objectivity was recognised by political figures and other writers. For instance, Lord Kames described Rapin as 'a judicious historian', while Robert Wallace believed that Rapin 'appears the most impartial of our historians'.[77] Rapin's background resonated with French readers, who believed that English historians were incapable of historical impartiality due to party allegiances.[78] Trevor-Roper highlights the positive reception of Rapin's work throughout Europe and shows that it was well received by

---

[73] Okie, p. 67.
[74] Okie, p. 68.
[75] Okie, p. 5.
[76] Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, pp. 167-168.
[77] Henry Home, Lord Kames, *Essays on British Antiquities*, 2nd edn (London: M. Cooper, 1749), p. 126; Robert Wallace, 'Papers of Robert Wallace in Edinburgh University Library', in Duncan Forbes, *Hume's Philosophical Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), p. 234.
[78] Trevor-Roper, p. 15.

Catholic, Protestant, English, French, Whig and Tory readers.[79] Rapin's background meant that readers expected a non-partisan, outsider's view of English history.[80]

Rapin and other authors were able to present the credentials for their impartiality to their readers through their prefaces and dedications.[81] The dedication which Rapin included in his English translations aimed to shape his own reputation. By dedicating his work to George I, Rapin sought to appeal to British readers and to make it clear that he respected the monarchy, even as a foreigner. Rapin presented himself as an impartial historian by describing his work as a 'simple and faithful recital of the actions of the Kings'; at the same time, he complimented his English audience by attributing historical events to 'the courage, the zeal, and the faithfulness of their English Subjects'.[82] Rapin also praised the relationship between monarch and government, writing: 'One will see clearly in this History, that the constant union of the Sovereign with his Parliament, is the most solid foundation for the glory of the Prince and the welfare of the Subjects'.[83] Rapin's praise was particularly resonant given that readers knew no such relationship existed in Rapin's native France. In fact, his departure from his homeland undoubtedly pleased many English readers, who felt the English political system was superior to the French.[84] While Rapin described his work as taking on 'the task of instructing Foreigners', he anticipated that his work would be much more widely read in Britain than in his home country, as his status as an exiled Huguenot allowed his publishers and translators to present him as an historian with a unique ability to transcend national prejudice and partiality. His preface targeted a British audience, and translators and publishers continued to market his perspective as impartial after his death.

---

[79] Trevor-Roper, p. 14.
[80] Okie, pp. 1, 47; Devoney Looser, *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820* (Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), p. 11.
[81] Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, p. 11.
[82] Paul de Rapin Thoyras, *Histoire D'Angleterre,* 10 vols (A La Haye: Chez Alexandre de Rogissart, 1724-1727), I, p. i.
[83] Rapin, *Histoire D'Angleterre* I, p. i.
[84] Graham C. Gibbs, 'Huguenot Contributions to England's Intellectual Life and England's Intellectual Commerce with Europe, c. 1680-1720', in Scoulaudi, pp. 20-41 (p. 20).

Rapin's impartial approach made an influential contribution to the development of a historical method which weighed up multiple opinions and forms of evidence. Rapin compared numerous historical sources and documents throughout his work. In this sense, Rapin acted as a judge, appraising the evidence from a wide variety of sources. Usually, after an assertion of impartiality, Rapin provided his own opinion, which was justified by the depiction of his capacity to evaluate the evidence effectively. This approach to sources ran in parallel with his legal qualifications and prompted his numerous translators to employ legal metaphors to describe his historical methods. Nicolas Tindal (1687-1784), the most popular translator of Rapin, described the historian as 'judicious'. David Hume took a similar view, at least initially.[85] By citing numerous sources and assessing their reliability, Rapin was able to portray himself as an impartial author who trusted his readers to form their own conclusions.[86]

Rapin's *History of England* was kept in the public's mind for decades due to the numerous advertisements for Nicolas Tindal's translation and continuation of the work. Tindal's last volume to his *Continuation* was published in 1760, more than thirty years after Rapin's original was first published in English. The succession of editions reminded the English that Rapin was a valid and reliable historian, whose work was popular enough to be continuously updated until the present day. For example, in August 1760, a continuation of the history was advertised to contain events up to January 1760.[87] Advertisements for Rapin's *History* in journals and newspapers published in London give some indication of how historical works were marketed. During this period, readers could choose from a variety of editions, translations and texts. Editions of Rapin's *History* were advertised in a 1751 issue of the *London Advertiser and Literary Gazette*, for instance. The paper advertised Nicolas Tindal's *Continuation* of Rapin's work while reminding readers that a summary of Rapin's *History* was available, as well as Tindal's original translations.[88] On the same page, another historical work on England is advertised: *A New History of England,* which was

---

[85] Sullivan, 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity', p. 154; Hicks, p. 149.
[86] Okie, pp. 47, 53.
[87] Evening Post or London Intelligencer, *issue 2247* (Leeds; London: 9-12 August 1760).
[88] London Advertiser and Literary Gazette, *issue 11* (London: 15 March 1751).

offered in both French and English. Available in question and answer form, it was described as 'extracted from the most celebrated Historians', 'particularly M. De Rapin Thoyras'. This citation highlights the credibility of Rapin in the eyes of English readers. In a 1734 advertisement in the *Daily Journal*, Rapin's historical skills were promoted in Tindal's continuation, where Tindal's work is described as encompassing Rapin's 'method, faithfulness, Impartiality, Freedom and Plainness'.[89] Here it is evident that Rapin had a highly regarded reputation with the reading public, a reputation that publishers used to their advantage in advertisements. Had Rapin's work not been so well received, it is doubtful that Tindal would have invested over thirty years writing a continuation. Furthermore, the regular advertisements for these continuations ensured that Tindal and Rapin remained in the public eye.

Rapin's numerous editions, and Tindal's continuations, contributed to the French historian's success. Following the Glorious Revolution, it became increasingly common to write about the more recent past. When discussing the history of England, most began with its Roman origins, and many eighteenth-century historians also included periods leading all the way up to 1688 and even beyond.[90] Rapin started his *History* with Julius Caesar and finished his work with James II (1633-1701), and Tindal's *Continuation* brought Rapin's account forward to the reign of George II (1683-1760). Tindal's extensions of Rapin's history integrated the historian's views of the ancient Saxon constitution and the necessity of regulating royal power, and he maintained this view in his continuations of English history since the revolution of 1688.[91] Tindal's work was much valued at the time, although not without controversy. There were some questions about the authorship of the *Continuation* (although there is no evidence to support those contentions and his many other works and literary style point to its authenticity).[92] Three decades after Tindal's translation, print runs of Rapin's work, which included the *Continuation*, probably amounted to a total of 18,000 copies. By way of comparison,

---

[89] Daily Journal, *issue 4244* (London: 24 August 1734).
[90] Okie, p. 2.
[91] A.F. Pollard, 'Tindal, Nicholas (1687-1774)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/article/27463> [accessed 25 June 2016].
[92] Pollard; M.G. Sullivan, 'Rapin de Thoyras, Paul de (1661-1725)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, < http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/article/23145> [accessed 08 June 2012].

only 16,000 copies of Clarendon's *History* are believed to have been printed.[93] Edward Hyde, First Earl of Clarendon (1609-1674), was an influential historian of the seventeenth century who became very popular with the reading public with his *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England: Begun in the Year 1641*, published in 1702-1704.[94] The high number of print runs of Rapin in comparison to Clarendon demonstrates Rapin's popularity with a British audience.

Abbé Millot and Abbé Raynal also achieved success in eighteenth-century Britain, although they never received quite the same recognition as Rapin. The work entitled *L'Histoire du parlement d'Angleterre* by Abbé Raynal, or Guillaume Thomas François Raynal, was first published in French in 1748 and anonymously translated into English in 1751. Raynal was educated by the Jesuits and joined the order as a young man, but, after going to Paris to work for the church, he gave up religious life in favour of writing. He was well-known in France, where from 1750 to 1754 he edited the government-supported literary periodical *Mercure de France*, winning literary respectability and a place in society. By the middle of the century, Raynal had become an accepted and prominent intellectual figure in England, as evidenced by his election as a member of the Royal Society of London in 1754.[95] His prominence in both France and Britain before the publication of his *History of the Parliament of England* helped pave

---

[93] The first translation of Rapin's *Histoire D'Angleterre* was commissioned in 1725 by the London booksellers James and John Knapton. The Knaptons' serialization of Rapin's work was considered ground breaking for the entire publishing industry. In 1729 another London bookseller, John Astley, published John Lockman's version of Rapin: *A New History of England*, which converted Rapin into question and answer form. Lockman's version of Rapin proved to be quite popular, as it was in its sixteenth edition by 1770 and still in use in schools in the first decade of the nineteenth century. In addition to English education, it had also been used as a textbook for French teaching. Following the success of the Knaptons, the bookseller John Mechell commissioned a hack writer, John Kelly, to deliver another translation in 1732, with a second volume translated by Joseph Morgan. By issuing Rapin's history in weekly parts, Mechell had hoped to outdo the Knaptons, as he also included illustrations as well as a preface that criticised the quality and price of the contending edition. Instead, the Knaptons also released their edition in weekly parts and included Tindal's continuation of Rapin's history up to 1727. Following this development, Mechell retaliated with a continuation by a Thomas Lediard which then saw the Knaptons add further illustrations, genealogical trees and maps. By the middle of the eighteenth century, Rapin had been translated three times, abridged as well as summarised, diversely illustrated and, in 1729 had even been printed with a French translation of Tindal's footnotes. For more on Rapin's translation and publication history, see Sullivan, 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity', pp. 151-152; Hicks, p. 147.
[94] Martine Watson Brownley, *Clarendon and the Rhetoric of Historical Form* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), p. xii.
[95] John Morley, *Diderot and the Encyclopaedists*, 2 vols (London: Chapman and Hall, 1878), II.

the way for his historical success in Britain. This success was amplified a few decades later with his publication of *L'Histoire philosophique et politique des établissements et du commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes* (1770) which, according to J.G.A. Pocock, was 'the first major history of the world-system'.[96] Raynal had the assistance of various members of the *philosophe* community in the production of this work, and even Diderot is credited with a portion. The influence of Raynal's involvement in enlightened discourses is present in his *The History of the Parliament of England*, as he condemns any actions of excessive passion or religious zeal. *The History*, however, is obviously one of Raynal's early works. The text's simple narrative and absence of notes or source material suggests an aim to appeal to a wider reading audience.

The other key historian who was well-received in Britain was the Abbé Millot, or Claude-François-Xavier Millot, who wrote *Élémens de l'histoire d'Angleterre, depuis son origine sous les Romains, jusqu'au regne de George II*, first published in 1769. Millot was a French churchman and historian. As well as writing *Élémens de l'histoire d'Angleterre,* his most famous works include *Éléments de l'histoire de France, depuis Clovis jusqu'à Louis XV* (1767-1769) and his *Élémens d'histoire générale* (1772-1773). The latter, which grew in popularity as the eighteenth century wore on, was prescribed to teach the newly created, and prioritized, subject of history in French central schools and is an indication of the public's response to his historical skills.[97] As Millot was a well-respected historian in France, his success in Britain suggests that his reputation crossed the channel.

Two different translations of Millot's *History* appeared in the eighteenth century. One was translated by a Mrs Brooke and published in London; the other was translated by William Kenrick (1725-1779) and published in Dublin. Kenrick was a well-known British novelist, playwright, translator and satirist and for these reasons I have used the Kenrick translation for this study. Kenrick admits to 'supress[ing] his sentiments',

---

[96] J.G.A. Pocock, 'Commerce, Settlement and History: A Reading of the Histoire des deux Indes', in *Articulating America: Fashioning a National Political Culture in Early America – Essays in Honour of J.R. Pole*, ed. by Rebecca Star (New York: Roman and Littlefield, 2000), pp. 14-44 (p. 16).
[97] Matthias Meirlaen, 'Philosophical History in the Revolutionary School Curriculum: Claude-François-Xavier Millot's Élémens d'histoire générale', *History of European Ideas*, 36:3 (2010), 302-310 (p. 302).

which include Millot's 'Romish faith' and 'partiality to his own country'.[98] Yet these corrections were minor, as Mrs Brooke explained in the advertisement to her translation that Millot's cultural and political views tended to align with those of the British. Mrs Brooke had informed her readers that due to Millot's Catholic faith and French nationality, she had compared his history 'throughout with Rapin and Hume; and has the pleasure to find, that there is no fact of any kind misrepresented, and no material one omitted'.[99] Mrs Brooke's comparison of Millot with Rapin and Hume illustrates the prominence of Rapin's *History* in eighteenth-century historiographical cultures. The analysis also provides insight into the apprehensions the British had towards French historians, and the way in which translators had to deal with differences in nationality and faith.

A notable attribute of Millot's history is that it was published much later than many other successful histories. French Enlightenment historiography flourished in the 1750s and the 1760s, and David Hume, whom Millot cites, had completed his *History of England* in 1762, seven years before the publication of the *Histoire d'Angleterre.* Millot was able to assess the histories of his predecessors from this vantage point. As a result of this awareness, Millot's work became a distinctive assembly that encompassed the main theories and philosophies of eighteenth-century history.[100] Millot entered the Jesuit order as a young man, and taught in many of their *collèges*, including at Lyon, where he taught rhetoric but was eventually expelled for praising Montesquieu. Millot was also inspired by Voltaire, and formulated a progressive form of history that is also found in Hume's *History*.[101] O'Brien notes that many British historians held the view that history was stadial: a progression that held many stages and held a natural trajectory.[102] The presence of this stadial form of history in Millot's account provides us with direct evidence of the cross-channel exchange of historiographical cultures.

---

[98] William Kenrick, 'Advertisement', in Abbé Millot, *Elements of the History of England*, trans. by Mr Kenrick, 2 vols (Dublin: James Williams, 1771), I, pp. iii-iv (p. iv).

[99] Mrs Brooke, 'Advertisement', in Abbé Millot, *Elements of the History of England*, trans. by Mrs Brooke, 4 vols (London: J. Dodsley and T. Cadell, 1771), I, pp. v-vii (p vi).

[100] Meirlaen, p. 309.

[101] Meirlaen, p. 308; O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment*, pp. 132-133.

[102] O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment*, pp. 132-133.

With the arrival of David Hume's *History of England* (1754-62), British authors of history became more widely appreciated and Rapin's history started to decline slowly in popularity.[103] Hume's text will thus serve as a point of comparison for French historical accounts of England's past.[104] Hume believed history was a science, consisting of the study of man and his environment. His work encompassed 'a wide variety of formal and thematic elements' which Phillips argues led to his success.[105] John Kenyan contends that Hume's history pursued causes, extending beyond well-rehearsed descriptions of wars and monarchs. Inspired by Voltaire's sense of the breadth of history, Hume widened his focus away from kings, parliaments, and armies, to incorporate literature and science as well.[106] The Scottish historian saw success with a British audience as he revealed that morals and manners had a direct effect on historical change, just as had wars and revolutions.[107] Hume believed that cultural context was a key component of history writing, as it allowed readers to comprehend past and present political events, in addition to the individual deeds of men.[108] In the interests of gaining a larger readership, Hume ensured that his approach diverged from that of Paul de Rapin. While Rapin was meticulous in the use of his sources and constantly reflexive in his handling of material, Hume sought to remove everything from his work that was inessential to the interest of his reader and that would hamper the flow of the narrative.[109]

When Hume took on his *History* he had 'calculated [it] to be popular' in the hope of exploiting the market for historical works that had been established by Rapin.[110] Declarations of impartiality became the norm in most eighteenth-century histories, even in cases where direct partisan patronage was evident. Historians had a preoccupation

---

[103] Okie, pp. 1, 47.
[104] It should be noted, however, that as a Scotsman Hume was still considered an outsider by some (Hicks, p. 3).
[105] Phillips, *On Historical Distance*, pp. 60, 61-78.
[106] John Kenyan, *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984), p. 42.
[107] Gallagher, 'The Beginnings of Enlightenment Historiography', p. 344.
[108] Hicks, p. 185.
[109] Sullivan, 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity', p. 158.
[110] Hume, *'Letter to Andrew Millar*, December 1754', in David Hume, *The Letters of David Hume,* ed. by J.Y.T. Greig (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932), p. 217; Sullivan, 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity', p. 157; Hicks, p. 174.

with appearing impartial, as like the true eighteenth-century gentleman, the best historian should be able to regard the past with disinterest.[111] Hume's portrayal of impartiality was different in the sense that he intentionally blended Whig and Tory interpretations of specific accounts. Phillips believes that Hume 'was anxious to distinguish himself from what he regarded as the narrow partisanship of earlier historians'.[112] This detached stance was designed to signal Hume's distinction from previous historians, and it succeeded in making his work appeal to readers of various political opinions.[113]

Section 3: Methodology

A point of particular interest throughout this thesis will be the characterization of monarchs by French and British historians. Narrative history, particularly political history, had traditionally played an important role in the education of gentlemen and men of affairs, and included the moral characterization of notable figures.[114] O'Brien argues that in the eighteenth century, the historical audience understood what constituted a 'proper, narrative history', which was a genre of history that was aimed towards the educated and the elite, who often expected moral examples in depictions of historical figures.[115] The period saw the humanization of historical figures in historical writing, as authors wanted their audience to feel engrossed in their historical material. Within the varied historical genres, such as autobiographies and memoirs, historical characters were individualized, and eighteenth-century writers made great men, previously displayed as heroes and examples of moral behaviour, into 'figures for readerly sympathy or ridicule', as Noelle Gallagher argues.[116]

---

[111] Okie, p. 10; Hicks, pp. 13-14; John Barrell, *English Literature in History, 1730-80: An Equal, Wide Survey* (London: Hutchinson, 1983), pp. 51-52.
[112] Phillips, *On Historical Distance*, p. 15.
[113] Sullivan, 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity', pp. 157, 159.
[114] O'Brien, 'The History Market', p. 105.
[115] O'Brien, 'The History Market', p. 105.
[116] Gallagher, *Historical Literatures*, p. 9.

Portraits, or character sketches, were a crucial feature of the classical concept of history writing. Historians often employed post-mortem character descriptions in order to evaluate the virtues and vices that were present in the important historical figure's life. As moral instruction was key to the humanist and neoclassical tradition, the character sketch facilitated the overall purpose of reading history as a form of training for public life.[117] Phillips argues that eighteenth-century history's concern with character had two purposes: 'As mimetic narrative, history is largely the story of the revelation of character in action, while as instruction, it is an effective form of teaching that uses compelling examples to train readers to aspire to virtue and to shun the temptations of vice'.[118] These characteristics are prominent features of eighteenth-century accounts of French and English monarchs. Historians included character sketches to provide a summary of the figure for the reader, and at the same time gave their audience a clear guide on how they should feel about the entire reign of a monarch. Using eighteenth-century notions of virtue and vice was a useful tool to depict a monarch's reign as a positive or negative development in the overarching history of England, while also portraying the monarch in a way that historians hoped would connect to the reader.

Due to similarities between characters in history and characters in other genres, historical figures, like literary characters, were employed as behavioural models. In both historical accounts and the classical and medieval epic, historical figures or characters were used to provide examples of vice and virtue to the reader.[119] The writing methods of eighteenth-century novelists and historians also shared great similarities during this period in their employment of the behavioural model, as both were written with the intention of creating a narrative that convincingly shaped human lives, witnessed directly or through records and memories of the past.[120] While history demonstrated the motivations and virtues of great men to explain great historical events, the novel aimed to accomplish the same purpose, but on a smaller, more domestic level.[121] This thesis

---

[117] Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, p. 65.
[118] Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, p. 65.
[119] Gallagher, 'Historiography', p. 635.
[120] Braudy, p. 3.
[121] Neil Hargraves, 'Revelation of Character in Eighteenth-Century Historiography and William Robertson's *History of the Reign of Charles V*', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 27:2 (2003), 23-48 (p. 31).

will explore how eighteenth-century French historians employed the characterization of historical figures in the grand manner, as historians linked the behaviour of great men to great historical events, speculating on their motivations in order to create lessons of virtuous behaviour for contemporary readers to emulate.

In neoclassical history, the historical figure was used as a moral and educational exemplar, and writers also highlighted the contribution of the individual to historical change.[122] Historical figures, or characters, were used by authors to portray their own insights into human nature and to fit the public's clear desire for insightful accounts of historical actors, customs and manners.[123] Through the provision of historical facts, historians sought to impart the relevant roles of contemporary values.[124] Eighteenth-century historians attempted to separate themselves from the dry accounts of earlier chroniclers, and employed the characterization of historical figures to connect with a wider audience.[125] Neil Hargraves suggests that there were two functions of the character in eighteenth-century historical works. For Hargraves, the first function was as an object of moral evaluation, normally constructed from notions of virtues and vice. The second function was how the character sketch offered a space for the author to demonstrate his historical skills, and to prove their identity as historians, as it was 'the forum for the display of [the historian's] forensic and artistic capability, his command of materials, and his penetrative insight into human nature'.[126] In linking the individual, and their influence, to the 'effective cause of historical change', eighteenth-century history was infused with the 'moral and political instruction that the historian wished to impart'.[127] As Hicks notes, the characterization of historical figures lifted from the classical narrative enhanced history's status during the eighteenth century, and Hume's characterization in particular was considered 'a great neoclassical literary achievement'.[128] Rapin, Raynal and Millot used both of these ideas of the historical

---

[122] Hargraves, p. 25.
[123] Hargraves, p. 25; Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, pp. 14-18, 29-30.
[124] Fussner, p. 319.
[125] Hargraves, p. 25; Brownley, pp. 12, 146-85.
[126] Hargraves, p. 24.
[127] Hargraves, p. 25.
[128] Hicks, p. 200.

character to infuse their historical accounts with British notions of politics, sentiment, and morality.

Previously, history held a tradition of creating general archetypes of their historical figures, but the eighteenth century saw the emergence of the humanization of these great figures, through the exploration of their inner lives. Great men were a prominent dimension of eighteenth-century historical writing, and their roles as historical characters were central to contemporary historiography. The multiple genres of history in the eighteenth century contributed to these developments, which also occurred because authors wanted to ensure that their readers felt more engaged with their accounts.[129] Some subgenres deployed historical figures in specific ways. The neoclassical genre of history used historical figures as behavioural models, and historical accounts were used as lessons in a nation's views of appropriate virtues and undesirable vices. The portrayal of English monarchs by French historians is exemplary of the way in which neoclassical history focused on providing a narrative of great men. These historical accounts demonstrate how authors expanded on this method as they discussed the inner lives and motives of these great figures to provide instruction, and material for inward reflection, for readers.

In focusing on the description of French and English monarchs this thesis will argue that the writing of history was influenced by the increasing humanization of monarchs in eighteenth-century France and, less strongly, in Britain. The image of the monarchy changed as monarchs started to play a more visible role in local and national affairs.[130] In France, Louis XV's reputation for decadence rather than virtue was well known. Similarly, the view that the king allowed his mistresses to dictate political policy was widespread. The king's vices, which were supposed to be private, became a part of public politics, and shaped perceptions of the monarchical government as corrupt.[131] In Britain, while political satirists mocked George III for his foreign descent, stutter and

---

[129] Phillips, '"If Mrs Mure Be Not Sorry"', p. 111.

[130] Jeffrey Merrick, 'Politics on Pedestals: Royal Monuments in Eighteenth-Century France', *French History,* 5:2 (1991), 234-264 (p. 238); Jeffrey Merrick, *The Desacralization of the French Monarchy in the Eighteenth Century* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990).

[131] Marisa Linton, *The Politics of Virtue in Enlightenment France* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), p. 130.

bouts of madness, the public mocked him as an individual rather than the institution of monarchy itself.[132] In histories written by British authors, criticism of specific monarchs did not imply criticism of the institution of kingship. The way in which French historians portrayed English monarchs fits within this historiographical method, as monarchs were presented as models of both virtuous and immoral behaviour. Historians explored the inner lives of kings and queens to humanize great figures for a contemporary audience, not to condemn the actions of the monarchy. While French authors may have been writing with French publishing restrictions and censorship in mind, their unwillingness to criticize the institution of British kingship in their history writing was a historiographical practice which they shared with their British counterparts.

Historical figures, especially great men, were used to demonstrate a nation's ideas of virtue. Neoclassical *artes historicae* emerged at the end of the seventeenth century which recommended that historians emulate the writing style and aims of the ancients, such as Livy and Tacitus.[133] French works such as *Of the Art of Writing and Judging of History* (1694) by Pierre le Moyne and *Instructions for History* (1680) by René Rapin were translated into English and became well known in both countries for championing the neoclassical ideal of writing history. This instruction included the idealization of historical figures in order to provide the audience of history at this time, the elite statesmen), examples of virtuous behaviour.[134] *Artes historicae* remained popular until the late eighteenth century, and influenced contemporary historical reading and writing practices.[135] Historical genres encompassed moral examples because from the 1640s and 1650s onwards in England, the nation's interest in virtue increased due to the upheavals experienced due to the Civil War and regicide.[136] As the events remained in the population's recent memory well into the eighteenth century, history stressed to

---

[132] Lora Rempel, 'Carnal Satire and the Constitutional King: George III in James Gillray's Monstrous Craws at a New Coalition Feast', *Art History*, 18:1 (1995), 4-23 (p. 4).
[133] Anthony Grafton, *What was History: The Art of History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 4-5, 64-66, 71, 194.
[134] Gallagher, *Historical Literatures*, p. 2.
[135] Grafton, p. 21.
[136] Kevin Sharpe, 'Virtues, Passions and Politics in Early Modern England', *History of Political Thought*, 32:5 (2011), 773-798 (pp. 780-781).

readers the need to regulate oneself, as unrestrained passions had developed into a synonym for Civil War and anarchy.[137] By the mid-eighteenth century, the ideal man had become a combination of morality, masculinity and integrity. The virtuous man was independent as well as incorruptible, both in his private and public life. He should have honest natural impulses, but be able to master his emotions whenever necessary.[138] This notion of virtue provided the basis for moral judgments of a historical figure's characterization.

My thesis will examine how eighteenth-century French and British historians invoked contemporary notions of virtue in their descriptions of English monarchs. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, virtue centred around the Christian form of the concept, as well as the civic virtue of classical republicanism. These beliefs were followed by the model of natural and sociable virtue, originating in British philosophers such as the third Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713) and Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746). Their theories were then adapted by French *philosophes*.[139] In France, by the mid-eighteenth century, individuals were encouraged not only to feel virtuous, but also to act virtuously.[140] The eighteenth-century historical accounts employed in this thesis will explore the varied ways in which historians commented on ideas of virtue in their descriptions of English monarchs.

In order to understand the aims of the historians examined in this thesis, it is important to acknowledge the various meanings that 'virtue' evoked in the eighteenth century. Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary* had ten definitions for virtue when used as noun.[141] Johnson's *Dictionary,* a work that appeared in 1755, is a useful source as it was first published in the middle of the period from which the sources in this thesis are

---

[137] Sharpe, pp. 780-781.
[138] Marisa Linton, 'Virtue Rewarded? Women and the Politics of Virtue in Eighteenth-Century France. Part I', *History of European Ideas*, 26 (2000), 35-49 (p. 36); David Morse, *The Age of Virtue: British Culture from The Restoration to Romanticism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), pp. 17-19.
[139] Linton, *The Politics of Virtue*, p. 15.
[140] R. Mauzi, *L'Idée du Bonheur dans la literature et la pensée française au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: A. Michel, 1960), pp. 605-13; Linton, *The Politics of Virtue*, p. 110.
[141] For more on the content of Johnson's *Dictionary* see A. Reddick, *The Making of Johnson's Dictionary 1746-1773* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

examined. The work will have derived definitions from the years leading up to it, and then continued to influence the British public for several decades. In fact, the work was viewed as the leading English dictionary until the completion of the *Oxford English Dictionary* 173 years later. The first great endeavour of its kind, the work was soon regarded as a standard authority after its first publication.[142] The applicable definitions of virtue were: 1. 'Moral goodness'; 2. 'A particular moral excellence'; 8. 'Bravery; valour'; and 9. 'Excellence; that which gives excellence'. Johnson also defined *virtuous*, and all but one of the definitions are useful here: as 1. 'Morally Good'; 2. [Applied to women] 'Chaste'; 3. 'Done in consequence of moral goodness'; and 5. 'Having wonderful or eminent properties'. The definitions for both that do not apply are about power, efficacy and whether divine or medical'.[143] David Morse believes that three more definitions existed in public knowledge at the time, which were '1. *Promoting and Advancing the Public Good* 2. *Benevolence* and 3. *The distinguishing mark of the aristocrat or gentleman, exhibiting the best qualities of an aristocrat or gentleman*'.[144] Morse argues that eighteenth-century virtue signified not only moral excellence but worthy social graces, such as elegance, dignity and politeness.[145] According to Pocock, virtue in the eighteenth century was inspired by republican ideals and as a result notions of virtue were often expressed in terms of devotion to the public good.[146] All of these new implications of virtue influenced how people perceived one another, and I argue that French eighteenth-century historians used these diverse meanings of virtue to create a historical figure that could both instruct and entertain readers. Morse's argument that the public good was imperative to eighteenth-century virtue is especially present within French and British historical texts of the period. The similar conceptions of virtue shared by the two nations were demonstrated in the way French historians wrote English history. They discussed the virtues and vices of Charles I (1600-1649), in his post-mortem portrait, ultimately giving a moral lesson about the Civil War. They also

---

[142] Pat Rogers, 'Johnson, Samuel (1709-1784)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/article/14918>, [accessed 28 June 2017].
[143] Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language,* 2 vols (London: J. and P. Knapton and A. Millar, 1755) II, p. 1028.
[144] Morse, pp. 3-4.
[145] Morse, p. 4.
[146] J.G.A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 42-50.

employed characterizations of virtue and vice to portray a chivalrous king in battle, seen in depictions of Richard I (1157-1199), or the Black Prince (1330-1376). Rapin, Millot, Raynal and Hume all characterized Henry VIII (1491-1547) with both vices and virtues when dealing with his portrayal as a king and husband. While these historians did not always agree on their depiction of monarchs, they all portrayed the ideal monarch as one who overcame personal vices for the common and public good.

Section 4: The Adaptation of the Neoclassical Model of History in the Eighteenth Century

The neoclassical model of history was adapted in the eighteenth century in order to appeal to a growing reading audience. The structure remained the same, and its instructional element continued to be a significant aspect, but its intended audience expanded from an elite readership to the middling order. Hicks describes neoclassical history as 'a narrative worthy of deed, polite and dignified, written to instruct the political elite with moral and political lessons'.[147] The elite status of formal historical accounts was the crucial element that eighteenth-century historians hoped to maintain, and as Hicks explains: 'contemporaries were careful to define history in precise terms to distinguish it from lesser forms in the literary hierarchy'.[148] Consequently, the framework of neoclassical history was kept in order to keep its status and usefulness as a social commodity. Historians, however, were aware of, and aimed to write for, the 'new readers' that Gallagher argues started to emerge at the beginning of the period.[149] Hicks notes that Hume wrote for an audience of 'gentry and nobility but also urban professionals and others ranked just below the landed elite', and he 'created a market for neoclassical history more diverse in terms of gender, nationality, and even class'.[150] By the last quarter of the eighteenth century neoclassical history was securely established in

---

[147] Hicks, p. 10.
[148] Hicks, p. 10.
[149] Gallagher, *Historiography*, p. 633
[150] Hicks, pp. 176, 215.

the reading of the British 'middling sort'.[151] Hicks argues that this historical transformation occurred thanks to the likes of Gibbon and Robertson, in addition to Hume, and this thesis argues that French historians were contributing to this change as well.

Eighteenth-century French historians kept the original structure and style of the neoclassical tradition that late seventeenth-century *artes historicaes* recommended, but transformed the way they described characters in order to appeal to a new, wider audience. O'Brien suggests that 'the achievement of eighteenth-century publishers and booksellers was to attract a broader, more diverse readership for history without fatally compromising its prestigious image'.[152] While neoclassical accounts succeeded in maintaining their high cultural status, historians used contemporary values to instruct their readers and moved beyond the simply political (but still included it – they were describing kings after all) to appeal to an audience consisting of both elite statesmen and the urban middling sort. The motives for historical events became more important, and this produced a corresponding change in the moral instruction that texts offered. As Pocock notes, 'history became a narrative of contexts as well as of actions' and as a result, 'the moral and exemplary character of the actions related was affected'.[153] This thesis will expand on Pocock and explore how French historians used aspects of character to explain the human motives behind historical events, in a manner that could connect to its expanding British readership.

The reading of neoclassical history increased in the eighteenth century because history became accessible in a greater variety of ways, such as through lending libraries and periodicals. The periodical industry developed rapidly at the start of the eighteenth century, and by the middle of the century it had established itself as a sizeable and elaborate system that was centred in London and then extended throughout the country.[154] This popularity of the periodical helped expand the consuming audience for

---

[151] Hicks, p. 215.
[152] O'Brien, 'The History Market', p. 106.
[153] Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, p. 9.
[154] Stephen Botein, Jack R. Censer and Harriet Ritvo, 'The Periodical Press in Eighteenth-Century English

historical accounts, where periodical and serial publications created small, affordable, units of history. The weekly and monthly instalments of multi-volume historical works became an attractive item for less wealthy patrons, whom O'Brien informs us sometimes purchased the instalments 'in the (sometimes misplaced) trust that their purchases would eventually build into a complete work'.[155] These developments in publishing and printing helped formal histories reach a wider audience; the serialisation of Rapin's *History of England*, which was published in weekly parts in the early 1730s, provides evidence of the effect of this development.[156] In addition to the growth of the periodicals, from the 1750s onwards the reading of history among the middling sort increased because it became easier to borrow books. Long-established lending institutions that were once reserved for the clergy, such as cathedral and parish libraries, were opened for women and laymen in the mid-eighteenth century.[157] By the later eighteenth century, borrowing reading materials became ubiquitous for practically everyone, including women, as reading became increasingly popular.[158]

One should note that the audience for neoclassical histories consisted of the elite, professional and urban middling sort, and at its crux was the eighteenth-century gentleman. Robert Shoemaker argues that 'the definition of a gentleman became increasingly fluid in the eighteenth century, as the traditional basis of the possession of a coat of arms and land was transformed into vaguer criteria based on lifestyle and behaviour'.[159] Narrative histories were read by the middling sort and wealthier audiences because the cost would likely deter less affluent readers.[160] The print runs of formal historical accounts were more likely in the thousands, rather than in the tens of

and French Society: A Cross-Cultural Approach', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 23:3 (1981), 464-490 (p. 467).
[155] O'Brien, *The History Market*, p. 107.
[156] R.M. Wiles, *Serial Publishing in England Before 1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1957), p. 97.
[157] David Allan, *Commonplace Books and Reading in Georgian England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 13.
[158] Allan, p. 256.
[159] Robert Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', *Social History*, 26:2 (2001), 190-208 (p. 197).
[160] O'Brien, 'The History Market', p. 106.

thousands as seen in other forms of literature.[161] However, it cannot be ignored that as the century continued, the reading of history became encouraged as an educational activity and it also became fashionable for women to be more educated, as will be explored in the last chapter of this thesis.[162] The combination of these factors meant that history developed into a prevalent reading subject for not just the elites but the middling sort of eighteenth-century Britain. My thesis will argue that it was this emerging audience for whom French historians of English history were writing.

In response to this emerging audience, French historians began to communicate ideal behavioural and personality traits that they believed affected both the elite and the middling sort. The foundation for these ideals were eighteenth-century notions of virtue. Historians often promoted the idea that virtue was the foundation of public welfare. Hicks argues that 'history taught public men political policy as well as personal morality'.[163] This 'personal morality' had the potential to have broader resonance. It appealed not just to the 'public men' reading neoclassical accounts but to a broader, more democratic range of readers. Historians adapted the neoclassical method to impart that the public good was the responsibility of the king as well as his people. Through the exploration of virtuous character this thesis will explore how the promotion of the public good, as earlier explored in the idea of virtue in the eighteenth century, was crucial for both the elite and the middle-class readership.[164] In the eighteenth century, kingship increasingly became a more secular and public role, and this thesis argues that as a result, historians used this to their advantage, and described the actions and behaviour of monarchs that were increasingly more comparable with those of the everyday contemporary man.[165] The public role of monarchs became an important aspect of their historical depiction for an audience that consisted of more than just the elite statesmen.

The eighteenth century witnessed the evolution from historians addressing statesmen by writing about public virtues, to the inclusion of personal and private

---

[161] O'Brien, 'The History Market', p. 106.
[162] Woolf, *Reading History*, pp. 322-323.
[163] Hicks, p. 9.
[164] Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce and History*, pp. 42-50; Morse, pp. 3-4.
[165] Linton, *The Politics of Virtue*, pp. 148-149.

virtues to help readers understand their role within society. Historians addressed their growing audience in their discussions of virtue with the more inclusive language of sentiment and sympathy, especially as the public good was deemed by historians to be affected by one's personal life. As Dew and Price argue, during the period, 'history increasingly addressed the relationship between individuals' public and private selves and attempted to the people of the past in both their buskins *and* their slippers'.[166] To shed light on this growing interest in the private lives of historical figures by an expanding reading audience, I will examine how French historians conveyed to readers that actions within one's personal life affected one's life in the public sphere. For example, French historians frequently implied that a monarch's vices, which were supposed to be kept within one's personal sphere, affected his or her public politics.

French historians contributed to the British historiographical practice of creating characters that were not simply positive or negative, but often a mixture of traits that produced an idea of good character with which new audiences could connect. While the major objective for French historians was to promote certain virtues, they also sought to humanize historical figures in order to address the growing audience for neoclassical accounts. Historical figures, such as monarchs, where presented with contemporary virtues but also were presented with less than ideal characteristics. For example, Henry V (1386-1422) before taking the throne was described as immoral, but redeemed himself. Charles I was presented as a king who did not respect the rights of his people, but historians described his character in a way that instigated pity and empathy for his circumstances.[167] In describing certain characters as redeemable, or imperfect, historians sought to create connections to contemporary readers. Paulina Kewes states that history was no longer a simple formula of creating examples of positive and negative qualities.[168] Historians appealed to their readers by presenting monarchs not only as exemplary figures, but also as complex individuals.This thesis will therefore explore how historians created ideals of good character that helped readers understand and

---

[166] Dew and Price, pp. 4-5

[167] These depictions of Henry V and Charles I will be explored further in Chapters 2 and 1, respectively.

[168] Paulina Kewes, 'History and Its Uses', in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 1-30 (p. 13).

connect to historical events, where historians included fallible and imperfect character types in order to elicit a response from elite and urban middling readers, and to instruct them on ideas of the greater good.

Eighteenth-century historians of formal histories maintained a classical and traditional rhetoric that had previously been meant for statesmen. But in order to connect with a more diverse readership, and as O'Brien notes, they also 'broadened the generic and thematic scope of their works to reflect the new kinds of audience'.[169] This thesis focuses on the broadening of the 'generic and thematic' scope of neoclassical accounts, linking it to developments in the way that historians examined personal, as well as political, motivations for action. By producing characterisations that examined the private lives of historical figures, including monarchs, historians were able to describe the type of virtues and vices that addressed contemporary views and values, and with which an expanded readership could identify.

Section 5: The Depiction of Good Character in Eighteenth-Century Historical Accounts

At the turn of the eighteenth century, formal historical accounts were aimed at the elite. Philip Hicks notes that in the early modern period the historian's task had been 'to select and preserve the most important, instructive events of the past for a political class with the power to act on such instruction for the public good'.[170] As the previous section discussed, I will explore how the changing audience in the eighteenth century led to historians writing for different types of men and women. In order to appeal to this emerging readership, French historians infused their works with what they believed to be the British cultural ideals of the middling sort, presenting historical figures as models of virtuous conduct deriving from the standards of the eighteenth century. This thesis

---

[169] O'Brien, 'The History Market', p. 106.
[170] Hicks, p. 8.

37

will therefore demonstrate the prescriptive role of history in neoclassical accounts, and how this prescriptive aspect was influenced by contemporary British ideas of virtue.

The focus for current historians has been on how the model of exemplary characters changed, and this thesis hopes to examine this change in much more depth. Phillips argues that history sought to create 'more inclusive categories of experiences' in the eighteenth century, as it 'could no longer define its terms as exclusively concerned with either males or public actions'.[171] Further to this, Woolf notes that readers were encouraged to create emotional connections to historical figures due to the emerging culture of sympathy and sentiment.[172] This thesis will therefore expand on Phillips' and Woolf's arguments, and examine how exactly French historians contributed to the historiographical method by providing in depth discussions of characters that explored their personal, as well as public, lives. I will be examining how historians also wrote for a female audience and aimed to shed light on the private lives of historical figures.

In the description of historical figures in eighteenth-century neoclassical histories, virtue was a fundamental aspect of describing ideal character traits. The concept of virtue could take various forms in the period, but at its centre was the idea of morality.[173] This thesis explores the use of contemporary virtue by historians to articulate what they believed to be ideal qualities of character that led to exemplary morality. The term 'virtue' was often employed in texts, whether in prescriptive conduct books, works of fiction or historical accounts and readers understood virtue's implication of morality, and its purpose in benefiting the public good.[174] In historians' exploration of the private self that affected the public good, they also employed forms of virtue prompted by the rise of sentiment and sensibility. This allowed historians to construct and impart ideas of virtue that they hoped would connect to their growing readership. Moreover, important to the meaning of virtue was its antithesis in vice. Often historians wrote about vice and virtue together, and described them as a conflict

---

[171] Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, p. 17.
[172] D.R. Woolf, 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500-1700', in Kewes, *The Uses of History*, pp. 31-68 (p. 54).
[173] Morse, p. 4.
[174] Morse, pp. 3-4; Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce and History*, pp. 42-50.

between opposing forces, similar to the opposition between good and evil.[175] Vice was employed to highlight why a historical figure failed, and to provide warnings against unwanted behaviour. Using concepts of virtue and vice therefore helped historians communicate ideas of good and bad character.

A key claim of this thesis concerns the emphasis that historians placed on the virtue of equanimity: a quality that was centred around the ideal of self-control. This attribute was seen as fundamental to good character for both men and women in the eighteenth century and it encouraged readers to think about emotion and the importance of self-regulation. Conveying this ideal offered a way for historians to connect the lives of ordinary private citizens with the grand deeds of monarchs. The desirable quality of equanimity grew in prominence after the political upheaval of the mid-seventeenth century that was viewed by some to be the result of excessive passions. As a result of these events, the need to regulate the passions was often promoted as it was feared that excessive behaviour from all parties had contributed to the Civil War and anarchy.[176] For the male audience especially, self-control was promoted through ideals of stoicism, and anything that shook men's' resolve could be interpreted as distinctly unmasculine.[177] For historical characters to demonstrate the virtue of self-control, they had to remain impervious to malicious influence, overcome fear and regulate their own emotions and reactions to events. This thesis will therefore shed light on the promotion of self-control by eighteenth-century historians as central to their ideas of good character.

In order to appeal to their wider British audience, eighteenth-century French historians, combined medieval notions of chivalry – that implied bravery and prowess in war – with more contemporary notions of chivalry that invoked ideas of gallantry.[178] The frequent wars between France and Britain in the eighteenth century led to the

---

[175] Morse, p. 105.
[176] Sharpe, pp. 780-81.
[177] Robert W. Jones, *Gender and the Formation of Taste in Eighteenth-Century Britain: The Analysis of Beauty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 5.
[178] *OED Online*, 'chivalry, n.', (Oxford University Press, 2017) < http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/31979?redirectedFrom=chivalry#eid> [Accessed 7 March 2017].

promotion of traditional masculine ideals of strength and bravery, and this is reflected in the portrayal of male historical figures. However, the culture of politeness that arose during this period meant that chivalry also incorporated ideals of gallantry that had implications for the way men treated the opposite sex. Chivalry affected how one treated others in public, but also within the private home. It was therefore applied to men's relations with women and the family, and men were thus expected to treat women with high regard.[179] Riu Susato argues that David Hume's understanding of chivalry contained several elements, and these included both the medieval traditional chivalric value of 'courageous and humane behaviour in the battlefield or single combat', along with the contemporary qualities of 'complaisance and politeness'.[180] French historians, whose accounts were published before and after Hume, presented ideals of chivalry that encompassed these two definitions.

The king as father to his people also played an important role in historical accounts, as historians hoped that their male audience could connect with the issues of marriage, fatherhood and inheritance. This idea of good character will be explored in the historical depictions of Henry VIII, as will be discussed in Chapter 3. I will also address the relationship between good character and kingship, as French historians promoted strong and sound leadership to their male audience. The key political events of the seventeenth century, including the Civil War and Regicide, and then the Glorious Revolution, encouraged debates about the importance, and nature, of the rights and liberties for both monarchy and government.[181] This thesis will demonstrate that as a result, for French historians, the ideal monarch fought for the liberties and rights of his people, and was able to make sound judgements, whilst remaining impervious to malicious advice from advisors and factions. Historians used their representation of monarchs to communicate ideals about leadership, which affected the eighteenth-century man whether he was the head of a household or the King of Britain himself.

---

[179] Michèle Cohen, '"Manners" Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750-1830', *Journal of British Studies*, 44:2 (2005), 312-329 (p. 319).

[180] Ryu Susato, 'The Idea of Chivalry in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Case of David Hume', *Hume Studies*, 33:1 (2007) 155-178 (p. 157). For more on Hume and chivalry, see Ernest Campbell Mossner, 'David Hume's "An Historical Essay on Chivalry and Modern Honour"', *Modern Philology*, 45:1 (1947), 54-60.

[181] Sharpe, pp. 780-81.

Eighteenth-century historians also promoted good character by demonstrating that one should obey one's role in the natural patriarchal order. Contemporary prescriptive texts promoted this ideal, and many other types of literature suggested that men were the naturally superior sex because of their physical and mental strength, which gave them an important responsibility as governors and protectors of women.[182] French historians promoted what they believed to be the natural patriarchal order in several facets of their accounts. They compared the king of the country to the head of the household, allowing their diverse readership to understand their responsibilities. These responsibilities included the fair treatment of wives and children, in keeping with the period's increasing emphasis on paternal love and companionate marriage.[183] Historians also argued that obeying the patriarchal order meant not abusing the privilege it conferred, and they presented this abuse when the Duke of Northumberland (1504-1553) sought to manipulate Lady Jane Grey (1537-1554) as well as the child King Edward VI (1537-1553). Yet historians also used their depictions of Grey to promote the feminine need to obey her role within the patriarchal order.[184] It was in these varied descriptions of assorted patriarchal roles that allowed historians to make their histories resonate with the domestic lives of their contemporary readers.

In the eighteenth century honour was the demonstration of high morality and it was used by historians as a marker of good character and behaviour. Faramerz Dabhoiwala argues that honour was a key part of a person's reputation, and constructed how individuals 'conceived of the relationship between the personal and the public, and between the projection and the perception of one's character'.[185] Honour therefore resonated with eighteenth-century concepts of virtue, as it affected how one's inner moral character affected the public good. For men of the upper classes, honourable

---

[182] Cohen, p. 329.

[183] Robert B. Shoemaker, *Gender in English society, 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres?* (Harlow; London: Longman, 1998), pp. 39, 102.

[184] This historical portrayal of the Duke of Northumberland and Lady Jane Grey will be explored further in Chapter 3.

[185] Faramerz Dabhoiwala, 'The Construction of Honour, Reputation and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6 (1996), 201-213 (p. 201).

behaviour was fundamental for its capacity to differentiate themselves from their inferiors.[186] French historians therefore also imparted the importance of honour to their readers in order to maintain the elite status of their neoclassical texts. Historians explored how honour affected one's behaviour in facets of life, including in politics, personal lives, and warfare. According to Shoemaker, for a gentlemen honour when fighting an opponent meant 'following a rigorous set of rules in the conduct of violence, in which honour demanded particular sensitivity to the requirements of fair play'.[187] Honour was also a gendered quality, and for women often implied notions of sexual conduct and chastity. As Soile Ylivuori argues, in the 'novels of Samuel Richardson, Fanny Burney, and Jane Austen, as well as in eighteenth-century conduct books and periodicals, female honour [was] routinely presented in a poetic image of a virtuous maiden guarding her chastity as the emblem of her honour'.[188] For both sexes, it implied morality and its effect on one's reputation. Philip Carter notes that honour, while sometimes implied in warriorship, was often associated instead with 'lawfulness, religious respect and sociability'.[189] French historians applied both of these ideas of honour in their texts in order to create characters that exhibited virtue in varied situations, such as men behaving fairly in battle, or kings treating their wives respectfully.

Ideals for positive female character also formed a crucial element of the eighteenth-century neoclassical historical text. French historians contributed to the British historiographic method of writing prescriptive texts for female readers, as will be explored in their promotion of certain ideals of good female character. The act of reading history became an important basis for female education during the eighteenth century and consequently women were an important part of the changing audience for formal histories during this period.[190] Histories were increasingly recommended and promoted to female readers, and as a result, the female audience formed a central part of

---

[186] Dabhoiwala, p. 203.
[187] Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and Public Violence', p. 198.
[188] Soile Ylivuori, 'Rethinking Female Chastity and Gentlewomen's Honour in Eighteenth-Century England', *The Historical Journal*, 59:1 (2016), 71-97 (p. 72).
[189] Phillip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society 1660-1800* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), p. 72.
[190] Woolf, 'A Feminine Past?', pp. 659-670.

history reading by the end of the century.[191] This new audience allowed historians to promote and explore what they believed to be female virtues. Hicks argues that 'classical historiography was designed primarily for men' and he contends that Hume was a crucial figure for writing his histories for both a male and female audience.[192] This thesis will demonstrate that French historians of English history were writing for a female audience both before and after Hume.

Historians catered for this female audience by writing prescriptive ideas of feminine virtue. Like the authors of conduct books, French historians emphasised supposedly ideal feminine qualities such as modesty, chastity, piety, beauty, youth and motherhood.[193] Beauty was especially valued by historians, as it was often considered a public reflection of a woman's inner virtue.[194] This thesis will therefore explore how historians promoted these ideals as central to the good female character. It will demonstrate how these ideas came into focus when discussed in relation to ideals of motherhood and spousal behaviour. By the end of the eighteenth century, female virtue was increasingly associated with the domestic sphere. Dana Harrington notes that it was within this sphere that children could 'develop a "virtuous Principle" through interactions with their mother, who (if properly educated) possesses superior affective qualities'.[195] Historians therefore depicted female historical figures that inflected the importance of virtue in both the public and private lives of contemporary women. To engage with this subject, I will explore how French historians discussed sixteenth-century queens to impart the idealized feminine qualities of good character.

Ideas of good character allowed historians to connect to a wider audience by discussing contemporary values, while still keeping the elite format and narrative of neoclassical

---

[191] Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, p. 168.
[192] Hicks, p. 215.
[193] Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus, 'Introduction', in *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities*, ed. by Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus (London and New York: Longman, 1997), pp. 1-28 (pp. 1-2).
[194] Jones, pp. 1, 7.
[195] Dana Harrington, 'Gender, Commerce, and the Transformation of Virtue in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 31:3 (2001), 33-52 (p. 33).

history. This thesis will expand on Dew and Price's idea that history in the eighteenth century was no longer simply:

> a matter of warfare and politics; economic, social and cultural issues had always played a significant, albeit subordinate role. However, the ways in which such issues were presented did undoubtedly alter through the course of the century.[196]

This thesis will demonstrate how the ideal character was exemplified in historical figures through connections to contemporary British social and cultural matters that were deemed to be just as important as issues of warfare and politics. Historians discussed ideas of good character that encompassed notions of virtue, honour, and chivalry that had precise particular meanings but were also nonetheless related to each other and overlapped. They drew upon - but did not represent – each other in complex ways. My thesis builds upon previous work by Dew and Price, Hicks, Phillips, O'Brien, Woolf and Pocock. I will expand on the current argument that eighteenth-century historical accounts were formed by the pressure to address, and engage with, contemporary interests and issues whilst also facing the challenge of retaining the formal and serious reputation that neoclassical historical accounts was sought for. French historians engaged with contemporary cultural ideas and issues by imparting ideal qualities and behaviours to their readers. These aspects of good character promoted by French historians for a French and British audience will be explored further in the upcoming four chapters in this thesis.

Section 6: Thesis Outline

The first chapter of this thesis, 'The King in Eighteenth-Century Historical Accounts', will examine how Paul de Rapin-Thoyras and other French historians imparted ideals of eighteenth-century kingship to their readers. Drawing on accounts of the reigns of William I (1028-1087), John I (1166-1216) and Charles I, the chapter will examine the portrayal of an ideal monarch according to the way a king treated the laws and liberties of the English people. This chapter will explore the representation of ideal

---

[196] Dew and Price, p. 4.

kingship by eighteenth-century French historians of English history through the examination of historical descriptions of the Norman Yoke Theory, the establishment of Magna Carta, Absolutism and the malignant influence of factions. It will conclude with a detailed study of the character sketches of William I, John I and Charles I in order to understand the role of character descriptions within these historical texts. The analysis of these characterizations will draw upon the previous work that Hargraves, Hicks and Phillips have established about the character sketch. It will explore how French historians depicted monarchs with contemporary notions of virtue and vice, and their effect and influence on great historical figures, and therefore, events.

The second chapter, 'War and Ideal Kingship in Eighteenth-Century Historical Writing', will examine how French and British historians depicted changing notions of ideal monarchical and masculine behaviour. The chapter will draw on accounts of the Norman Conquest (1066), the Third Crusade (1189-1192), and the battles of Crécy (1346), Poitiers (1356), and Agincourt (1415) to explore how historians discussed contemporary eighteenth-century conceptions of ideal masculinity alongside medieval notions of chivalry.[197] These accounts demonstrate the complex identity of history, as history encompassed a variety of genres during the period, as previously noted by Phillips.[198] This chapter will examine the popular English victories of the Hundred Years War to draw attention to the way in which historians were influenced by the medieval and classical epic. French historians combined the epic genre motifs such of bravery and heroism with contemporary British notions of eighteenth-century masculinity, such as equanimity and reason. This chapter will therefore illustrate how British historiographical cultures were present across the channel through the French historical depiction of ideal qualities and behaviour of monarchs during periods of warfare.

---

[197] For the medieval influence of chivalry in eighteenth-century texts, see Lionel Gossman, *Medievalism and the Ideologies of the Enlightenment: The World and Work of LaCurne de Sainte-Palaye* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1968), especially p. 329-331; Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, pp. 16-17.
[198] Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, p. 21; Phillips, *On Historical Distance*, p. 60.

The following chapter, 'The King as a Husband and Father', offers a close study of the reign of Henry VIII and the relationship with his family, court and household to explore the changing patriarchal and paternal roles of the eighteenth-century man. This chapter explores the humanization of historical figures through the depiction of the inner and private lives of Henry VIII and his six wives. It will provide evidence that French historians wrote their historical accounts with the aim to provide examples of moral behaviour. The formation of historical figures that elicited 'readerly sympathy or ridicule' that Gallagher notes was a significant writing method in eighteenth-century historical literature.[199] Henry's tumultuous relationship with his wives allowed historians to impart their ideas of virtuous spousal and feminine behaviour. They drew upon the humanization of the monarch in the eighteenth century to instruct on the accountability for one's private life. The historical accounts of Henry VIII by Rapin, Raynal, Millot and Hume will provide a means of examining the ways in which the concept of virtue changed in the eighteenth century, and the way in which the private life of a husband, father and head of a household reflected directly onto his public role.

The final chapter, 'Queens and Gender in Eighteenth-Century Historical Writing' examines how historians depicted feminine virtues, patriarchy and the role of the monarch. Through the examination of historical accounts of three sixteenth-century queens, Lady Jane Grey, Mary I (1516-1558), and Elizabeth I (1533-1558), this chapter will explore how French historians of English history were able to participate in British historiographical cultures through their engagement with female historical figures. As the reading of history was promoted as an educational tool for women in the eighteenth century, the accounts of sixteenth-century queens provided a distinctive opportunity for moral instruction. Jane, Mary and Elizabeth ruled in succession, and were vastly different from one another. These differences enabled historians to depict these notable sixteenth-century queens according to eighteenth-century notions of female virtue. This chapter highlights the prescriptive role of female virtues in historical texts, and provides evidence that historians wrote their accounts of queens with female audiences in mind.

---

[199] Gallagher, *Historical Literatures*, p. 9.

Collectively, these chapters will shed new light on the role of eighteenth-century French historical works within British historiographical practices at this time. My thesis argues that Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, Abbé Millot and Abbé Raynal, whose works were translated and circulated in Britain, saw success due to the way in which they described and wrote about English monarchs and key English historical events. These French historical accounts of England provide evidence that widespread notions of virtue and vice, and common political beliefs, were being exchanged across the channel. The existence of authors from differing nationalities responding to one another suggests that a historical dialogue existed between the two nations in the eighteenth century, even during hostile times. These bi-national historical opinions are essential to understanding the development of these two countries whose histories have been inseparable and co-dependant. Ultimately, this study of French historical accounts of English history will demonstrate the significant role of French historians and their influence on the neoclassical historiographical cultures in eighteenth-century Britain.

Chapter 1: The King in Eighteenth-Century Historical Accounts

In this chapter I argue that French historians gave moral instructions on ideal eighteenth-century kingship through their historical analysis of English kings. My analysis considers accounts of the reigns of William I (1028-1087), John I (1166-1216), and Charles I (1600-1649). In the eighteenth century, historical writing about kings provided moral instruction to their contemporary readers as well as offering a social and political commentary. As virtue played an important role in eighteenth-century political thought, the historical discussion of the rights and privileges of the monarch and his people allowed historians to discuss political and moral ideals.[200] I will demonstrate that the French authors Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, Abbé Millot, and Abbé Raynal wrote their historical analyses in a formal, neoclassical manner of moral instruction, and I will explore how the content of their works was informed by contemporary eighteenth-century British politics and opinions. This chapter contributes to my argument that the works of these authors achieved popular success because of their rhetorical and formal strategies in addition to their historical content. Moreover, these works provide evidence of how notions of virtue and vice, and common political beliefs about the rights and liberties of both the people and the monarch, were exchanged across the channel. To understand how historians approached the representation of kingship, it is first necessary to review developments in the discipline of historical writing.

The political events of the seventeenth century were a frequent topic of discussion among historians and their resonance is apparent in both French and British accounts of English history. The upheaval of the Stuarts remained prominent in the contemporary minds, especially in the Hanoverian period.[201] The desire to investigate and discuss such a recent event helped the advancement of the discipline of modern history. The events of the mid-seventeenth century inspired historians in the eighteenth

---

[200] David Morse, *The Age of Virtue: British Culture from The Restoration to Romanticism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), pp. 17-19.

[201] Laird Okie, *Augustan Historical Writing: Histories of England in the English Enlightenment* (New York; London: University Press of America, 1991), p. 2.

century to debate the nature of rights and liberties for both monarchy and government. A renewed interest in the Magna Carta and its significance for the laws and rights of the English people emerged in the seventeenth century. This interest encouraged debates about the importance of Magna Carta, which continued into the eighteenth century, while debates about the Norman Yoke theory began to take hold following the Glorious Revolution. At the same time, the nation's interest in virtue increased because of the upheavals experienced in the wake of the Civil War and regicide. These events fuelled the perception that it was necessary to regulate the passions because of the concern that excess had contributed to the Civil War and anarchy.[202]

The effects of the English Civil War and Interregnum on history writing were explored in several works written soon after these events. Debates about the Norman Conquest and the significance of Magna Carta emerged in the immediate aftermath. One such work was Edward Hyde, First Earl of Clarendon's influential *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England: Begun in the Year 1641*, published posthumously in 1702-1704. Clarendon, an advisor to both Charles I and Charles II, was urged to write the *History of the Rebellion* by Charles I in 1646 after Parliament appointed Thomas May (1595-1650) to write an official historical account of the struggle. Clarendon intended it not as public propaganda for the King, but as political advice in the form of a great work of literature. Clarendon's innovation in history writing has been attributed to his relationship with contemporary continental historians who had published works about civil wars in sixteenth-century and seventeenth-century Europe, and these historians inspired his own work.[203] Martine Watson Brownley argues that Clarendon was valued by eighteenth-century readers because he was a direct witness to the events, but that readers were also conscious that his interpretation of the events was likely to have been affected by his familiarity with them. However, even those who disagreed with Clarendon's Tory political interpretations still valued the literary quality of his

---

[202] Kevin Sharpe, 'Virtues, Passions and Politics in Early Modern England', *History of Political Thought*, 32:5 (2011), 773-798 (pp. 780-81).
[203] Paul Seaward, 'Clarendon, Tacitism, and Europe's Civil Wars', in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 285-306 (p. 288).

work.[204] Clarendon's personal insights into the Civil War and Interregnum helped readers to comprehend why the events had transpired, and historians sought to emulate this connection throughout the eighteenth century. Royce Macgillivray also argues for Clarendon's importance as an authority on the Civil War, noting that the prevalence of Clarendon's works far surpassed every other leading historian of his time. Macgillivray contends that Clarendon's 'comprehensiveness in his discussion of the war' resulted in his becoming one of the best-known historians of the Civil War.[205] He attributes some of this success to Clarendon's superior grasp of the psychology behind the events, which the politician emphasized further than previous historians.[206] Clarendon's influence can be found in the way eighteenth-century historians examined the motives of both the monarch and his people to make sense of the past. They employed the method that Clarendon used to analyse the Civil War and extended it to the entire history of England.

Clarendon's character sketches also proved influential, and provide insight into the nature of character sketches within eighteenth-century French and British historical accounts. Previous scholarship has emphasized the importance of the establishment of the concept of the character in eighteenth-century historical texts.[207] Deirdre Lynch argues that the history of the character in the eighteenth century can be attributed to the way that authors constructed various economies in which the typical and the particular interacted in specific ways. While Lynch does not include historical works in her analysis, her discussion of character sheds light on its development. She argues that the concept of the character emerged from a new culture of mass consumption that took place from 1720 to 1780, as people sought to make sense of their own identities in an increasingly commercial society.[208] The prevalence of character sketches in eighteenth-century historical works suggests that both author and reader sought to discover ways to connect to historical figures through understanding of the figures' individual motives as

---

[204] Martine Watson Brownley, *Clarendon and the Rhetoric of Historical Form* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), p. xii.
[205] Royce Macgillivray, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974), p. 197.
[206] Macgillivray, p. 201.
[207] Brownley, p. 177.
[208] Deirdre Shauna Lynch, *The Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 5-8.

well as their own. The nature of the historical character has been explored in depth in Hargraves' study of eighteenth-century historiography, which focuses particularly on William Robertson's *History of the Reign of Charles V* (1769). Hargraves argues that the genre of history contributed a great deal to the 'revelation and presentation' of characters in the literary genre, and he attributes to historians the responsibility of unmasking the inner character of historical figures in order to comprehend the motives for their actions.[209] The inner and outer selves were examined in their characterizations to explain the actions within both the public and private life of a figure.[210] These characterizations can be found within the historical texts of both French and British authors, and they employed descriptions of vices and virtues of monarchs to provide judgment on a monarch's public and private life.

The English Civil War and Interregnum had a particular effect on the way in which the relationship of the rights and liberties between the monarch and his people were viewed in the eighteenth century. Historians of the period, on both sides of the channel, reflected on this political prerogative in their historical works. Duncan Forbes' study of David Hume's political thought provides insight into the historical debate about ancient constitutionalism and, in addition to Hume, extends to the works of Rapin and Bolingbroke. Forbes argues that Rapin's history was original in its assertion that the downfall of the monarchy in the mid-seventeenth century could be attributed to the Stuart kings as they had tried to institutionalise monarchical government and hereditary right. These actions were viewed as destructive to the English constitution.[211] Rapin's assessment of the Stuart kings proved influential as his opinion was echoed in the accounts of Millot and Raynal. All three historians linked father and son in order to accuse James I (1566-1625) and Charles of usurping the royal prerogative of previous monarchs.

---

[209] Neil Hargraves, 'Revelations of Character in Eighteenth-Century Historiography and William Robertson's *History of the Reign of Charles V*', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 27:2 (2008), 23-48 (p. 24).
[210] Hargraves, p. 24.
[211] Duncan Forbes, *Hume's Philosophical Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p. 235.

The mid-seventeenth century witnessed a changed in historical writing that affected how French and British historians approached their accounts. Woolf argues that the role of ideology faded in historical works from the 1640s and 1650s onwards because history was no longer assumed to be the working of God's purposes.[212] This change in historical philosophy was cemented in the later seventeenth century as post-Newtonian science inspired continued debates about the will of God. By the early eighteenth century, the nature of history was appraised in rational, rather than theological, terms.[213] As Woolf argues, in the eighteenth century, God's role in historical writing was as a '"divine clockmaker" who allowed his creation to tick away from day to day, propelled for the most part by its own cogs'.[214] Eighteenth-century historians thus used figures and events from the past to understand how their history had unfolded. They debated the origins of their rights and liberties through the Norman Yoke Theory and Magna Carta, as well as the regicide of Charles I and the following Civil War and Interregnum. Historians then employed character sketches to understand the motivation of individuals behind historical events, no longer attributing their significance to the will of God.

Focusing on the work of Rapin, Millot, and Raynal, this chapter will explore how accounts of William I, John I, and Charles I were used to discuss the role of the ideal king in respect to both the rights and privileges of his subjects, and in terms of ideas of eighteenth-century virtue. French historians engaged with an expanding British readership by using contemporary interpretations and opinions of England's past, such as the Norman Yoke theory and the symbolism of Magna Carta (1215). I will demonstrate how French historians followed the neoclassical ideal in writing history, but adapted it to suit more diverse readers that included the elite as well as the middling sort.[215] Rapin, Millot, and Raynal wrote in the grand manner by connecting moments in history to the overall narrative of England's past. They followed this ideal in their use of

---

[212] D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The light of truth' From the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto; London: University of Toronto Press, 1990), pp. 4-8, 247.
[213] Woolf, p. 263.
[214] Woolf, p. 262.
[215] Philip Hicks, *Neoclassical History and English Culture: From Clarendon to Hume* (London: Macmillan, 1996), p. 215.

kings as moral exemplars, and they portrayed an ideal king as a monarch who respected the laws and liberties of his people and was able to exert self-control and moderation. French historians used neoclassical historical methods in their characterization of monarchs and by concluding their account of a monarch's reign with a character sketch they were able to impart ideal qualities and castigate unwanted vices.

This chapter contains five sections. The first examines how French historians referred to the Norman Yoke theory to judge William I's kingship. Their accounts of the role and impact of William I in the subjugation of ancient rights demonstrate the preoccupation of eighteenth-century historians with the role of laws and liberties in English kingship. The second section assesses the French historical portrayal of John's poor sovereignty as historians emphasized his failings as a king to highlight the necessity of the Magna Carta. John was used by eighteenth-century historians as a key example of flawed kingship, as well as to confirm the importance of the Great Charter for British rights and liberties. The third section, on Charles I, demonstrates the profound impact that the Civil War (1642-1651) and Interregnum (1649-1660) had on the British mindset. Like John, Charles was used as an example of poor kingship, and this section examines how French historians discussed the rights and privilege of monarchy and parliament with reference to Charles' failings to give moral instruction to French and British eighteenth-century readers. Charles' execution was used to argue for the necessity of moderation and self-control because historians accused the parliament of fanaticism. Section four examines how the contemporary problem of factions and advisors in both France and Britain in the eighteenth century shaped the French historical portrayal of factions and advisors. The negative influence of advisors and political factions was prominent in French depictions of William I, John I, and Charles I, and found parallels in British portrayals of Louis XIII (1601-1643) and Louis XIV (1638-1715). Finally, the fifth section assesses the way in which historians employed character sketches at the end of a monarch's chapter in order to provide a summary of a king's morality with a list of his vices and virtues. This form of summary also enabled historians to clarify their interpretation of the factors behind significant actions and events. A character summary provided historians with an opportunity to leave readers

with a clear view of the standard by which a monarch was judged and thereby made a statement about what readers should expect from an ideal monarch.

Section 1: William I and the Norman Yoke Theory

Historians used accounts of William I's conquest and reign, from 1066 to 1087, to demonstrate how kings influence the laws and liberties of the people. The Norman Yoke theory was utilised to demonstrate that a king can either encourage or impede the progression of modern government. This approach followed the neoclassical historical format, through which historians offered instruction on virtuous behaviour through the idealisation of historical figures.[216] French historians, however, applied British cultural views in the hope of targeting the expanding audience for formal historical accounts. Following the events of the Glorious Revolution (1688) and Hanoverian Succession (1714), the British became preoccupied with the origins of their laws and liberties. The use of the Norman Yoke theory by French historians demonstrates the shifting popularity of this debate through the eighteenth century, especially as the Glorious Revolution, 1689 Bill of Rights, and Hanoverian Succession faded from recent memory.

The Norman Yoke theory centred upon the idea that, before William's conquest, the English lived free under the law and that these liberties were subsequently lost under the new rulers. Norman law, foreign law, and what was seen in the seventeenth century as French law, were imposed in their place.[217] As a consequence, until the English Civil War, the English were, effectively, under the rule of the Normans. The struggles in the seventeenth century were thus to free England from the Norman Conquest and its

---

[216] Noelle Gallagher, *Historical Literatures: Writing about the Past in England, 1660-1740* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), p. 2.

[217] Marjorie Chibnall, *The Debate on the Norman Conquest* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), pp. 4-5; See also 'The Norman Yoke', in Christopher Hill, *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), pp. 46-111.

Yoke.[218] Chroniclers and historians throughout the seventeenth century reflected on this breach in the continuity of English institutions and repeatedly insisted on the disastrous nature of the Norman Conquest.[219] The concept of the Norman Yoke had circulated verbally before 1640.[220] The theory continued to be prominent in historical writing in the eighteenth century. The British debated the question: who were the true originators of British liberties and institutions? Answers included the Celts, Saxons, ancient Britons, and Goths. What mattered was that these groups were presented as illustrious, unsullied ancestors whose lives differed drastically from the luxury and effeminacy of contemporary society.[221] The Norman Yoke theory gained traction with the more radical members of the early eighteenth-century Whig party, who believed that the people had natural rights, which included the right to overthrow tyrannical governments. They hoped the Revolution of 1688 would usher in an age of reform in which the constitution would be more libertarian as well as representative. Mainstream Whigs instead tended to use historical appeals to the ancient constitution to position their argument for liberty and property.[222]

The Glorious Revolution and Hanoverian Succession made people curious about England's past and the origins of its laws and liberties. Historians were thus preoccupied with exploring the origins that led to the employment of the Norman Yoke idea by eighteenth-century politicians, philosophers, and writers. Bolingbroke's *Remarks on a King* contributed to the prominence of this debate. According to Forbes, *Remarks* was 'a thin and rather vague Norman Yoke thesis'.[223] In this work, Bolingbroke argued that William I had 'imposed many new laws and customs', 'made very great alterations in the whole model of government', and ruled his new conquest like an absolute monarch. Bolingbroke further contributed to the Norman Yoke theory when he informed his

---

[218] Christopher Hill, *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution: Revisited* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 361.
[219] Martin Dzelzainis, 'History and Ideology: Milton, the Levellers, and the Council of State in 1649', in Kewes, *The Uses of History*, pp. 265-283 (p. 265).
[220] Woolf, p. 103
[221] Colin Kidd, *British Ethnicity Before Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 1-7.
[222] Okie, p. 19.
[223] Forbes, pp. 241-242.

audience that William could not 'destroy the old constitution; because neither he nor they could extinguish the old spirit of liberty'.[224] As an eminent political writer, Bolingbroke provided a glimpse of public sentiments of the period and he demonstrated the ongoing eighteenth-century debates on the origins of British laws and liberties. His theories on the subjugation of ancient rights exhibited the preoccupation with the role of the constitution in ideal eighteenth-century kingship.

While the Norman Yoke theory was evoked with increasing frequency following the political developments of the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries, its use waned as the eighteenth century went on. The waning prominence of this debate may have been due to the period in which the works of writers like Rapin, Raynal, and Millot were written, because the establishment of the 1689 Bill of Rights and the Hanoverian Succession debates had faded from immediate political memory. Rapin, who published his work from 1724 to 1727, supported the Norman Yoke theory, and he portrayed William the Conqueror as a catalyst in the transformation of English laws during the period. In this way, Rapin's history made sense of the post-1688 constitution by invoking the Norman Yoke theory. According to Rapin, 'the mixed government' of king and parliament was not new, but had first been 'established by the Saxons in Germany' who then imported the practice into England.[225] Several recent historians have analysed the Norman Yoke Theory in Rapin's text. Sullivan argues that Rapin 'plotted the whole of the British history as a struggle to maintain liberty through the equilibrium of prerogatives and privileges' and that liberty was 'maintained only when the prerogatives and privileges [were] evenly balanced'.[226] This interpretation of a balance corresponds with Rapin's belief in the virtue of moderation as the French historian criticized any excessive behaviour in his *History of England*. Sullivan's description of a balance between prerogatives and privileges has also been explained by Trevor-Roper, who maintains that Rapin's achievement in his history was to render history understandable

---

[224] Henry St. John Bolingbroke, *The Works of Lord Bolingbroke* (London: Carey and Hart, 1841), p. 318.
[225] Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, 'A Dissertation on the Two Parties of the Whigs and Tories, Shewing their Rise, Progress, Views, Strength, Interests and Characters', in *The History of England*, trans. by Nicolas Tindal, 2nd edn, 2 vols (London: J. and P. Knapton, 1733), II, p. 796.
[226] M.G. Sullivan, 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity of the Historian in Eighteenth Century England', *History of European Ideas*, 28:3 (2002), 145-162 (p. 149).

through the categories and vocabulary of post-revolutionary politics. The English constitution that was asserted in 1688 was, according to Rapin, the same constitution that the Anglo-Saxons had brought with them from Germany.[227] The Norman Yoke Theory therefore played a crucial role in Rapin's success. As popular Whig politics at the time argued for the symbolism of the ancient constitution, Trevor-Roper's argument for Rapin's achievement is found within the historian's account of the Norman Conquest and the incorporation of the Norman Yoke thesis in his text.

The Norman Conquest was an opportunity for French historians to discuss the origins of British rights and privileges, yet they did not link this foreign usurpation directly to the one that occurred in 1688. Despite having the same names and both coming from foreign territories, historians did not draw any direct comparisons between William I and William III (1650-1702). This is unsurprising as eighteenth-century British monarchs earned their claim to the throne due to the Glorious Revolution. Rapin, Millot, and Raynal employed the same approach to describe dissimilarities between the conquest of William I and the Glorious Revolution. All three historians declared that there had been confusion in London with William's quick arrival, thus hinting to the reader that there was not much choice in the matter of London's submission to the Conqueror.[228] This unwanted submission was a contrast to the Glorious Revolution, in which William III had long been in discussion with political allies in England and had much of their support before his arrival. Thus Millot, Raynal, and Rapin subtly hinted to their audience that William I only gained supporters once the country had realized there was no choice but a lengthy war. As the events of 1688 were still in recent memory, French historians were evidently circumventing any direct linkages between William I and William III to avoid criticisms of the current British monarchy. This avoidance was a way in which French historians could ensure their historical accounts remained

---

[227] Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'A Huguenot Historian: Paul Rapin', in *Huguenots in Britain and their French Background, 1550-1800*, ed. by Irene Scoulidi (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1987), pp. 3-19 (p. 16); Sullivan, p. 149.

[228] Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, *The History of England*, trans. by Nicolas Tindal, 15 vols (London: James and John Knapton, 1725-1731), II, pp. 229-230; Abbé Raynal, *The History of the Parliament of England*, trans. by [Anon] (London: T. Osbourne, 1751), p. 16; Abbé Millot, *Elements of the History of England*, trans. by Mr Kenrick, 2 vols (Dublin: James Williams, 1771), I, pp. 69-70.

attractive to British readers, while also providing evidence that British political opinions had spread to the continent.

O'Brien argues that Rapin depicted William I 'as a type for' William III because the latter king was a 'military hero who pushes the insular English people into an international arena'.[229] While Rapin did commend William I for his military prowess, I contend that the historian avoided depicting similarities between the two monarchs as his invocation of the Norman Yoke thesis would not shed a positive light on the king who had invaded a country in 1688, even if by invitation. Rapin applied the Norman Yoke theory when he wrote that the Normans 'introduced a new system of laws into the Kingdom'.[230] Earlier in his text, Rapin had emphasized that William I 'made several innovations in the English laws'.[231] Rapin initially defended William's behaviour at the beginning of his reign of England, when the new king summoned nobles from all of England to hear of the ancient laws and confirm them. Rapin reminded the reader that the summoning was implemented as a result of William's fear of rebellion as he lived 'in a constant dread that some sudden revolution would rob him of the fruits of all his labours'.[232] Furthermore, Rapin argued that there was no doubt that in taking the estates from their original English owners, William was operating simply as a conqueror would.[233] Nonetheless, Rapin portrays William I as a catalyst in the transformation of English laws of the period because by 1070, William went further and removed the English 'from all places of trust' and distributed the lands among his officers and followers. When Frederic, Abbot of St. Albans, formed a rebellion against William, conspirators quickly drew an army together. William assured them peace if they surrendered and promised to 'establish the laws of Edward'. However, William broke his promises and he banished or imprisoned them, or put the conspirators to death.[234] According to Rapin, William did indeed create the Norman Yoke as the conqueror quickly ceased to appease the English once there was no longer a threat of rebellion. For

---

[229] Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 17.
[230] Rapin, *The History*, III, p. 150.
[231] Rapin, *The History*, II, p. 275.
[232] Rapin, *The History*, II, p. 256.
[233] Rapin, *The History*, II, p. 244.
[234] Forbes, p. 239.

Rapin, then, William had taken away the previous laws and liberties of the English people.

Raynal's *History of the Parliament of England*, published in 1748, put forward a more favourable view of the Norman Conquest. Although he agreed with the Norman Yoke theory in certain respects, Raynal also believed that William's conquest was a progressive development in England's constitutional history. He described William I as a despotic king, but one made so by his newly conquered English subjects. Raynal presented William's coronation as a display of a supposed continuation of Anglo-Saxon rule, by writing that 'the Conqueror took an oath to hold the sceptre on the same conditions as the Saxon kings, and to maintain laws'. Raynal portrayed this action as a cunning strategy on William's part as he wrote that William 'was too prudent to give such early intimation to his new subjects of his inclination to establish a despotic government'.[235] Raynal argued that with William's arrival in England, a country which had been 'always, or almost always, placed under an evil constellation, now received the benign influences of a more favourable planet'. He suggested that William initially created 'clear and judicious laws' which 'insured the happiness of the English', and he described it as a 'wise and moderate government', which 'extinguished even to the alarms which a conquered people always conceive for their liberty'.[236] For Raynal, this change in government was a progressive movement in England's history, although the tranquillity it brought was not to last. The English were wary of even 'the best of kings' so were distrustful of an 'ambitious prince' who had 'brought them under the yoke'.[237] In the original French text, Raynal used the French term 'subjuguer' rather than 'yoke'.[238] Here, the British translator brings in the debate of the Norman Yoke, suggesting that the readers were aware of its controversy, even in the middle of the eighteenth century.

---

[235] Raynal, *The History*, p. 16.
[236] Raynal, *The History*, p. 17.
[237] Raynal, *The History,* p. 18.
[238] Abbé Raynal, *L'Histoire du parlement d'Angleterre* (London, Paris: 1748), p. 24.

Raynal, although an admirer of William I, eventually admitted that the king changed England's laws and liberties but argued that these changes were necessary for the conquest to succeed. In the title of his first 'epoch', he described William as the king who 'establishes Despotism in England in 1066', and used the word 'despotisme' in the original French version. Taken from the French, despotism in the eighteenth century meant 'the rule of a despot; despotic government; the exercise of absolute authority', and its use was first recorded in 1728.[239] 'Despot', as used in England starting in the seventeenth century, meant 'an absolute ruler of a country; hence, by extension, any ruler who governs absolutely or tyrannically; any person who exercises tyrannical authority; a tyrant, an oppressor'.[240] According to Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language*, 'despot' meant 'an absolute prince; one that governs with unlimited authority. This word is not in use, except as applied to some Dacian prince; as the *despot* of Servia'.[241] Despite using the term to describe William's impact, Raynal nevertheless considered William to be an admirable monarch, writing: 'one must be an Englishman, not to reckon William the Conqueror one of the few kings who have done honour to the throne. In whatever age he had lived, he would have been a great man'.[242] Raynal's assertion that 'one must be an Englishman' not to admire William I reflects how he hoped to employ a perspective that transcended national prejudices. Raynal argued that William's actions could be defended as he was acting as a conqueror, where 'he was obliged to insure the obedience of the English, as it was dangerous to trust to their affection; he did it by introducing despotism'.[243] Raynal, however, was aware that for many of the English, William was not an entirely well-liked figure, and wrote that 'satire has drawn this great Prince in the most odious colours. It is nevertheless true, that the Nation which detests him, owes to him her glory'.[244] Although Raynal may have believed that William changed the laws of England, he viewed this change as a desirable

---

[239] OED Online, 'despotism, n'. (Oxford University Press: 2015) <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/51031?redirectedFrom=despotism> [accessed February 15, 2015].
[240] OED Online, 'despot, n'. (Oxford University Press: 2015) <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/51024> [accessed February 15, 2015].
[241] *Ibid.*
[242] Raynal, *The History*, p. 21.
[243] Raynal, *The History,* p. 22.
[244] Raynal, *The History,* pp. 22-23.

development in England's history. This opinion is in contrast to those articulated in the accounts of Millot and Rapin.

Abbé Millot's *Elements of the History of England* skirted around the Norman Yoke theory as it depicted William I as a conqueror, rather than a king. Published in 1769, it was the furthest removed in time from the Glorious Revolution, and it reflects how the debate on the origins of the laws and liberties of Britain had lessened in intensity. In his chapter on William I, Millot alluded to the possibility of a happy reign under William since 'the English flattered themselves with the prospect of peace, and a sage and equal administration'. Yet he followed this sentence by pointing out that 'William was more attentive to his own advantage than to the happiness of his new subjects'. These actions were attributed to William's distribution of estates to his own men, and his construction of castles to fortify his rule. To Millot, William 'had the soul of a conqueror, rather than of a king'.[245] This classification explained William's unconventional acts as king because his stronger qualities lay with his military persona rather than his ability to rule. The English revolted on his return to Normandy because they were 'not yet insensible to the charms of liberty'.[246] However, Millot then criticized William for heavily taxing the English, for the new king 'intended the total servitude of the English'.[247] Millot provided both depictions in order to maintain an air of impartiality, which encouraged readers to make a judgment for themselves while avoiding any friction with opposing opinions. Millot was much less clear on the notion of the Norman Yoke and did not discuss the supplanting of English rights. Millot's text demonstrates that as the effects of the Glorious Revolution faded, the Norman Yoke debate became less prevalent. This decline is evidenced in Millot's absence in participating directly in the discussion of William's role in the continuity of the Anglo-Saxon laws.

Millot, Raynal, and Rapin all discussed the distribution of English estates to the Normans and how this distribution affected the laws and liberties of the people.

---

[245] Millot, I, pp. 70-71.
[246] Millot, I, p. 71.
[247] Millot, I, p. 72.

According to these historians, William I gave estates to his officers to secure the land. Pierre-Joseph d'Orléans, whose *Histoire des revolutions d'Angleterre depuis le commencement de la monarchie jusqu'a present* was originally published in 1689, emphasized the fact that all the current great 'Seigneurs' could find their origins in the Norman Conquest, and were thus beneficiaries of the redistribution of estates.[248] Thus Orléans was suggesting that the eighteenth-century aristocracy were unable to criticize the Norman Conquest since they had profited from the event, a perspective which may not have been well received by some British readers. In *Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse, et d'Irelande*, the author Isaac de Larrey provided a fairly positive commentary on the redistribution of land; he described it as a normal action for any conqueror and stated that there was never a conqueror who did it with more moderation.[249] Both Orléans' and Larrey's historical accounts were never fully translated into English, and their positive views of the Norman Conquest may have contributed to their more limited recognition within Britain. However, as Raynal also supported William's reign as a progressive development, their accounts must have been unattractive to British readers in other areas as well.

Writing about the Norman Conquest enabled historians to debate the origins of Britain's laws and liberties by incorporating the Norman Yoke theory into their accounts and by subtly drawing attention to the dissimilarities between the conquest and the Glorious Revolution. The Norman Yoke theory became less prominent in French accounts as the eighteenth century wore on and this waning demonstrates how the events of 1688, the 1689 Bill of Rights, and the Hanoverian succession grew less contentious over the course of this period, both within Britain and on the continent. Nonetheless, William I remained an important figure for French historians, who continued to discuss this monarch to identify desirable traits of kingship and to explore contemporary notions of the rights of the laws and liberties of the British people and their monarch.

---

[248] Pierre Joseph d'Orléans, *Histoire des revolutions d'Angleterre depuis le commencement de la monarchie jusqu'à present,* 4th edn, 3 vols (Amsterdam: D. Mortier, 1714), I, p. 69.
[249] Isaac de Larrey, *Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse, et d'Irelande,* 4 vols (Rotterdam: Reiner Leers, 1707-1713), I, p. 262.

Section 2: Magna Carta vs King John

French historical accounts of King John and Magna Carta reveal eighteenth-century attitudes to the relationship, and perceived ideal relationship, between king and constitution. The seventeenth-century rediscovery of the Great Charter allowed eighteenth-century historians to discuss the development of Magna Carta in order to show how a flawed king can be constrained by a constitution and by his people, who are represented by the barons in these historical accounts. John was used by eighteenth-century historians as an example of poor kingship, in a manner that confirmed the importance of Magna Carta's role and symbolism in defending English rights and liberties against an unruly monarch.

In the sixteenth century, only common lawyers had much awareness of Magna Carta. However, by 1700 it was in the consciousness of a much larger audience. Like the Norman Yoke Theory, it began to be mobilised in political discussions about rights and liberties following the events of the 1640s.[250] Magna Carta was viewed in the eighteenth century as a symbol of liberty and justice. It was associated with campaigning for parliamentary reform and its symbolism was used to support the unwritten, ancient constitution. Similar to the concept of the Norman Yoke, Magna Carta evoked the idea of a return to Saxon laws and pre-conquest liberties.[251] The eighteenth-century Whig interpretation of history maintained that the Glorious Revolution was an illustration of the reclaiming of ancient liberties. The Whigs, inspired by Lockean theories, believed that England's constitution was a social contract that was founded on documents such as the Petition of Right (1628) and the Bills of Rights (1689), in addition to Magna Carta.[252] The Magna Carta represented the fundamental principles of the ancient constitution and was considered to be evidence of the lawful contractual relationship between people and government. The Statutes of the Realm, reaffirmed in the Bill of Rights (1689) and the Act of Succession (1701), were all formed upon the values of

---

[250] Dzelzainis, p. 279; Woolf, p. 103.
[251] Dzelzainis, p. 276.
[252] Ralph Turner, *Magna Carta: Through the Ages* (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 169-170.

63

property rights and personal freedom that the British people believed to be derived from Magna Carta.[253] Magna Carta was employed in the seventeenth century as a legal instrument, and in the eighteenth century it was invoked with increasing frequency in Britain and its growing empire as a symbol of liberty and justice. It became a symbol that was closely associated with the campaign for parliamentary reform, where it was used to support ideas of an unwritten, ancient constitution as well as the people's ancient rights.[254]

In the early seventeenth century, Sir Edward Coke (1552-1634) brought the charter into the public eye when he put forward the notion that Magna Carta provided the constitutional foundation of the legitimate institutions of government and justice.[255] The 1225 reissue of the charter was also published in Latin, and then in the vernacular at this time.[256] The Great Charter remained an important text for lawyers, particularly employed in the defence of property rights, and it became more widely read as printed versions circulated and levels of literacy increased.[257] By the eighteenth century, pamphleteers, politicians, and royal elites, as well as ordinary people, were aware of the Magna Carta and its role in their constitutional history. In 1759, Sir William Blackstone published a critical edition of the 1215 charter and organised it in a numbering system that is still employed today.[258] This edition further extended the number of people who encountered the medieval document and deepened its place in the British imagination, in conjunction with its presence in historical texts of the period.

French eighteenth-century historical accounts of King John demonstrated contemporary notions of what constituted poor kingship. Historians used John's reign to

---

[253] Justin Champion, 'Reinventing the Charter: from Sir Edward Coke to "Freeborn John"', *Historian*, 125 (2015), 16-21 (p. 21).
[254] Alexander Lock and Jonathan Sims, 'Invoking Magna Carta: Locating Information Objects and Meaning in the 13th to 19th Centuries', *Legal Information Management*, 15:2 (2015), 74-85 (pp. 81-82). For more on the development of Magna Carta since the seventeenth century see Turner, pp. 145-182; Anne Pallister, *Magna Carta: The Heritage of Liberty* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
[255] Champion, p. 16.
[256] Faith Thompson, *Magna Carta: Its Role in the Making of the English Constitution 1300-1629* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1948), pp. 147-149.
[257] Turner, p. 133.
[258] Turner, pp. 67-68.

evaluate flawed sovereignty and the need for a constitution. In Rapin's history, John I was portrayed as a degenerate king long before the signing of the Great Charter. In his account of the year of 1204, more than a decade before the signing of Magna Carta, Rapin criticized John for denying the rights of the barons early in his reign. His reference to the death of King John's mother, Eleanor, allowed Rapin to convey further his true opinion of John. Eleanor, Rapin wrote, 'had the mortification before her death to behold the decay of the Monarchy'.[259] The use of the term 'decay' conveyed a degeneration of John's power and personal behaviour. In this manner, Rapin set the stage for his readers to witness John's undesirable kingship in denying the rightful privileges to his barons and in his weakness in his struggle with foreign powers who had triumphed against him.[260]

Gabriel Gaillard's account of John in *Histoire de la rivalité de la France et de L'Angleterre*, which was never translated into English, was the most zealous in its descriptions of John as an inferior king. Gaillard informed his readers that they would not encounter anything about the rivalry between John and France's Phillipe Auguste as it would belittle one of France's greatest kings.[261] Gaillard did not believe that John should have been king and suggested that his nephew Arthur had the right to the throne.[262] According to Gaillard, King Phillipe of France had no choice but to embrace Arthur's claim as it was a just cause, as well as useful to him.[263] In the events leading up to the signing of Magna Carta, Gaillard depicted John as pitifully fearful.[264] When John asked his barons for more time, it was because he was afraid and wanted to request support from the Pope, as Gaillard emphasized that John was fearful of the barons. He was a king who floated between 'insolence et la crainte' (insolence and fear).[265] These

---

[259] Rapin, *The History*, III, p. 182.
[260] Rapin, *The History*, III, p. 219.
[261] Gabriel Henri Gaillard, *Histoire de la rivalité de la France et de l'Angleterre*, 10 vols (Paris: Saillant and Nyon, 1771-1777), II, p. 202. In French: 'Nous ne regarderons point Jean sans terre comme le rival de Philippe Auguste: ce seroit trop rabaisser un des plus grands rois de la France'.
[262] Gaillard, II, p. 202.
[263] Gaillard, II, p. 206.
[264] Gaillard, II, p. 288.
[265] Gaillard, II, p. 289.

qualities demonstrated his poor kingship and leadership skills, and the evident need for a document such as the Magna Carta.

Historians further warned against poor kingship in their discussion of John and his inability to continue the royal power he had inherited. Historians believed that John started his rule with a strong legacy, left to him by Richard I, and thus had the opportunity to be a great king. Instead, his weak character, fickle decisions, and cowardice led to tyranny and a loss of monarchical power. For example, after his chapter on William the Conqueror, Raynal moved on to the reign of John I and immediately emphasized John's weak kingship for his inability to hold power. As was common in the eighteenth century, Raynal began his chapter with a short summary of its contents, which gave a clear sense of the author's views. This introductory outline of the Second Epoch's contents stated that John 'degrades the royal authority, by granting the grand charter in 1215': the historian thus began his criticism with John's inability to control his people. Raynal explained that 'scarce was the Conqueror in his grave, when they [the English] tumultuously demanded the re-establishment of their ancient customs'. While the following Kings 'amused the nation […] by great promises […] which were never executed', the laws 'imposed by the Conqueror' had actually 'acquired strength' and had 'very solid foundations' when John began his rule.[266] Raynal criticized John for his weakness as a king because he had lost a great deal of inherited power. After highlighting John's feebleness, Raynal provided a very critical depiction of the king by highlighting his 'wickedness', 'stupidity' and 'shame[ful]' behaviour.[267] Raynal did not believe John was a virtuous king as he was 'void of all sentiments of religion and honour'.[268] Raynal thus argued that John's inadequacies as king were a result of his lack of strength in his own character. For Raynal, John was a failure because he did not want to grant English liberties, and moreover because he did not maintain the laws that William the Conqueror had established. Raynal highlighted these failures in order to criticize John's poor kingship for losing the power that his most recent ancestors had left for him.

[266] Raynal, *The History*, p. 24.
[267] Raynal, *The History*, p. 24.
[268] Raynal, *The History*, p. 25.

While historians were keen to point out John's deficiencies as a monarch, they also used his reign to illustrate that a bad king can be constrained by a constitution. David Hume's *History of England*, which provides insight into contemporary British political thought, described the establishment of Magna Carta as a necessity to protect the people, even if it was not initially very powerful. Hicks argues that Hume wrote his historical account 'with examples of behaviour and policy to be imitated or avoided'.[269] Hume explored policy in his final musings on John, in the second appendix following the king's death, which included an analysis of the legacy of the charter which 'gave rise, by degrees, to a new species of government, and introduced some order and justice in the administration. The ensuing scenes of our history are therefore somewhat different from the preceding'. According to Hume, however, Magna Carta was not innovative in any new establishment of political or public laws, even if it had improved 'order' and 'justice'. It only guarded, weakly, against the tyrannical practices of a king, giving men 'some more security for their properties and their liberties'. The charter only 'approached a little nearer to that end, for which it was originally instituted, the distribution of justice, and the equal protection of the citizens'.[270] In the use of terms like 'by degrees', 'somewhat different', 'some more' and 'a little nearer', Hume argued that the charter held only a small amount of legislative power. Nonetheless, Hume believed that even if Magna Carta was not very effective as a legislative document, it remained valuable as a symbol of the problems of oppressive kingship. Hume argued that the Charter represented 'a kind of epoch in the constitution'.[271] While Hume deemed that it may have been weak in its material impact, it nevertheless helped to restrain 'the barbarous licence of the kings, and perhaps of the nobles'.[272] In this respect, the charter appears pivotal to Hume's understanding of history as a movement towards a state of civilisation.

---

[269] Hicks, p. 178.
[270] David Hume, *The History of England,* 2nd edn, 8 vols (London: A. Miller, 1763), II, p. 143. For more on Hume's account of Magna Carta and its contents see also pp. 86-91.
[271] Hume, *The History*, II, p. 144.
[272] Hume, *The History*, II, p. 143.

Similarly, Millot argued for the importance of the charter's symbolism and its role in the establishment of British liberties, writing:

> Although the great-charter abolished not the ancient courts, established no new modes of administration or justice, descended into no important details, and only guarded the properties of the liberties of the people by general regulations and clauses; yet it changed, by degrees, the tyrannical aspect of the government, and became a kind of epoch in the constitution.[273]

Curiously, Millot's account draws direct parallels to Hume's, and lifts specific ideas from Hume's text. Both Millot and Hume described Magna Carta as 'a kind of epoch', and Hume had argued that 'the Great Charter contained no establishment of new courts […] nor abolition of the old'. Hume had also written that 'It only guarded, and that merely by verbal clauses, against such tyrannical practices as are incompatible with civilized government'.[274] Millot's account was written fifteen years after the first volume of Hume's *History* was published, and his debt to Hume cannot be denied. These similarities also shed light on the practices of the translator Mr Kenrick, who admitted to 'adorn[ing] his text with the expression of that great historian [Hume]' at some of the times when Millot cited the historian.[275] Like Hume, Millot underscored the importance of the symbolism of Magna Carta, rather than the contents of the charter. For the historian, Magna Carta was a progressive development in England's history that increased the rights and liberties of the everyday people, and this resonated with Hume's and Millot's enlightened discourse. Millot, like Hume, chose to conclude his chapter on John I in this way in order to emphasize the importance of Magna Carta to his audience. Millot used the term 'epoch' to indicate the magnitude of the event, even if it was just in relation to the symbolism of the charter. Millot's twenty-three-page chapter on John was much longer and more detailed than that on William I, which only filled eleven pages. This variation in length suggests that Millot considered Magna Carta to be a more important development in England's constitutional history than the Norman Conquest.

---

[273] Millot, I, p. 157.
[274] Hume, *The History*, II, pp. 143-4.
[275] William Kenrick, 'Advertisement', in Millot, I, pp. iii-iv (p. iv).

Gaillard's account of John argued for the necessity of Magna Carta. Gaillard wrote that the development of Magna Carta was so important that one must look back at the events that led to its birth and from which the government of France was so different. For this purpose, he first mentioned the Anglo-Saxons, with a particular emphasis on the laws passed by Alfred and Edward the Confessor, which he said created the base for England's jurisprudence and were viewed as the source of 'le droit commun' for England.[276] Given Gaillard's support for Magna Carta, as well as the Norman Yoke theory, it is interesting that his historical work was not translated into English. His history was published from 1771 to 1777 and comprised eleven volumes; publishers may have considered his work as overly lengthy in comparison to the more concise works of Millot and Raynal.

Magna Carta was a significant event in Rapin's interpretation of England's history. However, while Rapin gave the full text of the charter in his *History*, he did not discuss the laws and liberties which it specified. He simply informed the readers that the barons forced John to give up all the prerogatives that 'his predecessor had enjoyed ever since William the Conqueror'.[277] According to Rapin, Magna Carta was ultimately a confirmation of the laws of Edward the Confessor and in this statement he was moreover able to reaffirm his previous arguments of the Norman Yoke theory.

Historians were able to demonstrate the ways in which a poor king can be constrained by his people by discussing Magna Carta. Rapin presented the barons as the heroes of his historical account. For Rapin, the barons established liberties by signing the Great Charter, whereas the Catholic Church posed a threat to this positive development. In his account, the historian argued that John regretted signing the Great Charter and that he sought to annul it by demanding the pope's assistance. Rapin wrote that John pleaded to the pope to void Magna Carta to 'absolve him from his oath', while the pope threatened the barons with 'the indignation of the Holy See'.[278] Rapin criticized the Catholic Church's behaviour as unreasonable. Influenced by his Huguenot

---

[276] Gaillard, II, pp. 293-294.
[277] Rapin, *The History*, III, p. 157.
[278] Rapin, *The History*, III, p. 230.

background, Rapin contended that the Catholic Church restricted the rightful liberties of the English people in the thirteenth century, as they had in France more recently. Since most of those living in eighteenth-century Britain were Protestants, Rapin's perspective chimed with contemporary British anti-Catholicism.[279]

David Hume also drew upon anti-Catholic prejudices and depicted the barons as the heroes of the story. When Hume described Pope Innocent III's contemplation of whether to help King John, he referred to John as a 'base and degenerate prince' who the pope was willing to help. According to Hume, the pope did not want the administration to fall into the hands of the 'gallant and high-spirited barons' since the barons 'would vindicate the honour, liberty and independence of the nation'.[280] Hume presented the barons as being so passionate in their demands that they were able to overcome 'the power of superstition itself'.[281] Hume presented an enlightened discourse in his description of the barons who were able to fight for rights of the English man and listen to reason rather than 'superstition'. To Hume, John was a king who hoped to hold onto tyrannical power, and the pope was his ally. Here we see Hume critiquing the Catholic Church itself, as well as John, by presenting the wickedness of the Church in contrast to the heroic behaviour of the barons. According to Hume, the barons had imposed the main articles of the charter so that they could have had significant power over the kingdom and common man, but nonetheless chose to fight for 'the interest of inferior ranks of men' as they wanted to ensure that all the provisions made were 'in order to ensure the free and equitable administration of justice, tended directly to the benefit of the whole community'.[282] Had the barons not been thinking of their vassals, 'national happiness and liberty would have been very little promoted' by Magna Carta.[283] For Hume, the barons, not the king, were the enlightened heroes.

---

[279] Colin Haydon, *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-Century England, c. 1714-80: A Political and Social Study* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993); Jeremy Black, 'The Catholic Threat and the Press in 1720s and 1730s', *Journal of Religious History,* 12 (1983), 364-381.
[280] Hume, *The History*, II, p. 83.
[281] Hume, *The History*, II, p. 83.
[282] Hume, *The History*, II, p. 89.
[283] Hume, *The History*, II, p. 88.

The prominence of Magna Carta and the failures of King John in eighteenth-century cross-channel historical accounts are found in the text of Millot, who cited, and agreed with, Hume's description of the barons as moral exemplars. According to Millot, John was 'abandoned by his subjects'.[284] The charter, according to Millot, was 'the foundation of English Liberty'.[285] Millot also stated that 'it is worthy of observation, that the barons, by thus consulting the interest of their people as well as their own, laid themselves under the necessity of being just, and protecting the inferior orders of men'.[286] After his account of the signing of Magna Carta, Millot stated that he wished to follow the 'method' that 'Mr Hume' used in his history, that is, a 'general account of the feudal system of policy, and of the state of the English Nation from the Norman Conquest'.[287] The descriptions by Millot and Hume are rather similar and again provide evidence of Hume's influence on Millot's *History*. Millot held a similar view that the barons, not John, were the key figures in the pursuit of English laws and liberties. Millot, like Hume, emphasized that the barons looked after the common man and not just their own individual desires. Both writers articulated the enlightened ideal of putting the public good before private needs. Their emphasis was on the granting of liberty to the people, an important theme of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment discourse and historical discussion of Britain's rights and liberties.

Section 3: The Absolute and Despotic King of the Seventeenth Century

The English Civil War, Regicide, and Interregnum remained contentious events in the eighteenth century and played a crucial part in British notions of laws and liberties. As a result, eighteenth-century historians frequently wrote about the Stuart period and turned to Charles I as an instructional example and a means of investigating matters of morality and kingship. Stuart histories were in high demand in the first quarter of the eighteenth

---

[284] Millot, I, p. 145.
[285] Millot, I, p. 146.
[286] Millot, I, p. 147.
[287] Millot, I, p. 150.

century and French historians continued to use Charles I to debate the rights and privileges of monarchy and parliament throughout the century. More specifically, historical texts used Charles' execution in 1649 as an example of the importance of reason and the need to keep passions in check. Depictions of the king's comportment at his death allowed historians to promote the eighteenth-century virtue of equanimity.

The impact of the events of the 1640s and 1650s is evidenced by the writing and publishing of Stuart histories in Britain, where the changing political climate of the turn of the century influenced historical writing.[288] A few French works of English history had their chapters on the Stuart reigns translated into English and circulated in Britain. For instance, a part translation of Pierre-Joseph d'Orléans' original English history emerged in 1711, under the title *The History of the Revolutions in England under the Family of the Stuarts, from the Year 1603, to 1690*.[289] Similarly, in 1716 Isaac de Larrey had the Stuart era from his original text translated into a new English work, *The History of the Reign of King Charles I*, with a secondary title, *Containing A More Particular and Impartial Account of the Rebellion and Civil Wars Than Has Yet Been Published*.[290] The secondary title of this text highlights that the Stuart reign and its downfall was still of interest. Larrey's assertion of his impartiality suggests that multiple accounts had emerged that had strongly argued differing political views. Moreover, the author's advertisement of his work to be 'more particular' indicates public demand for a more detailed account. As no other part of the original texts of these two historians was translated into English, the translation of Stuart chapters suggests that the events of the Civil War and Interregnum were of particular interest to British readers.

Hume's work reflects the eighteenth-century British interest in the Stuarts. The first historical period that Hume chose to write about was the reign of the Stuart monarchs James I and Charles I. This volume was published in 1754, and was followed by volumes that covered the period from the invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution

---

[288] Okie, p. 2.

[289] Pierre Joseph d'Orléans, *The History of the Revolutions in England Under the Family of the Stuarts, From the Year 1603, to 1690* (London: E. Curll and R. Gosling, 1711).

[290] Isaac de Larrey, *The History of the Reign of King Charles I,* 2 vols (London: A. Bell and J. Osborn, 1716).

of 1688. As a consequence, the sixth volume of the complete work was the first to appear in print in 1754, while the first two volumes were actually published last, in 1762. Hume's purpose was expressed in his letter to Adam Smith (1723-1790):

> I confess, I was once of the same Opinion with you, & thought that the best Period to begin an English History was about Henry the 7th. But you will please to observe, that the Change, which then happen'd in public Affairs, was very insensible, and did not display its Influence till many Years afterwards. Twas under James that the House of Commons began first to raise their Head, & then the Quarrel betwixt Privilege & Prerogative commenc'd. The Government, no longer opprest [sic] by the enormous Authority of the Crown, display'd its Genius; and the Factions, which then arose, having an Influence on our present Affairs, form the most curious, interesting, & instructive Part of our History.[291]

In his letter, Hume highlighted the impact of the Stuart reign on eighteenth-century affairs. He argued that their present parliament found its strength during this period, as they stood up against the 'opprest' monarchy. He valued the study of the Stuart period as it could provide useful instruction to readers. Hume felt it was significant because of the debates about the rights and privileges of the people and their monarch, in the 'quarrel betwixt privilege and prerogative'. Hicks argues that Hume 'sought to modernize political philosophy', and part of this modernisation was to 'root out faction'.[292] Hume's disdain for factions is found within this letter, as well as in his *History*, where he wrote that they still had 'influence on our present affairs'. As Hume argued that the origins of the factions of the eighteenth century were in the reigns of James I and Charles I, it is not surprising that he chose to begin his history of England with the Stuart period. As he noted, it provided a subject that was both 'curious' and 'interesting', as well as 'instructive'. The Stuart kings played a major role in Rapin's history as well, written a quarter of a century earlier. Charles I was discussed in the second half of volume VII of Rapin's original text, as well as in volume VIII. Once

---

[291] David Hume, *The Letters of David Hume,* ed. by J.Y.T. Greig (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932), pp. 167-168. For more on the chronology of Hume's *History of England*, see Denys Hay, *Annalists and Historians: Western Historiography from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Centuries* (London: Methuen, 1977), pp. 174-175; J.G.A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion Volume Two: Narratives of Civil Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 199-203.
[292] Hicks, p. 173.

Tindal completed his translation and added his own notes and analysis, the amount on Charles increased to three full volumes of around 600 pages each. This expansion confirms that Charles' regicide, the Civil War, and Interregnum continued to be of historical interest for eighteenth-century readers.

The focus on the Stuart period allowed historians to use Charles I to debate the rights and privileges of monarchy and parliament. Rapin attributed the Stuarts' downfall to their attempt to stretch the royal prerogative and their desire to make the power of the king absolute. According to Forbes' study of Rapin's history, Rapin felt that the first two Stuart kings behaved destructively towards the English constitution in their attempts to propagate previously unseen qualities of hereditary right and monarchical government.[293] This critical approach enhanced the appreciation of Rapin by his British readers as, according to Forbes, previous historians such as Clarendon had not 'properly explained' the events that led to the Civil War.[294] Rapin's provision of the points of view of both king and parliament, combined with his inclusion of lengthy official documents and character sketches, also appealed to readers. Rapin's approach to history helped readers to understand the psychological motives behind the events of the 1640s and 1650s, which represented a shift in the way neoclassical history was written, as early eighteenth-century historical works included more focus on the personal and emotional qualities of historical figures.[295] Moreover, Rapin's explanation of the Stuarts' misguided application of Divine Right resonated with eighteenth-century British society because God's role as the 'divine clockmaker' had taken hold in history writing. Historians invoked the idea of a non-interventionist God and reason became an important historical motive.[296] In arguing against divine kingship, Rapin's account contributed to this new way of making sense of Britain's recent past. According to Rapin, James I and Charles I were the same person, as 'Charles I trod exactly in the steps of the King his Father'.[297] Rapin argued that both kings embarked with an ambition to undermine the constitution from the very beginning of their reigns, leading

---

[293] Forbes, p. 235.
[294] Forbes, p. 235.
[295] Gallagher, p. 8.
[296] Woolf, pp. 247, 262.
[297] Rapin, *The History*, X, p. 7.

them to exercise their despotic power.[298] He wrote that Charles 'had formed a design to establish in England an arbitrary government'.[299] He also argued that no despotic or 'absolute' monarch could compare in power and wealth to a king who was loved by his subjects. In Rapin's view, a monarch could achieve a successful reign that benefited both the king and his people by respecting the constitution and observing the laws. As he wrote, a king who 'render[s] himself absolute […] would never be able by oppression and violence to get from his people what he may draw from them with their consent, by submitting to the laws and constitution of the government'.[300] To Rapin, the Stuarts' downfall could be attributed to their attempt to stretch the royal prerogative and to make the power of the king absolute. By contrast, he described how 'A Wise and Prudent King of England, who is acquainted with his own interest, will never quarrel with his parliament'.[301] Thus he argued that the Stuart kings brought about the Civil War because they claimed parliament was a royal concession, entirely at the disposal of the king.

The view of the Stuarts as despotic in their attempts to expand monarchical power had its origins in Thomas May's *History of the Parliament* (1647), which argued that the demise of the Stuarts was due to James I's failure to uphold the policies of Elizabeth I.[302] Eighteenth-century historians furthered this link by arguing that Charles' reign was a direct continuation of his father's, with little change or improvement. Rapin argued that even compared to Henry VIII, James was more absolute in the way he transgressed his rights as king. The historian described Henry VIII as 'the most absolute of all the kings of England since William the Conqueror'. But James I was even worse because he resolved 'to assert this supposed hereditary right', which 'was the first cause of the troubles which afflicted England, and which are not yet ceased'.[303] In Rapin's view, Henry VIII controlled the parliament by religion but never claimed to do so by hereditary principles as had the Stuart kings. The phrase 'not yet ceased' reflected his belief that these debates about royal prerogative were ongoing. Rapin's comparison used

[298] Rapin, *The History*, X, pp. 6-7
[299] Rapin, *The History*, XI, p. 140.
[300] Rapin, *The History*, X, p. 247.
[301] Rapin, *The History*, IX, p. 498.
[302] Woolf, p. 249.
[303] Rapin, *The History*, IX, p. 239.

his previous criticisms of Henry VIII and William I to underscore to the readers that the Stuarts were responsible for the overstepping of their natural rights.

Like Rapin, Millot suggested that Charles allowed the problems that had emerged in the reign of his father James to persist. Millot stated that beside the unfortunate influence of the Duke of Buckingham, 'the new king [had] inherit[ed] the principles of James I, and being equally obstinate and open to prejudice, the seeds of discord scattered through the kingdom, [and] would naturally produce in such a reign the most unhappy effects'.[304] Millot connected Charles' rule to that of his father to argue that they were both guilty of creating the circumstances that led to their demise by attributing it to the 'seeds of discord' that the Stuart kings had created. The events of the Civil War and Interregnum were thus attributed to both James and Charles, and were viewed by historians as inevitable because of the kings' transgression of their natural monarchical authority.

For French historians, the Stuart kings were guilty of taking away rights that belonged to parliament, which allowed them to develop an argument that the regicide and subsequent events rebalanced the power between monarchy and parliament. In his *History,* Rapin wrote that during the reign of James I and Charles I, Parliament 'had a right to demand first the Redress of Grievances, as a condition, though they avoided calling it so. This is the method constantly observed by the parliaments on the like occasions […] of this there are frequent instances in the history of England'. Yet, James I and Charles I did not follow this course, and instead 'chose to dissolve the Parliaments, rather than yield to redress their Grievances'.[305] According to the historian, the two kings had ignored their duty to their parliament and therefore their people. When Rapin stated that there were 'frequent instances' in history of parliament's redress to their monarch, he argued that this was a natural right of Britain's parliament. James and Charles had instead chosen to dissolve Parliament in order to 'free themselves from the

---

[304] Millot, II, p. 114.
[305] Rapin, *The History*, X, p. 31.

Yoke of the Parliament' and thus ignored their monarchical duty.[306] Rapin's use of the word 'yoke' here might have aimed to remind the readers of the Norman Yoke Theory in order to emphasize that James I and Charles I were not honouring the rightful constitution of England. The following three volumes were full of petitions, declarations, and answers from the king. Rapin was trying to explain meticulously to his readers how the Civil War came about by arguing that the Stuart monarchy held some culpability in their own demise as both kings sought to suppress the rights of the English Parliament.

The rights and privileges of monarchy and parliament were also discussed in Raynal's historical account of Charles I. Raynal argued that the Stuarts' despotic nature created discord with their parliament and people, but that Parliament surpassed its constitutional boundaries in its actions against Charles. Raynal highlighted the discord between monarch and people when he observed that 'Scarce had Charles I ascended the Throne, when there appeared a mutual disposition to hate one another, and even a settled antipathy, between him and his subjects'.[307] Raynal argued that Charles was a monarch who did not comport himself with the nation's best interest in mind as he had fought against his own nation from the beginning of his reign. For Raynal, Charles I had:

> exacted contributions with a haughtiness never known in the island. He had forgot that the King, who is elsewhere the sovereign judge of the nation, from whom there lies no appeal, in England is only the first magistrate of the kingdom. According to his principles he ought to be as absolute as any monarch that ever wore a crown.[308]

Thus Charles was deemed guilty by Raynal of not knowing how best to rule his country and for not understanding how best to comport himself as king. In so doing, Raynal implied that Charles did not understand England's unique relationship between people and monarch. Eighteenth-century historians considered Charles to be an absolute monarch as he tried to gain power that did not belong to him.

---

[306] Rapin, *The History*, X, pp. 31-32.
[307] Raynal, *The History*, p. 170.
[308] Raynal, *The History*, p. 174.

Millot argued that Charles jeopardized the English constitution and employed a similar concept to the Norman Yoke theory as he called for a return to the rights and liberties that were seen in ancient times. Millot's account gave particular emphasis to the events of 1628, when England was at war with France. According to the historian, when Charles summoned a parliament, 'the religious zeal of the commons was favourable to war in defence of Huguenots'. Yet Members of Parliament were hesitant since they remembered that 'Charles had declared of taking some extraordinary steps if they refused their assistance'. When Charles made a speech to address their concerns, Millot stated that it was a 'very serious affair' as 'the constitution was at stake'. Then, 'the cry of liberty was echoed in the House of Commons, as it had anciently been in the Roman senate'.[309] Millot's reference to the Roman government is indicative of the way in which the ancients were revered as creators of the modern institution of fair government. Indeed, they were a frequent reference point for men of letters in the seventeenth and eighteenth century.[310] As Millot noted, Members of Parliament called on their 'ancestors' several times in their speeches, declaring a need for 'liberty of parliament' and 'personal liberty'.[311] Millot sought to make sense of the Civil War for his readers, and he stated that 'from this language it was easy to judge of the violence that would ensue'. The Commons then created the Bill of Rights, which 'insisted on the Great Charter, the laws of Edward III'.[312] Millot argued for the fundamental importance of Magna Carta for current British laws, rather than referring to the Anglo-Saxons and the Norman Yoke theory. In this way, Millot was repositioning history. He suggested that the Magna Carta was the origin of liberty and called on classical examples to cement his views. Moreover, his text, published in 1771, indicated when the Norman Yoke theory became less conspicuous in eighteenth-century histories, in contrast to its importance in the political debates of the early eighteenth century, when it provided a way of thinking about the still relatively recent events of the Civil War and Restoration period.

---

[309] Millot, II, p. 118.
[310] J.B. Black, *The Art of History: A Study of Four Great Historians of the Eighteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1926), pp. 15-16.
[311] Millot, II, p. 118.
[312] Millot, II, pp. 118-119.

The behaviour of Parliament during the 1640s was criticized by eighteenth-century historians, who argued that the government's overreaction to Charles caused the events that followed. Raynal, for instance, felt that Parliament had overstepped its rights:

> The Parliament was desirous that he should sacrifice to them the right which the Kings enjoyed, of banishing and imprisoning without discovering causes; he sacrificed it: that he should give up his claim to all the taxes that were levied by his orders, and made a part of his revenue; he gave them up: that the two tribunals designed to support the honour and rights of the crown, should be suppressed; he suppressed them: that he should engage himself to call a parliament regularly every three years; he engaged to it.[313]

Raynal used terms like 'sacrifice' to highlight that the king eventually tried to appease his parliament and mend their relationship. In this way, Charles was a martyr to parliament's zealousness. In Raynal's view, Parliament had surpassed its constitutional boundaries and was thus responsible for the turmoil that followed. Raynal used several examples of Charles' eventual leniency towards Parliament to stress that Charles did eventually try to concede the power that he had unlawfully gained. By giving four examples of Charles' good behaviour, one after another, the historian highlighted parliament's relentless desire for revenge against their king. Raynal argued that not everyone agreed with the views of the malcontents within parliament, and the 'good subjects' found 'it still more strange, that the Parliament should want to govern without a King, than that the King should want to be without a Parliament'.[314] As absolute a ruler as Charles was, Raynal did not believe that the country should do without a king altogether. As a result of this belief, the historian did not condone the events that followed Charles' regicide, writing that 'The war was carried on with more brutality than bravery, more obstinacy than constancy, more impetuosity than understanding, more animosity than emulation, more fury than heroism'.[315] Raynal felt that Parliament had exceeded beyond its political rights despite Charles' poor kingship. He also emphasized that the country suffered in the absence of a king.

---

[313] Raynal, *The History*, p. 186.
[314] Raynal, *The History*, p. 187.
[315] Raynal, *The History*, p. 188.

The 'fury' Raynal referred to also signals another key lesson that is conveyed by his depiction of this period of history: management of the passions. Historians used Charles as a moral example, in the neoclassical tradition, by discussing his execution to demonstrate the need to keep personal passions in check. The virtue of self-control was important in the eighteenth century, and was one of the principal aims of John Locke's (1632-1704) theories of virtue.[316] Later in the period, the importance of moderation can be found in William Robertson's (1705-1793) dedication of his *History of Ancient Greece,* which implored the Prince of Wales to 'contemplate the immortal Heroes of Greece' who had sacrificed 'their passions to their reason'.[317] Instruction on moderation, as in accounts of Charles' reign, was a central lesson in eighteenth-century historical texts.

Historians argued that the absence of moderation by Parliament led to a deadly war, which Raynal recounted to provide a moral lesson on self-control to readers; although, he also made comments about the natural rights of parliament. Both Raynal and Millot did not feel that Parliament held the right to carry out the act of regicide and depicted Charles' equanimity to further emphasize the injustice of the king's execution.[318] Raynal criticized Parliament and incriminated both the peers and the Commons, writing: 'Most of the Peers who composed this too-celebrated assembly, were corrupted, and all the members of the House of Commons fanatics'. Raynal provided specific reasons for the deficiencies of both the peers and the Commons. Due to their 'timid[ity]' and 'narrow views', the Peers were too introspective. The Commons, by contrast, were 'fanatics' who were unable to rein in their dangerous, capricious passions. For Raynal, the peers and the Commons were polar opposites as the peers were too timid and the Commons too volatile. This opposition represented the need to find a middle way, and the importance of moderation and restraint in emotions and behaviour. Raynal accused Parliament of detesting Charles and asserted that they

---

[316] Morse, pp. 17-19.
[317] William Robertson, *The History of Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh; London: Charles Elliot and J. and J. Robinson, 1786), p. vi.
[318] Millot, II, pp. 160-161.

were absolutely 'determined to destroy him'.[319] In Raynal's view, the rebellions against Charles were a result of political fanaticism. Although historians accused Charles of being unable to restrain his prerogatives as king, the actions of Parliament exposed the rashness of their own behaviour.

Millot's depiction of the execution was similar as he did not believe that Parliament was justified in its actions. Millot reserved much of his ire for Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) by capitalising on Cromwell's poor reputation in the eighteenth century.[320] According to Millot, 'the English constitution was totally reversed by those who pretended to maintain it. The hypocrite, Cromwell, by affecting inspiration, supported these astonishing usurpations'.[321] Millot highlighted the 'pretended' acts of parliament to insinuate that their actions, far from being beneficial for the nation, were disingenuous. This argument was carried further by the historian's labelling of Cromwell as a 'hypocrite'. For Millot, Cromwell was complicit in the 'usurpations' that saw him replace Charles as the head of the nation. As a result, the historian believed that Cromwell's desire for power was selfish, rather than for the public good. Orléans, similarly, described the execution of the Stuart king as a sorrowful event. However, he immediately placed the blame on Cromwell by depicting him as an outright villain and describing him as a 'tyrant' whose manipulative skill earned him many 'creatures' who needed no persuasion to commit murder.[322] In highlighting Cromwell's influence in the call for the execution of the king, historians undermined the legitimacy of such an act. Historians criticized Cromwell's part in the execution, to add culpability to his actions during the events that followed the regicide.

The trial and execution of Charles I was criticized by Hume as he viewed the actions by Parliament to be an extreme overreaction to the king's behaviour. David Cressy has identified how royalist historians at the end of the seventeenth century

---

[319] Raynal, *The History*, p. 181.
[320] Roger Howell Jr, 'Cromwell, the English Revolution and Political Symbolism in Eighteenth-Century England', in *Images of Oliver Cromwell: Essays for and by Roger Howell,* ed. by Roger Howell (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), pp. 63-73.
[321] Millot, II, p. 161.
[322] Orléans, *The History*, pp. 125-128.

contended that the demise of the monarch came about because of the perversity and dishonesty of Charles' subjects, rather than the behaviour of Charles himself.[323] Similar arguments continued to be made a century later, as when Hume emphasized that Parliament was unappeasable in its demands of Charles. When Hume introduced the monarch's trial, he wrote that 'the height of all iniquity and fanatical extravagance yet remained [...] To this period was every measure precipitated by the zealous independents'.[324] Hume employed terms such as 'fanatical' and 'zealous' to highlight the extremity of parliament's actions and to condemn the regicide. The killing of the king was thus deemed to be an excessive and unjust overreaction, which demonstrated the necessity of self-control. Similarly, according to Larrey, the Civil War took place because of 'misunderstandings' in Charles I's rule. Larrey presented the act of regicide as unnecessary. The historian argued that 'from that misunderstanding arose a dispute, that broke out into an open war, the fury of which could not, it seems, be satisfied with a less sacrifice than blood, shed by the hands of the executioner'.[325] Larrey described an anger that could not be 'satisfied' to highlight that extreme emotions that had taken hold in parliament, thus highlighting the benefits of moderation and self-control to readers. In a similar vein, he called Charles' execution a 'sacrifice' to draw attention to its futility. While historians were often critical of Charles' kingship, they always used his regicide as an example of the moral need for self-regulation.

Rapin's account of Charles' execution argued that moral errors were made by both king and parliament. The execution of Charles was deemed unnecessary, yet Rapin empathised with the frustration towards a monarch whose aim was to make the government 'arbitrary and tyrannical'. To Rapin, however, the period immediately leading up to the trial witnessed behaviour from Parliament that was just as corrupt, as he described when he presented the reasons against parliament by supporters of the king:

---

[323] David Cressy, 'Remembrancers of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographies of the 1640s', in Kewes, *The Uses of History*, pp. 253-264 (p. 259).
[324] Hume, *The History*, VII, p. 137.
[325] Larrey, *The History*, I, p. vii.

But there was not an Englishman who was not satisfied that the government had never been more despotical, more tyrannical, and more arbitrary than after this Parliament met. There was scarce a Law but what had been violated. The two Houses had, for several years, usurped the supreme authority contrary to the known laws. And lately the Commons had voted, that all Power was lodged in them, without the concurrence of King and Peers, a maxim unknown to the English from the foundation of the Monarchy.[326]

To Rapin, the House of Commons was just as guilty of installing despotic rule. He used the terms 'violated', 'usurped', and 'contrary' to highlight that Parliament was stretching its prerogative, just as Charles had. Thus with this description, Rapin argued that a king was necessary to provide balance as, without a monarch, Parliament established a 'more despotical, more tyrannical, and more arbitrary' rule than any of the kings in his historical account. Rapin felt that the Commons infringed on England's ancient and modern constitution as the Commons had taken the laws and liberties away from both the monarchy and the peers. Rapin also provided explanations as to why Cromwell's Interregnum did not work and why there was a need for a British king.

The Interregnum, regicide, and Civil War remained in popular memory in the eighteenth century, as evidenced in the selection of Stuart chapters that were translated from French historical accounts. The Stuart period allowed historians to debate the rights and privileges of monarchy and parliament. Charles was critiqued for his attempts to expand the royal prerogative and was described as a despotic king. Constitutional boundaries remained important to historians, and the rights of the people were debated within the Norman Conquest, the signing of Magna Carta, and especially within the reign of Charles I. French historical depictions of Charles' execution were united in their criticisms of the fanaticism of parliament, and historians used this bloody act to educate readers on the need for moderation and personal restraint.

---

[326] Rapin, *The History*, XII, p. 576. Rapin gives a brief description of the trial, informing his readers to instead read *A true Account of the Tryal of Charles Stuart,* which was published at London in 1650, and translated into French. Rapin writes: 'I imagine I shall do the reader no injury to refer him to this little book, which is not scarce, and which will inform him of all particulars' (p. 569). Rapin's recommendation to his readers of an English book translated into French suggests that this work was in demand from both French and British audiences.

Section 4: Factions, Advisers, and Kingship

This section examines the tendency of both French and British eighteenth-century historians to criticize factions and advisors. French accounts of William I, John, and Charles I will be compared with British portrayals of Louis XIII and Louis XIV to demonstrate how historians from both countries depicted the negative influence of advisors and political factions. For these authors, the corruption and manipulation of a king by an advisor or faction, for their personal ambition, was an immoral act. There was a fear that these factions mislead the king to favour individuals instead of the good of the entire nation. Factions were a problem in eighteenth-century France and England, and criticisms of their effect on politics resonated with author and reader alike. French historical accounts showed that kings corrupted by their court were not able to serve the public good as their first priority. Historians argued that poor advisors exploited the weak will and character of kings, who were not strong enough to find their own royal voice against poor counsel.

Advisors who attempted to gain too much power were presented by historians as lacking in virtue, and examples of their behaviour were provided to demonstrate how they did not comport themselves for the greater good. Narrative history had traditionally played an important role in the education of gentlemen and men of affairs, and both French and British historians sought to instruct their readers on the need to resist immoral influence.[327] The virtuous man was supposed to have independent views that were incorruptible, both in his private and public life. Such men should have honest natural impulses and yet be able to master their emotions whenever necessary.[328] Historians made the case to their readers that public and private virtue was imperative of effective monarchical rule for kings; the ideal king had to follow this archetype. Examinations of factions and advisors allowed historians to explore how vice affected both the public and the private spheres.

---

[327] Okie, p. 8.
[328] Marisa Linton, 'Virtue Rewarded? Women and the Politics of Virtue in Eighteenth-Century France. Part I', *History of European Ideas*, 26 (2000), 35-49 (p. 36).

In eighteenth-century Britain, factions took the form of political parties: the Whigs and Tories. From the Revolution of 1688 to the Hanoverian Succession, British politics were embroiled in the struggle between the Tories and Whigs.[329] There was considerable political strife, especially in the reigns of William III and Queen Anne. After the Hanoverian succession, there came some political stability with a firmer establishment of Whig politics.[330] The Tory party shrank and politics began to revolve around a different pair of factions: Court and Country.[331] The country faction was concerned about court influence and its effect on the corruption of the body politic. For example, Robert Walpole was accused of systematically exploiting crown patronage to diminish Parliament to a rubber stamp that deprived the citizenry of their civic virtue, liberty, and independence.[332] In France, factions were considered to be a problem throughout the reign of Louis XV, especially in its early stages, when the young king's failings were attributed to inexperience and manipulation by unscrupulous advisers within his court.[333] French and British writers both showed a disdain for the effects of factions on the monarchy in their depictions of weak kings.

In these historical accounts, poor advisors demonstrated the weak will of kings and the need for a monarch to trust his own opinion and not be influenced by malevolent advisors. When eighteenth-century historians wrote about the negative influence of royal advisors, their motivation was two-fold. It enabled them to critique those kings who they felt lacked the requisite willpower to rule successfully. These critiques also formed the basis of more general advice that historians offered to their readers that emphasized the necessity of using reason to maintain personal autonomy, rather than

---

[329] Okie, pp. 3, 5.

[330] H.T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Methuen, 1977), p. 121.

[331] Okie, pp. 6, 50; See also John Cannon, ed., *The Whig Ascendancy: Colloquies on Hanoverian England* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1981). For the argument that the Tory Party thrived long after the Hanoverian Accession of 1714, see Linda Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 290.

[332] Okie, p. 50.

[333] Kenneth N. Jassie and Jeffrey Merrick, 'We Don't Have a King: Popular Protest and the Image of the Illegitimate King in the Reign of Louis XV', *Consortium on Revolutionary Europe 1750-1850: Proceedings,* 23 (1994), 211-219 (p. 211).

falling prey to the advice of malignant influences. According to French historians, Charles I was misled by the Duke of Buckingham (1592-1628). Millot wrote that—like his father before him—although Charles came to the throne a 'brave, modest, sober and virtuous' king, he was 'in the hands of a man unworthy of his favour'.[334] Millot outlined Charles' good qualities that had been squandered and lost due to the Duke of Buckingham in order to highlight Charles' potential for successful rule. Rapin made the same point, albeit less bluntly: 'He had the same favourite, the same council, the same ministers, and all the Places at Court and in the Country, continued in the Hands of the Duke of Buckingham's creatures. So there was nothing new but the King's person'.[335] Rapin used this continuity to criticize Buckingham's influence, which had hindered Charles from progressing and formulating his own type of kingship. In order to draw attention to the negative influence of the Duke of Buckingham on the king, Raynal described the former as 'a dangerous man, who after having been the father's favourite, was the son's Idol'.[336] Raynal informed his readers that 'the unfortunate Monarch [Charles I] was brought to this tragical [sic] end by the passions of Buckingham, […]the treachery of his favourites', in addition to 'the ambition of Cromwell'.[337] Millot, Rapin, and Raynal all criticized the negative influence of Buckingham, and they highlighted how his destructive guidance originated when he was an advisor to James I. All three historians used the Duke as an example to advocate for the need to use one's own reason against malevolent influence.

The accounts of Isaac de Larrey and Pierre-Joseph D'Orléans contained similar depictions. According to Larrey, the Civil War could be attributed in part to 'the King's too great love for favourites, that were envied by the Lords, and hated by the Commons'.[338] Larrey called attention to the havoc that favourite advisors played on the parliament to argue that the favourites functioned against the public's interests. In his account, he told his readers that the Duke of Buckingham had 'bewitch'd' James, and Larrey accuses him of 'sacrificing his country, his religion, his master and benefactor to

---

[334] Millot, II, p. 114.
[335] Rapin, *The History*, X, p. 8.
[336] Raynal, *The History*, p. 171.
[337] Raynal, *The History*, p. 198.
[338] Larrey, *The History*, I, p. 2.

his own ambition' during Charles' rule.[339] Larrey employed the term 'sacrifice' to highlight the detriment that the Duke brought to James, Charles, and the nation, all for his own selfish 'ambition[s]'. Orléans' account of the Stuarts made it very clear who he blamed for Charles' demise as he argued that had Charles 'been more politick' and 'less govern'd by others' he most likely would have 'surmounted all those difficulties'.[340] This criticism also referred to the Duke of Buckingham, who was 'a favourite that was both envy'd and hated', and who eventually sought to 'alienate the Hearts of the English from their new King'.[341] The accusations against Buckingham revealed that historians held the advisor responsible for many aspects of the disastrous reign of Charles. Historians thus argued that the ideal king needed to stand strong against advisors and factions who did not act in the best interests of the monarch and nation.

Rapin advised his readers that more than one advisor had the ability to undermine a monarch's reign and he argued that several advisors corrupted the court and contributed to the formation of Charles' despotic rule. Rapin stated that it was the 'Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Strafford, Archbishop Laud, and the Queen herself, who was used to a very different government from that of England, were the persons that hurried this unhappy Prince down the Precipice, whom they so passionately desired to raise higher than his predecessors'.[342] The historian argued that these advisors 'hurried' Charles to his end, and he called the king's downfall a 'precipice'. This choice of wording made it clear that Rapin held the advisors responsible for Charles' downfall. Rapin blamed the multiple factions for the corruption within Charles' court, and for their contribution to the formation of his despotic rule and the threat he created to the normal English laws and liberties as discussed in the previous section.

Rapin argued strongly that kings corrupted by the court did not serve with the public good as their first priority. During the eighteenth century, a devotion to the public

---

[339] Larrey, *The History*, I, p. 6.
[340] Orléans, *The History*, p. 10
[341] Orléans, *The History*, p. 11.
[342] Rapin, *The History*, XII, p. 586.

good was a significant virtue and was inspired by republican ideals.[343] This commitment to the public good was emphasized in eighteenth-century historical accounts and was used by Rapin to explore the way the monarch served his people in the manner in which he governed. Rapin emphasized in his history that there was an ever-present danger to the British constitution in the form of court influence and corruption of parliament. Rapin informed his readers that the king had no real ability to create an absolute monarchy because of the self-defeating aspects of the English government and the boundaries of its constitution. For Rapin, a king could only lose the natural advantages that he drew from the constitution due to the 'pride' and 'insatiable avarice of favourites and ministers'.[344] Larrey expressed this notion in similar terms, writing that 'there is no excuse can be made for his too great complaisance for favourites, and too little deference for the Nation and Parliaments'.[345] For both Rapin and Larrey, the corrupt advice of a favourite could have serious consequences for a king and his nation.

Like their French counterparts, British historians argued in their works that advisors could undermine the monarch's judgment. In their accounts of France, British historians focused on Cardinal Mazarin (1602-1661) and Cardinal Richelieu (1585-1642) to prove how a corrupt court could undermine a king, who should ideally place the needs of his country first. The continued attention to these two cardinals in eighteenth-century historical accounts underlines how factions remained a continuing contemporary concern that was repeatedly raised with readers of historical works. In a history of France, which was published at the start of the eighteenth century, David Jones wrote that Richelieu had a substantial influence on Louis XIII. Jones' final description of the cardinal offered his interpretation of the advisor: 'He set the King at Enmity with his Mother, Brother, and it may be with himself, constraining him to give up his Authority to him'. Jones thereby argued that Louis XIII was so strongly manipulated by Richelieu that it created discord with the king's own family, leading the king to have no one to trust but the Cardinal as he could not even trust 'himself'.

---

[343] J.G.A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 42-50.
[344] Rapin, *The History*, X, pp. 246-247; Forbes, pp. 240-241.
[345] Larrey, *The History*, I, p. 5.

According to Jones, Richelieu, 'Having disarmed the Protestants in France', subsequently 'laid the great Ones low, weakned [sic] the People and the Parliament' and ultimately 'established the Vigour of Arbitrary Government'. He was moreover 'the author of wars' and 'cruel in his Hatred, and inflexible in Revenge'.[346] Jones furnished Richelieu with many vices in order to emphasize the impact of the negative influence of a malicious advisor. These negative attributes led to Richelieu's manipulations of the king to satisfy his 'cruel' demeanour and 'inflexible' desires. Jones suggested that the advisor was unable to exercise self-control as he was unable to see beyond his personal aspirations. The historian blamed Richelieu for the corruption of parliament and government by implying that an advisor with too much influence operated against the nation's best interest for his own personal advantage.

Rolt, writing half a century later, described Richelieu in a similar fashion in *A New History of France*. The text, first published in 1754, was in a question and answer format. After stating that Richelieu was made cardinal and prime minister, Rolt asked the question: 'How did Richelieu behave in this high station?'. The historian then answered himself: 'With absolute power; for he turned out, or put in, the great officers of state at pleasure; and the court changed its face at the will of the minister'.[347] Rolt described Richelieu's power as 'absolute' in order to argue that the advisor behaved like a despotic king. When asked if Louis 'regret[ed] his loss' when Richelieu passed away, the answer was: 'he seemed glad that he was delivered from a minister whom he esteemed very much, but whom he feared much more'.[348] This relief portrayed Louis XIII as a weak king who was vulnerable to Richelieu's power. Although he cared for the Cardinal, Rolt wrote that the king feared his advisor to suggest that Louis had lost control of his monarchical power, which Richelieu then took up.

The criticisms of corrupt advisors and factional influence endured late into the eighteenth century. In 1786, Richard Johnson continued to stress how the court was

---

[346] David Jones, *The History of France from the Origin of that Nation to the* Year *1702,* 2 vols (London: D. Brown and A. Bell, 1702), II, p. 876.
[347] Richard Rolt, *A New History of France, by Question and Answer* (London: W. Owen, 1754), p. 213.
[348] Rolt, pp. 213, 217.

corrupted by obstructive advisors in *The History of France: From the Earliest Period to the Present Time*. Louis XIII's mother was depicted as another form of corrupt advisor in the form of regent queen. This exploitation occurred when Louis XIII came to power and was too young to rule:

> A new form of government now sprung up, which seemed to foretel [sic] the decay of the kingdom. The Queen was governed by the Florentine Concini, and still more by his wife Eleanor Gelagai, who were entirely taken up with making their own fortunes, and had no other regard for France than to enrich themselves with its spoils. The council was a confused assembly, where no salutary measures could be resolved on. They abandoned the great project of Henry IV.[349]

Johnson accused Louis' mother of corrupting the king and alluded to the 'decay' that was present in his rule that was a result of her influence. He then argued that the queen herself was a victim of corrupt advisors, including the wife of the Italian minister Concini. Johnson outlined the corrupt influence of two women to call attention to their unnatural position, and he drew upon a prevailing cultural standard that no woman should take power from a man, especially a king.[350] Johnson then told his readers that four civil wars took place during this reign, giving the impression of an unhappy country that was despondent with its ruler as a direct result of this influence. In Johnson's view, Louis XIII's rule took a turn for the better once Richelieu became involved in governance: 'From the time Richelieu entered into the council, the government seemed to have changed its policy; for the greatest designs were then conceived, and the best measures taken'.[351] Richelieu's influence was thus viewed as preferable to that of the queen regent. Johnson's stance was exceptional, and his uniquely positive account of Richelieu may have been motivated by the author's wish to assert male authority in some way. His opinion of Richelieu may have been a response to growing anxiety about the increasingly visible public role of women at the time he was writing.[352] Johnson suggested to his readers that Louis XIII was easily susceptible to the opinions and

---

[349] Richard Johnson, *The History of France: From the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (London: E. Newbery, 1786), pp. 124-125.
[350] Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus, 'Introduction', in *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities*, ed. by Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus (London and New York: Longman, 1997), pp. 1-28 (pp. 12, 15).
[351] Johnson, p. 133.
[352] Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History*, p. 99.

guidance of others, especially due to his 'flexible mind'.[353] In this instance, flexibility implies weakness, and the historian presented Louis XIII as an exemplar of the need to be steadfast against malicious influence, even in the form of the king's mother.

British historians also used Cardinal Mazarin's influence on Louis XIV to advocate against corrupt factions and advisors. Mazarin was accused of mismanaging the affairs of government. According to Rolt, he was 'solely engaged in enriching himself and increasing [sic] his own power, he suffered the justice, the commerce, the marine, and even the finances of France, to languish and decay'.[354] The historian listed numerous facets of Louis' rule to emphasize the vastness of the Mazarin's manipulation. He used the term 'decay', as Johnson did to describe the queen regent during the reign of Louis XIII in order to argue that nothing positive resulted from Mazarin's corrupt guidance. When posing the question of what historians currently thought of Mazarin, Rolt answered that while 'pride and revenge were predominant in the soul of Richelieu', Mazarin was 'prudent, artful, and greedy of riches'.[355] Rolt used the two cardinals in the same answer to argue that both were guilty of corrupting the monarchy and to place them as equals who both offered poor advice to their kings. Rolt inferred that Mazarin held power over Louis when he wrote that Louis was able to rule as an effective king after Mazarin's death as he 'first restored discipline among his troops, and then order in the finances'. The reference to 'discipline' and 'order' aimed to convey that a king could properly rule his people had he mastered his own self. Rolt suggested that 'magnificence and decency adorned [Louis'] court; brilliancy and grandeur appearing even its pleasures' because the newly independent king had finally listened to his own council.[356] His description of the king's new reign was a sharp contrast to the depiction of Mazarin's character only a few sentences before, and he used the terms 'magnificence', 'decency', 'brilliancy', and 'grandeur' one after the other to argue that a king ruled much more effectively without manipulation from factions and favourites.

---

[353] Johnson, p. 149.
[354] Rolt, p. 228.
[355] Rolt, p. 230.
[356] Rolt, p. 230.

The historian thus argued that a king served his people best when he was not susceptible to corrupted influence.

Both the French and the British were concerned about corrupt advisors and factional influences in the eighteenth century. Johnson's *History* linked the corruption of the two nations' courts. The author made a direct connection between Charles I and Louis XIV to highlight how negative courtly influence affected both of their countries, and he made a comment on how the influence could be handled:

> Charles the First, King of England, lost his head on a scaffold, for having, at the beginning of his troubles, given up the life of Strafford, his favourite, to his parliament. Lewis XIV on the contrary, became the peaceable master of his kingdom by suffering the exile of Mazarin; and thus the same weaknesses had different effects. The King of England, by abandoning his favourite, encouraged a people who breathed nothing but war, and who wished to curtail the arbitrary power of kings; while Lewis XIV or rather the Queen-mother, by sending away the Cardinal, took away all pretence of rebellion from a people, who were tired of war, and who loved despotic royalty.[357]

Advisors and favourites of the king were seen as highly volatile by the public, who grew nervous that a man not destined as their natural king could influence the way in which their countries were run. Johnson argued that a nation easily lost faith in their monarchy if a king was not level-headed and was seen as easily influenced. Johnson emphasized that Louis XIV was a successful king because he sent his favourite away, and—in contrast to Charles I—did not concede to unreasonable demands. When Charles allowed a close friend to be put to death, Johnson believed that his honour was jeopardized completely as the king had given up all personal convictions to meet the demands of an unreasonable parliament. The historian also implicitly suggested that these actions ultimately set the precedent for his death. Johnson's account advised readers on the morality of being steadfast in one's convictions against corruption in the form of factions, advisors, and an over-zealous parliament. The similarities between British and French criticisms of factional involvement in monarchical rule suggest that the two

---

[357] Johnson, p. 158.

nations shared a political frustration with contemporary politics and the effect of favourites and factions on kingship.

Section 5: Virtues and Vices in the Historical Character Sketch

At the end of chapters dedicated to particular monarchs, historians provided a character sketch. These sketches offered a summary of the king or queen as a monarch, with didactic intent. Historians sought to give their readers a clear indication of how they should feel about a monarch's overall reign. Character sketches used eighteenth-century notions of virtue and vice to depict a reign as a positive or negative development in the overarching history of England. Historians presented monarchs as individuals and took note of their particular character traits as well as their qualities as political beings. The sketches portrayed each monarch in a way that historians hoped would provide moral reflection and connect to contemporary readers.[358] This section will analyse character sketches of William I, John, and Charles I to shed new light on historians' objectives. It will compare these depictions with British accounts of Louis XIII and Louis XIV. This analysis will shed light on contemporary ideas of virtues and vices and their effect on a king.

In the eighteenth century, the new commercial world intensified the valuing of characterization by readers and writers. Lynch argues that as a result of this increasing commercialisation, the printing press 'in overdrive' contributed to the quick dissemination of '[fleshed] out characters'.[359] According to Lynch, this context led to a movement away from the neoclassical foundations of what made a character legible and brought new rationales for the presentation of individuals into reading matter. Lynch notes that the reading public sought characters to 'escape from their social context', but

---

[358] Mark Salber Phillips, *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain, 1740-1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), p. 65.
[359] Lynch, pp. 24-25.

also to whom they could connect with as 'individuals'.[360] I would argue that in the historical genre in the eighteenth century, there was a strong link between the neoclassical and modern modes of characterization that gave readers the opportunity to connect with historical figures. My discussion of historical texts will demonstrate how the two methods worked together. French historians drew upon neoclassical understandings of virtue but presented them within the context of a more fully developed and psychologically complex character to whom eighteenth-century readers could relate and even emulate. French historians kept the foundations of neoclassical history and used the formal way of writing history to keep its elite status while also creating accounts that could connect to a new emerging reading public.

Historical writing became synonymous with the characterization of individual figures in the eighteenth century. The character sketch offered a space for authors to work out the relationship between individuals and history; for them to assert that 'the character of an individual was the effective cause of historical change and that history was the imprint of the remarkable individual upon the nature of things'.[361] By the end of the period, in a periodical essay appearing in *The Mirror* (1779), William Craig discussed the literary genre known as the 'Character'. In it he claimed that:

> Besides those who have professedly confined themselves to the delineation of character, every historian who relates events, and who describes the disposition and qualities of the persons engaged in them, is to be considered as a writer of characters.[362]

Craig's connection between the creation of characters and their relation to events encapsulated the historical writing goals of the eighteenth century. Character sketches were a device that was used in historical writing on both sides of the channel, both before and after the publication of Hume's *History*. Not everyone was in agreement about their value. Adam Smith argued that a character sketch distorted the nature of a historical figure and promoted generalisation rather than diversity. A character sketch forced readers to come to the same judgment as the author as he placed himself between

---

[360] Lynch, p. 6.
[361] Hargraves, p. 25.
[362] William Craig, *The Mirror*, 31 (1779), as cited in Hargraves, p. 24.

the reader and the historical event in his characterization.[363] Modern scholars have come to similar conclusions about the idea of a historian's personal judgment. White, for instance, argues that eighteenth-century historians interpreted 'the truth of the facts' that reflected the historian's personal enquiries.[364] As historians sought to make accounts of characters that provided instruction, as well as reflection, it is not surprising that historians wrote accounts that echoed their personal views.

The prevalence of the elaborate character sketch in eighteenth-century historical works is partly attributable to Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*. Clarendon's ability to humanize the motives and directions of the main players of the revolution made this work an engaging read, and other historians attempted to emulate his methods. Perez Zagorin argues that Clarendon's *History* continued to be important for its piercing commentary on events and individuals. He notes that the account provided insight of a seventeenth-century statesman's views of the evils of 'rebellion and the virtues of subordination, tradition, and lawful kingship'.[365] Clarendon's humanization of historical figures in his character sketches and his explanation of the driving forces and causes of the demise of the Stuart monarchy inspired other French and British historical accounts. This practice of commenting on the psychology of the Civil War suggests that other historians also sought to avoid a repeat of the events of the mid-seventeenth century by exploring the recent past and by describing a character's vices and virtues. Brownley argues that Clarendon's success derived from his narrative ability to connect personal experience with historical purpose. Clarendon's characterizations, in particular, strengthened his larger thematic points.[366] Clarendon's humanization of his historical figures thus helped to transform the historical genre. The nation could view the influential figures of the past as actual people. Paul Seaward argues that Clarendon's historical work was emulative of the ancients, and that his desire to investigate the cause

---

[363] Adam Smith, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, ed. by J.C. Bryce (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 78-84.
[364] Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), pp. 49-53.
[365] Perez Zagorin, 'Clarendon and Hobbes', *The Journal of Modern History*, 57:4 (1985), 593-616 (p. 593).
[366] Brownley, p. 177.

and consequences of the Civil War followed the approach of Tacitus.[367] Clarendon was thus one of the first influential neoclassical historians who based his approach on that of ancient writers such as Tacitus and Livy. J.G.A. Pocock argues that the influence of the ancients was further present in debates about foundation, legislation, corruption, and virtue, as historians wrote about the ability of individuals to 'occasion moments of systematic change'.[368] With the character sketch, historians were able to convey how individuals instigated change as they listed the virtues and vices of a monarch in order to give readers insight into the monarch's actions and motives.

Virtue was an increasingly important value in eighteenth-century France and thus moral qualities of character were used by many French historians to judge the ideal ruler. As Marisa Linton notes, kingly virtue was gradually, but steadily, being transformed into a largely secular quality during this period.[369] Previously, the notion of the divine right of kings placed monarchs in an exalted position, where they were expected to put their virtue into practice. Towards the middle to the end of the eighteenth century, the king's virtue came to be judged in a similar way to those of other citizens. The king's private virtue became the object of legitimate public speculation and were likewise subject to examination. His inner virtue was judged for how it affected his public actions.[370] Morse argues that after the revolution of 1688, 'those who acted not selfishly but in the best interests of the state and the people were virtuous'.[371] At the end of the seventeenth century, two texts helped with the materialisation of a widespread discourse of virtue: John Locke's *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693) and Anthony Ashley Cooper, Third Earl of Shaftesbury's *An Enquiry Concerning Virtue or Merit* (1699). Bolingbroke's *The Idea of Patriot King* was another non-historical work of the eighteenth century which reflected on the idea of virtue and kingship. This text was already circulating in manuscript form by late 1738 and it remained both one of the

---

[367] Seaward, pp. 301-302.
[368] Pocock, *Barbarism*, p. 10.
[369] Marisa Linton, *The Politics of Virtue in Enlightenment France* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), pp. 148-149.
[370] Linton, *The Politics*, pp. 148-149; Isaac Kramnick, 'Corruption in Eighteenth-Century English and American Political Discourse', in *Virtue, Corruption, and Self-Interest: Political Values in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. by Richard K. Matthews (London: Associated University Press, 1994), p. 56.
[371] Morse, p. 2.

more highly praised and one of the more roundly condemned of Bolingbroke's works.[372] It argued that a future ideal monarch could unify and purify the nation by seizing the initiative to abolish factions and rule over an administration based on virtue rather than on party.[373] As we saw in the previous section, factional influence was deemed to be a problem in both France and Britain throughout the eighteenth century. Bolingbroke's argument for a virtuous ruler thus resonated with eighteenth-century readers. Eighteenth-century historians made the same argument as Bolingbroke: that virtuous qualities created a stronger king. The character sketch, which assessed a monarch's balance of virtue and vice, was thus used to evaluate whether the reign was successful.

The notion of vice was used by eighteenth-century historians as the antithesis of virtue. Some historians discussed virtue and vice together as a conflict between opposing forces, like the opposition between good and evil.[374] In Johnson's *Dictionary*, vice was defined as 'the course of action opposed to virtue; depravity of manners; inordinate life' or as 'a fault; an offence. It is generally used for a habitual fault, not for a single enormity'.[375] Eighteenth-century historians engaged with both of Johnson's definitions of vice. Historians used the term as a simple way to articulate that the figure discussed was wanting in virtue or to highlight a general characteristic that the figure expressed continuously in his, or her, life. When Edward Gibbon wrote his *The History of Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776-1789), he thought it was his duty to follow the classic tradition of commending emperors and other powerful individuals for their commitment to virtue or criticising them for their corruption and vice.[376] His approach continued a method which had been used by French and British historians throughout the eighteenth century.

---

[372] H.T. Dickinson, 'St John, Henry, styled first Viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, < http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/article/24496> [accessed 4 January 2016].
[373] David Armitage, 'A Patriot for Whom? The Afterlives of Bolingbroke's Patriot King', *Journal of British Studies*, 36:4 (1997), 397-418 (p. 397).
[374] Morse, p. 105.
[375] Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language,* 2 vols (London: J. and P. Knapton and A. Millar, 1755), II.
[376] Morse, p. 10.

Moral instruction played an important role in historical eighteenth-century neoclassical accounts. Millot's account provided an indication of the model virtues and vices for readers in the second half of the eighteenth century. Millot's thoughts on vice and virtue, as expressed in his introduction, highlight their importance to eighteenth-century French and British historical philosophy. He devoted two pages to the value of being virtuous, and the problems of vice, before concluding:

> History never ceases to demonstrate, in spite of the blasphemy of the dying Brutus, that the wise and just man, whatever adversity he may experience, has always sufficient reason to felicitate himself on his virtue; but that unjust, perfidy, deceit, debauchery, and rapine, every vice and every crime, revenges on itself the evils which it inflicts on society.[377]

The musings of Millot on vice and virtue are a strong indication of their importance to historians and the ways in which they could be used to evaluate a monarch. Millot also highlighted that the life of a moral man in society was made easier by virtue and that destructive vices had repercussions. The danger of vice was especially pressing for a king as his society was the nation itself and private actions have public consequences.

The characterization of William I in French texts of English history was mixed. Some historians viewed his actions during the conquest as a political necessity, while others characterized him in negative terms for his subjugation of ancient English rights and liberties. Both Larrey and Rapin also discussed previous representations of William I. Larrey felt that William had been presented either as a tyrant or as a fair and moderate ruler. French historians agreed that William was not a cruel king and emphasized how his reign was mostly non-violent. After noting that previous historians often chastised William for taxing the English, Larrey questioned what else the king could have done to maintain an army, and he argued that taxation was a necessity for the government to function. According to Larrey, even the accusations that William took treasures and sacred riches from the Church were exaggerations instigated by the Church itself, which was disgruntled with its lack of special treatment when it came to taxation.[378] Larrey's

---

[377] Millot, I, pp. xv-xvii.
[378] Larrey, *Histoire d'Angleterre*, I, p. 262.

Huguenot background is evident in his critical depiction of the Church as nowhere in this account of historical views does he name an actual historian or source.

Like Isaac de Larrey, Rapin discussed the historical debate that surrounded William's character. His account reflects White's view of metahistorical consciousness, in which historians tend to portray historical figures according to their personal objectives. Rapin concluded:

> Some viewing him only as a Conqueror of a great kingdom, have extoll'd him to the Skies for his Valour and Prudence, and slightly pass'd over the rest of his actions. Others considering the same Conquest as no better than a downright Usurpation […] have not scrupled to represent him as a real Tyrant.[379]

This description highlights the role of a historian's opinion in the portrayal of the past. Rapin used two contradicting characterizations of William to reflect on the conqueror's legacy, while giving the impression of maintaining his own impartiality by including both views. Rapin, as a self-titled impartial historian, claimed that he refused to choose a side as they 'may all be in the Right, since this monarch had a great mixture of good and bad qualities'.[380] Rapin's description of William as 'vigilant and active' suggested that the monarch was brave and bold. 'On the other hand', Rapin felt that William should be remembered for his 'covetous temper', in addition to the partiality he had for his countrymen who 'put him upon doing many things, which can hardly be justified'.[381] With this conclusion, Rapin's true opinion of the conqueror was unmasked as he chose to finish his description with William's flaws in order to call greater attention to them. Details of weakness in character and apparent corruption in the courts allowed Rapin to undermine William's appearance as a virtuous king. Rapin's conclusion, coupled with his reference to other historical accounts, was an explicit acknowledgement of the constructed nature of history and demonstrates that he, like Isaac de Larrey, was also involved in the interpretative act that White has described.[382]

---

[379] Rapin, *The History*, II, p. 283.
[380] Rapin, *The History*, II, p. 283.
[381] Rapin, *The History*, II, pp. 283-284.
[382] White, pp. 49-51.

Hicks argues that the character sketch was an element of classical narrative that remained prevalent in the eighteenth century.[383] In his discussion of Hume, Hicks notes that that the British historian 'carefully, systematically […] weighed the virtues and vices, successes and failures, or monarchs and ministers'.[384] Hume furnished William I with more positive qualities than vices in his character sketch, and his account conveyed a sense that a certain number of positive qualities could balance, or even redeem, a person's vices. Hume argued that William was 'entitled to grandeur and prosperity, from the abilities and vigour of mind which he displayed in all his conduct'.[385] Describing him as a fortunate king, Hume believed that William deserved the kingdom he gained through his heroic actions. The historian added that his 'spirit was bold and enterprising, yet guided by prudence; his ambition, which was exorbitant, and lay little under the restraints of justice, and still less under those of humanity, ever submitted to the dictates of reason and sound policy'.[386] Hume thereby instructed his readers on the ideal of compromise, and he argued that a king should be able to regulate his potential for excess. 'Prudence' was a key ideal quality for all monarchs since everything they desired was readily available to them. According to Hume, William's natural 'ambition' was still controlled by 'reason and sound policy', in line with the ideal qualities of a king. The historian attributed William's successful reign to his virtues, which compensated for his vices.

Millot characterized William's reign as a positive development, and similar to Hume, depicted the conqueror as meriting the kingdom he gained through his heroic accomplishments. Millot's second point in his section on William had the title 'his wise administration', making Millot's positive view of the monarch clear from the outset.[387] Although Millot believed William I to be more of a conqueror than a king, he stated in the character sketch that 'the valour, the capacity, and the political discernment of William, enabled him to establish his power upon the most solid foundation' and argued that the king's stern actions were 'perhaps the only means by which he could suppress

---

[383] Hicks, pp. 181, 200.
[384] Hicks, p. 181.
[385] Hume, *The History*, I, p. 300.
[386] Hume, *The History*, I, p. 300.
[387] Millot, I, p. 69.

seditions and revolts'.[388] Millot argued that William's more dishonourable actions had a certain validity given his role as a conqueror, even if he was disliked by those he subjugated. The vices that William displayed were deemed necessary in order to establish rule over a foreign country and Millot argued that the king's actions were only natural given the new monarch's situation. The historian thus maintained that some vices were unavoidable, and this argument allowed Millot to excuse the monarch for his otherwise unvirtuous behaviour.

Rapin argued that William had denied the rights of the English and hinted at William's multiple vices in the character sketch in order to criticize the conqueror. He informed his readers that William was not a virtuous king because of his failings in the protection of the laws and liberties of his people. Moreover, Rapin also employed arguments about William's masculinity to prompt his readers to question the king's character. Rapin wrote that William was a handsome king in his younger years and had 'great strength and vigour', yet he also made reference to a debate conducted by other historians, who he does not name, about the 'chastity' of the king. Rapin argued that some historians said William was 'addicted to women', and others 'gave occasion of calling his manhood into question'.[389] Rapin presented two extreme depictions of William's masculinity: the strong, virile man with multiple lovers, and someone who was incapable of performing his duties as a man. An 'addict[ion] to women' was interpreted as a sign of effeminacy in the eighteenth century as Michèle Cohen has argued. This perception might explain why Rapin wrote that William's 'little inclination that way' made others doubt his masculinity, especially since the king 'never gave his queen any cause to be jealous'.[390] Rapin, always keen to tell both sides, then discussed the rumour that William had a clergyman's daughter for a mistress. Rapin thus used the sentence 'addicted to women' as a double entendre: as a sign of effeminacy as well as one of masculine sexual prowess. The author followed this description with an account of William's financial habits and tendencies for 'magnificence', which connected the

---

[388] Millot, I, pp. 79-80.
[389] Rapin, *The History*, II, p. 284.
[390] Michèle Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 2014), p. 7; Phillip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society 1660-1800* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), p. 131.

King's sexual prowess with a debate about fiscal responsibility. To conclude his character description, Rapin considered the possibility of whether William held 'Wittena-Gemot' or 'Parliament' during feasts and festivals at Gloucester, Winchester, and Westminster, 'as some do affirm'. Rapin, however, 'can hardly be persuaded' of this action, since William would not 'leave them in possession of the greatest of their privileges' after depriving them of their estates.[391] The historian did not believe that William was capable of holding a form of parliament as it went against the conqueror's despotic nature. Rapin argued that by denying the rights of the English, William was not exhibiting ideal kingly behaviour. He thus confirmed to his readers that William was not a virtuous king as his failure to protect the laws and liberties of the people did not serve the public good. The historian employed arguments about the king's masculinity and financial abilities in order to highlight this unvirtuous conduct.

Raynal, although initially complimentary of William, blamed William's distrustful nature for his troubles with the English people. Raynal employed characterizations of the king to highlight the necessity of virtue in a monarch, in order to inspire virtue in his people. He informed his readers that the monarch 'had all the shining qualities which dazzle the eyes of the multitude; an air of dignity, which bespeaks a hero, or a prince whom heaven plainly intended should rise to be one,' even when describing the final years of William's reign.[392] Despite this expression of admiration, Raynal did not hesitate to criticize William as he noted that the king was 'naturally distrustful' and his 'suspicions suggested to him injurious and excessive precaution to prevent any revolution'.[393] Thus the historian argued that William's personal shortcomings brought about the discord with his conquered country, rather than it being the fault of the English themselves. Raynal argued that had William exhibited more virtuous behaviour, his people could have emulated him.

While the characterizations of William I were mixed, the dislike of King John was universal. In the character sketches of John, every historian attributed numerous

[391] Rapin, *The History*, II, pp. 284-85.
[392] Raynal, *The History*, p. 21.
[393] Raynal, *The History*, p. 18.

vices, rather than virtues, to the king. Hargraves' argument that eighteenth-century historians aspired to uncover the inner character of a historical figure, in order to comprehend the motives for their actions, is supported by the emphasis in many accounts on John's numerous vices as historians sought to provide insight into the monarch's motives as he fought against the Magna Carta.[394] Rapin, after questioning the quick judgment of previous historians, still reached the same conclusions about John's overall character. In his character sketch of John, Rapin wrote that he could have represented him as 'one of the vilest wretches that ever liv'd', if he were to 'copy after Matthew Paris, [John's] chief historian'.[395] Rapin's citation of Paris' work suggests that eighteenth-century historians continued a discourse which began shortly after John's reign. Yet Rapin informed his readers that he has approached his estimation of John with 'a great deal of caution' regarding the 'particular sentiments and expression of historians'.[396] This description was another instance of Rapin's cultivation of impartiality as he sought to weigh up previous historical accounts judiciously. In the end, however, Rapin argued that he had to produce a 'very disadvantageous idea of him, when one considers his unjust proceedings'. Rapin informed his readers that John had 'extreme indolence', a 'meanness', a 'breach of faith with his barons', and that he found in John 'scarce any one valuable qualification'.[397] Although Rapin argued that as a historian he had approached John in a fair manner, he had no choice but to criticize the king for his many vices. Rapin's description of John as 'mean' implied that the king was petty, a quality – like 'indolence' – which was not befitting of a man who ruled an entire nation. Nonetheless, Rapin appeared to pity the king. Although John might merit some degree of blame, Rapin believed historians have 'drawn him in blacker colours than he deserv'd' as really, 'King John's fortune never squar'd with his temper. He was a lover of peace and quiet, and his fate was to be perpetually in action'.[398] John was not well suited to his rule, and according to Rapin, the difficulties of his reign brought out his most undesirable traits. In his description of John as a monarch who simply wanted 'peace and quiet' but whose reign involved constant 'action', Rapin humanized the king

---

[394] Hargraves, p. 24.
[395] Rapin, *The History*, III, p. 243.
[396] Rapin, *The History*, III, p. 243.
[397] Rapin, *The History*, III, p. 243.
[398] Rapin, *The History*, III, p. 244.

by his depiction of him as a man who was unfortunately faced with tumultuous times. While John was still depicted in unflattering terms, Rapin suggested that adverse circumstances played their part, and that John's downfall should be attributed in part to his inability to overcome these circumstances.

Like Rapin, Raynal argued that John did not hold the positive qualities of character that were expected of a king. To Raynal, John 'was equally deficient in the virtues which adorn a diadem or a private station; and possessed the vices of every condition of life'.[399] His failure was on a private level, as a man as well as a king. As Raynal was not specific, he left the readers to reflect on the nature of John's vices for themselves. Raynal, however, concluded with his personal estimation of the king, that John 'had no wit but to hurt, no fire but to embroil, no courage but to destroy'.[400] In this sentence, he provided a series of ways in which John exhibited undesirable types of masculine and kingly characteristics. The repetition of 'no', and the juxtapositions of positive and negative qualities, emphasized his point. Raynal thereby communicated his view that John's reign was wanting in virtue and not to be emulated.

Millot argued that John was a weak-willed and cowardly king, but he did not include a character sketch to conclude his chapter on John's reign. He did, however, portray John's character negatively throughout his account. For example, he argued that John only initially submitted to the conditions of the charter as he in fact 'secretly waited for an opportunity to violate all his engagements'.[401] Thus John was deemed a coward as he reneged on his promises when he was in a stronger position. According to eighteenth-century notions of virtue, cowardice was a very negative facet of character and it was presented as a quality which John exhibited frequently throughout his reign.[402] Millot stated that 'the debauchery, the meanness, the violence, and the tyranny of John, awaked the inquietude of the nobles' that eventually resulted in the signing of

---

[399] Raynal, *The History*, p. 25.
[400] Raynal, *The History*, p. 25.
[401] Millot, I, p. 148.
[402] Morse, pp. 3, 240.

Magna Carta.[403] Thus John's many vices served as a contrast to the barons' heroism. By listing the king's vices in succession, Millot argued that the barons had no choice and opposed their king in the best interest of their country. In his description of the barons' advancement on London, Millot reminded his readers that John was 'abandoned by his subjects' to emphasize that the monarch had lost the respect of his people for these many vices.[404] Moreover, John 'provided his person was in safety, could bear with patience the most humiliating indignities'.[405] This willingness to undergo degradation implied John's cowardice and the absence of a heroic nature. In this depiction of weak character, Millot suggested to his readers that John was not a king to be admired.

British historical accounts were more critical of John than their French counterparts. Hume's account of John excluded any virtues altogether. He presented John's character as composed solely of vices that were 'equally mean and odious' and argued that John was a king 'ruinous to himself, and destructive to his people'.[406] Hume implied that a king who harmed himself, harmed his people; conversely, a king who had strength in character gave strength to his people. The historian provided a list of specific vices which included 'cowardice, in-activity, folly, levity, licentiousness, ingratitude, treachery, tyranny, and cruelty' in order to leave no doubt in the readers' minds that John was an unsuccessful king. Hume criticized John's personality, his actions, and his type of kingship. He noted that 'all these qualities appear too evidently in the several incidents of his life to give us room to suspect'.[407] In this description, Hume argued that John held immoral qualities in all aspects of his character, and as a result his people, and history, considered him to be unvirtuous and this perception would endure.

Hume criticized John's cowardice as one of the more deplorable of his characteristics. The British historian gave his readers an anecdote about John that Rapin, Raynal, and Millot did not include in their accounts:

---

[403] Millot, I, p. 144.
[404] Millot, I, p. 145.
[405] Millot, I, p. 148.
[406] Hume, *The History*, II, p. 100.
[407] Hume, *The History*, II, p. 100.

The prejudices against this king were so violent, that he was believed to have
sent an embassy to the Mirramoulin or Emperor of Morocco, and to have offered
to change his religion and become Mahometan, in order to purchase the
protection of that monarch. But tho' that story is told us, on plausible authority,
by Matthew Paris, it is in itself utterly improbable; except, that there is nothing
so incredible as may not become likely from the folly and wickedness of John.[408]

Hume used the same source, Matthew Paris, as had Rapin, but not to engage in debates
about John's reign. Instead, Hume seems to have included this fanciful anecdote in order
to completely undermine John's character. Hume absolved himself from his
responsibilities as an impartial historian by stating that the anecdote is 'utterly
improbable'. The statement nonetheless suggests that he was not simply recounting the
facts. John's fickle behaviour was depicted by the historian as an example of his
dishonour as it suggested that the king was willing to change his faith quickly in order to
survive. To Hume, this hasty conversion was not brave, clever, or stoic, but desperate
and spineless. John's cowardice was a prominent vice in Hume's characterization of the
king and its presence is found in Millot's account written a decade later.

Character sketches of Charles I portrayed the king in less negative terms
compared with John. Many historians depicted him as a king with various positive
qualities, who was a victim of unfortunate circumstances and whose vices were
understandable. As Okie notes, the Civil War and regicide were still contentious in the
eighteenth century; historians tried to make sense of these events for their readers, while
using them as a cautionary tale.[409] Charles was given several positive attributes by
Rapin, who felt that Charles had the potential to be a great king had the Civil War and
regicide not taken place. According to Rapin, the enemies of Charles I 'represent him as
a cruel and bloody Prince'. But, in his view, this 'charge is wholly founded on the
supposition of his having been author of a war wherein so much blood was spilt'.[410]
Thus Rapin explained to his readers that Charles had been viewed as a 'cruel' character
in past historical accounts as the recent events of the Civil War and Interregnum made

---

[408] Hume, *The History*, II, p. 100.
[409] Okie, p. 2.
[410] Rapin, *The History*, XII, p. 582.

the populace desire accountability for the events. Yet Rapin admitted that criticism of Charles had some merit as 'sincerity was not his favourite virtue' and 'this may be said to be one of his principal causes of his ruin, for giving thereby occasion of distrust'.[411] To the historian, Charles had some culpability for his unsuccessful reign, and Rapin thus highlighted the importance of trust between a monarch and his people to his readers. Yet later on, he added that this insecurity 'was only in order to be the better able to execute what he had undertaken'. Thus, while Charles' insecurity led to his downfall, the king had little choice given the circumstances. For Rapin, Charles had 'a great many virtues and noble qualities', and 'had it not been for this unfortunate project, he might be said to be one of the most accomplished Princes that had ever sat on the English throne'.[412] Rapin's final musings demonstrates Lynch's argument that eighteenth-century authors and readers sought ways to connect to literary figures.[413] Rapin revealed Charles' vulnerability because even though the king had many 'virtues and noble qualities', he was not able to withstand the circumstances of his reign. With this description of a king who was not infallible, Rapin created a historical figure with whom readers could connect.

Raynal's depiction of Charles' character was similar to Rapin's. Both showed that Charles had the potential qualities to be a good king, but lacked the confidence to deploy his strengths. Aware of the controversy of the regicide, Raynal summarised Charles' character in a positive manner and stated that he was 'the best master, the best friend, the best father, the best husband, the best Christian, perhaps the honestest man of his age, to be a great King he only wanted to know his own talents'. He then commended Charles' 'abilities', highlighting his 'bravery', 'generosity' and 'understanding'.[414] However, according to Raynal, Charles failed because 'unhappily he distrusted too much his own strength, and [gave] himself up without reserve to the passions of his Ministers and the caprices of his favourites'.[415] This description implied

---

[411] Rapin, *The History*, XII, p. 582.
[412] Rapin, *The History*, XII, pp. 585-586.
[413] Lynch, pp. 5-8.
[414] Raynal, *The History*, p. 198.
[415] Raynal, *The History*, p. 198.

that Charles was unable to attain self-mastery, witnessed in the king's surrender 'without reserve'. To historians, self-control was an imperative virtue for kings.

Millot suggested that Charles' attributes changed over the course of his reign. The positive attributes of the king at the start of his reign gradually gave way to an increasing number of vices. At the beginning of his account of Charles I's reign, Millot used eighteenth-century notions of good character to describe what could have been. The king had begun his reign as 'a prince of the age of twenty-five, brave, modest, sober and virtuous' who was likely 'to make England respectable amongst the neighbouring nations'.[416] The initial, positive portrayal of Charles served as a contrast to the depiction of the later events of his reign, and therefore added rhetorical weight to the transformation of the king's character. Millot displayed a certain sympathy for the king, and he hinted that he considered the king's downfall to result from corrupt factions and Protestant religious zeal rather than his vices or injustice. He did not use any strong critical adjectives before going on to describe Charles' actions, as he had with John I.[417] Millot certainly did not support the king's execution, and he believed that the people had taken their notions of liberty too far. By presenting Charles' character in optimistic terms at the start of the account, Millot accentuated his argument that the regicide was a dark period in England's history.

Overall Hume portrayed Charles in positive terms, and he included references to frailty and weakness in his depiction of the king. These aspects of Charles' character humanized the king for readers. This approach exemplifies the use of past figures by historians to convey their historical insights into human nature and to satisfy the public's demand for illustrative, and representational, accounts of historical customs, manners, and actors.[418] In Hume's *History*, when Charles was accused of having 'traitorously and maliciously levied war against the present parliament' and constructing 'a wicked design to erect an unlimited and tyrannical government', he was 'therefore impeached as a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and a public and implacable enemy to the commonwealth'.

---

[416] Millot, II, p. 114.
[417] Millot, I, p. 144.
[418] Hargraves, p. 25; Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, pp. 14-18, 29-30.

Hume portrayed Charles' reaction as courageous, writing: 'The King, tho' long detained a prisoner and now produced as a criminal, sustained, by his magnanimous courage, the majesty of a monarch. With great temper and dignity, he declined the authority of the court and refused to submit himself to their jurisdiction'.[419] Hume thereby asserted Charles' positive qualities before the character sketch section of his account. Moreover, Hume noted that when the rest of the world found out about the government's intention to try the King, they unanimously 'rejected this example, as the utmost effort of undisguised usurpation, and the most heinous insult on law and justice'.[420] In the character sketch itself, Hume declared that 'the character of this Prince, as that of most men, if not all men, was mixed; but his virtues predominated extremely above his vices, or, more properly speaking, his imperfections'.[421] Hume's depiction of Charles was positive overall, but elements of frailty and weakness featured in the character sketch. His description of Charles' character as 'mixed' corresponds with Noelle Gallagher's argument that eighteenth-century historians abandoned 'neoclassical history's archetypal characterizations'.[422] For Hume, Rapin, and Millot, historical figures were not simply only of vice or only of virtue. To Hume, Charles ultimately 'deserves the epithet of a good, rather than of great man; and was more fitted to rule in a regular established government, than either to give way to the encroachments of a popular assembly, or finally to subdue their pretensions'.[423] Even though one hundred years had passed since the regicide, shock reverberates in Hume's account, demonstrating how historians were still grappling with this event and what it meant in the second half of the eighteenth century.

The nature of virtue and vice in monarchical portrayals was also explored in British accounts of French history. Monarchical power in France was considered to be absolute during the reigns of the seventeenth-century kings Louis XIII and Louis XIV. Historical accounts of these kings form a valuable comparison to those of Charles I. British views of seventeenth-century kings illuminates the country's sentiments towards

---

[419] Hume, *The History*, VII, pp. 141-142.
[420] Hume, *The History*, VII, p. 145.
[421] Hume, *The History*, VII, p. 151.
[422] Gallagher, p. 8.
[423] Hume, *The History*, VII, p. 151.

kings who ruled absolutely. Notions of virtue and vice feature in historical writing about these kings by British historians. These historians held a less forgiving attitude to absolute kingship, compared to their French counterparts, most likely due in part to the events of the mid-seventeenth century.

Some of the features of character sketches by British historians mirrored those which we have examined in histories of England written by French historians. For instance, the final assessment of Louis XIII's character by David Jones outlined how a king can fail due to the influence of others. Jones wrote:

> Lewis having by his Arms enlarged the Power, Renown and Majesty of his Kingdom, had certainly been numbered among the Princes of greatest Fame, if the Glory of Richelieu had not interposed, to whom the World ascribed the Counsel and Success, but he lived and died without being capable of defending himself against the Arts of Favourites; he was indeed adorned with some good Virtues.[424]

Jones hinted to readers that Louis XIII lacked personal conviction and as a consequence he did not govern on his own accord. While Louis had good qualities, they were not enough to defend against the influence of courtly corruption. For Jones, Richelieu controlled the king, and thus France, and his 'glory' prevented Louis XIII from being an ideal monarch. Jones alluded to the great potential of Louis' reign to emphasize the negative effect on the country of Richelieu's influence. British historian Richard Johnson, writing in 1786, was not quite as critical at the end of his chapter on Louis XIII and explored the contrasting characteristics of the king:

> In receiving the extreme unction, he called God to witness, that, in the course of his ministry, he had never any other view than the good of religion and the state; but the voice of the public did not give him so flattering a testimony. However, his ambition, his despotism, his cruel revenge, and his little jealousies, could not efface the glory of his great enterprises. He is reproached with having sacrificed the laws of humanity to his passions; but it should be remembered, that he

---

[424] Jones, II, p. 878.

conquered Rochelle, restrained the seditious, and made France respectable to its enemies.[425]

Johnson thus argued that a king could be a good monarch if his virtues outweighed his vices. Although Louis XIII was guilty of 'despotism' and of being 'cruel', it did not stop him from attaining 'glory' and 'great[ness]' for his people. Like Hume's account of William I, Johnson used this depiction to demonstrate that in making France 'respectable', Louis XIII's vices could be forgiven. Johnson excused Louis' behaviour by arguing that France thrived as a result of his absolutist tendencies. Jones' earlier account contains a similar criticism. He argued that Louis' 'good virtues' had the potential to outweigh the king's tendency for weakness towards his favourites.[426] Jones' and Johnson's opinions of Louis XIII demonstrate how historians balanced virtues and vices against one another, and how the overall equilibrium was also affected by the success of a nation during a monarch's rule. This balance of positive and negative qualities of character was not unique to the character sketch, but most commonly found within it as a technique used by historians to explain and summarise the monarch's actions during their rule.

Appraisals of Louis XIV's character in British historical texts were mixed, as were those of his father. Jones wrote his *History* while Louis XIV was still in power, at a time when England was enmeshed in the constant turmoil of the Anglo-French wars. As Jones' history ended in 1702, the year his *History* was published, and the French king did not die until 1715, it did not include a summary of Louis XIV's reign. Instead, Jones described how Louis XIV, at the age of 22, took the helm of Mazarin's government and kingship, worked long hours with his ministers, kept a watchful eye on all 'transactions that passed in the Government', and gave audience once or twice a week to everybody.[427] Jones, although not writing a formal character description, portrayed Louis XIV as a monarch with the possibility for virtue in the way that he was serving his people and striving towards the greater good of his nation. Jones did not give

---

[425] Johnson, p. 153.
[426] Jones, II, p. 878.
[427] Jones, II, p. 958.

glowing praise to Louis XIV, as other British historians would later on in the eighteenth century.

According to Rolt, whose *History* was written fifty years after Jones' account, Louis XIV's behaviour at his death was 'suitable to the glory of his life', in that he 'beheld death with a surprising greatness of soul'.[428] This depiction of the French king's composure allowed Rolt to demonstrate Louis' bravery. At the same time, the historian argued that Louis XIV was a worthy figure as the 'greatness of [his] soul' had religious connotations that suggested the king was going to be welcomed into heaven. Rolt's esteem for Louis can be found in his response to a rhetorical question: 'how was his death regarded by his subjects?'. Rolt noted that:

> although both the life and death of Lewis XIV were glorious, he was not regretted so much as he deserved. However, time which matures the opinions of men, has stamped its seal upon his reputation; and, notwithstanding all that has been written against him, his name will never be pronounced without respect, nor without receiving the idea of an age for ever memorable.[429]

Rolt admitted how the passage of time had an effect on the legacy of a king, and he alluded to the impartial opinion that only came with historical distance. Louis XIV was one of the more recent monarchs in Rolt's account, as his reign had only ended thirty years before. Rolt, however, argued that this gap was sufficient to allow impartial reflection on France's recent past.

The effect of distance from historical events is best shown in Johnson's account of Louis XIV. Written at the end of the eighteenth century, it argues most strongly for Louis' many positive qualities of character. When Johnson began his chapter on Louis XIV, he claimed that 'we are now entering on the most important reign in the history of France, and shall therefore be particular in our account of it'.[430] His esteem for Louis XIV is clear from the beginning. Johnson saw Louis' treatment of the Huguenots as a small fault in his overall reign. By contrast, the development of the arts and sciences

---

[428] Rolt, p. 297.
[429] Rolt, p. 298.
[430] Johnson, p. 155.

was an area of achievement. As Johnson wrote, his 'unbound ambition […] prompted him to that liberal encouragement of science, which contributed to bring forward and put into action those great men, to whom the success of his reign was really due'.[431] Both Johnson and Rolt emphasized Louis' generosity in patronising others, which they depicted as a positive quality and worthy of the estimation of the king's character, rather than his unvirtuous behaviour towards the Huguenots. Ultimately, the historical depiction of kings used the contemporary ideas of virtue to provide motives for historical events. French and British historians writing within the neoclassical genre of history used historical figures as behavioural models. These historians fostered the tradition of the historical character sketch and contributed towards the development of the character in the literary world. Eighteenth-century historical accounts therefore explored, and recommended, contemporary views of positive qualities of character that formed the ideal monarch, but also connected to an increasingly diverse readership.

Conclusion

French accounts of England's past used neoclassical ideals to portray the ideal king and were influenced by eighteenth-century British and French politics. Portraits of the three English monarchs, William I, John I, and Charles I, provide insight into the way in which historians discussed the role of the ideal monarch in respect to the rights and privileges of his subjects. While historians used every king as a moral lesson for the eighteenth-century reader, these three monarchs reigned during significant events in England's political history. The accounts of their reigns effectively exemplify how historians used monarchs to provide instruction on how to succeed as an ideal king and to demonstrate the consequences of failed kingship.

French historians followed the neoclassical historical ideal that encouraged readers to learn from great men. However, they created historical figures who were

---

[431] Johnson, pp. 183-184.

varied in their vices and virtues, as argued by Lynch, Hargraves, and Phillips, in order to appeal to an audience that sought to connect to the literary figures in their reading material.[432] Historians still sought to make figures who provided moral contemplation, but they also sought to connect to and entertain readers, creating 'figures for readerly sympathy or ridicule' as Gallagher has argued.[433] In their use of contemporary cultural notions of vice and virtue, historians were able to create historical accounts that resonated with a British audience. Moreover, historical works provided lessons that made recommendations to kings, while arguing that the monarch, as the head of his people, should exhibit behaviour that was virtuous and exemplary. The role of monarchs in these historical accounts was thus twofold: kings provided moral exemplars for personal conduct, while they also gave historians the opportunity to commentate on contemporary politics. Hicks argues that David Hume was a 'neoclassical historian [who] was a teacher of moral and political lessons'.[434] I argue that the way in which French historians used monarchs, both as moral exemplars and for political commentary, suggests that they also formed, and continued, an important part of the neoclassical historical genre. William I and his conquest were used by historians to discuss the ideal king's role in the development and impediment of the laws and liberties of a nation. Historians used John as an example of a weak king. A charter was needed to stop his tyrannical behaviour, and this new legislation resulted in the start of the British constitutional monarchy. Charles I's portrayal allowed historians to comment on the ideal rights and privileges of the king and parliament, while also reminding the reader of the moral necessity of keeping vices, and passions, in check.

This chapter has focused on these three kings because their reigns had links to eighteenth-century politics, and historians ensured that the reader understood and was invested in their work by engaging with these contemporary political issues. The Revolution of 1688, as well as the 1689 Bill of Rights and Hanoverian succession, meant that people were preoccupied with the laws and liberties of the people, particularly in accounts written earlier in the century. The insertion of the Norman Yoke

---

[432] Lynch, p. 6; Hargraves, p. 25; Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, pp. 14-18, 29-30.
[433] Gallagher, p. 9.
[434] Hicks, p. 179.

theory meant that historians were able to comment subtly on the events of the Glorious Revolution. The symbolism of Magna Carta saw similarities to the Norman Yoke theory and enabled historians to reflect on the ideal relationship between monarch and constitution. Magna Carta allowed French historians to follow the neoclassical historical format of creating exemplars of vice and virtue by drawing attention to the flawed characteristics of John I. Historians used John to articulate eighteenth-century notions of undesirable kingship. They commented on contemporary notions of the ideal relationship between the monarch and his nation by demonstrating that a king could be constrained by a constitution as well as his people. The symbolism of Magna Carta, and its role in the development of the constitution, remained a central part of French historical accounts of Britain. The inclusion of contemporary British politics by French historians indicates that these monarchs played an imperative part in the wider grand narrative of Britain's history, while simultaneously demonstrating the exchange of political and historiographical views across the continent.

These accounts demonstrate the importance of the events of the 1640s and 1650s in eighteenth-century historical writing. Historians approached their accounts with the aim of understanding the motives behind such exceptional events.[435] Historical arguments against the evils of war continued into the eighteenth century as historians called on the positive and negative qualities that both king and parliament had displayed in order to shed light on how to avoid such an event again. The publication of numerous Stuart historical works, and the prevalence of translated French historical accounts of Stuart histories in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, suggest that both historians and readers agreed that the event was astonishing and wished to make sense of it. The historical depictions of the virtues and vices of Charles I, which assessed his character and explored the motives for his actions, demonstrate the lingering impact of the Civil War and regicide well into the eighteenth century.

The French works of Rapin, Millot, Raynal, Larrey, Orléans, and Gaillard contributed to the neoclassical historical genre because they discussed historical figures

---

[435] Macgillivray, p. 232.

with the purpose of presenting moral instruction. It was believed that one of the benefits of reading history was to learn from great men and emulate past heroes as these texts provided instructive examples of virtuous conduct.[436] Historians provided moral instructions in their descriptions of the reigns of William, John, and Charles in order to connect a wider eighteenth-century audience. With their particular interpretations of historical events, which allowed them to reflect upon the present, historians were able to explore the ideal qualities of a king in eighteenth-century France and Britain. The virtuous king fought for the rights and liberties of his people, and simultaneously had to be honourable and strong in character. The ideal king had confidence in his convictions and could withstand malevolent advice from a corrupted court. These ideas were employed by historians to characterize a monarch's reign and to present the reign as a positive or negative part of England's history. The accounts of these French historians demonstrate the tendency for eighteenth-century historians to impart contemporary lessons on morality and virtue that could be understood by the everyday reader, and not just the political statesman.

Current scholarship focuses on the writing of history within Britain itself. By analysing French historical writing on British ideal kingship, we can further understand how historiographical cultures were an evolving and shared practice between the two nations of France and Britain. French-authored works were translated and circulated in Britain because they followed the format of formal neoclassical histories and used monarchs as moral exemplars in order to fulfil the public's desire for insightful historical accounts.[437] The absence of a suitable neoclassical history of England in the early eighteenth century, as Okie argues, allowed Rapin to find success within Britain, and I argue that Hume, Millot, and Raynal offered similar interpretations of the past.[438] The use of kings as moral exemplars, who represented British notions of ideal kingship and virtue, and the use of contemporary eighteenth-century British politics in French historical works, is evidence of a wider cross-cultural historiographical relationship between Britain and France. The French historical accounts provide evidence that

---

[436] Okie, pp. 5-6.
[437] Hargraves, p. 25; Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, pp. 14-18, 29-30.
[438] Okie, pp. 1, 47.

political ideals, in addition to notions of virtue and vice, were being exchanged across the channel.

Chapter 2: War and Ideal Kingship in Eighteenth-Century Historical Writing

In this chapter I argue that historians used periods of warfare to construct arguments about ideal qualities of kings and desirable modes of monarchical and masculine behaviour. French and British historians communicated exemplary virtuous behaviour in times of conflict. I examine how these arguments featured in their discussions of the Norman Conquest of 1066, the Third Crusade (1189-1192), and the battles of Crécy (1346), Poitiers (1356), and Agincourt (1415). My analysis explores how these accounts were shaped by eighteenth-century notions of ideal masculinity that were combined with traditional notions of chivalry. This chapter will argue that the use of the neoclassical method by French historians led to a presentation of ideal kingship and masculine behaviour that was aligned with the virtuous qualities that were present in the epic genre. Historians combined the medieval epic motifs of chivalry, such as bravery prowess in war, with contemporary notions of eighteenth-century masculinity, such as reason and equanimity.

My research evaluates how historical writing about these conflicts was affected by the changing nature of war in the eighteenth century. France and Britain were at war throughout the period, and this chapter examines the impact of this ongoing conflict on analyses of monarchs' participation in earlier battles. Periods of conflict were used by historians to impart lessons on the ideal masculine qualities and military tactics of both kings and men. French historians sought to impart lessons on virtue and morality, writing in the neoclassical style.[439] They were, however, conscious of their intended readership, especially as the audience for neoclassical accounts expanded from the elite statesmen to the urban middling sort in the eighteenth century.[440] As Mark Salber Phillips has argued, during the period, an important aspect of history's concern with the

---

[439] Noelle Gallagher, *Historical Literatures: Writing about the Past in England, 1660-1740* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), p. 2; Laird Okie, *Augustan Historical Writing: Histories of England in the English Enlightenment* (New York; London: University Press of America, 1991), p. 8.
[440] Philip Hicks, *Neoclassical History and English Culture: From Clarendon to Hume* (London: Macmillan, 1996), p. 215.

character, or historical figure, was to offer instruction, as 'an effective form of teaching that uses compelling examples to train readers to aspire to virtue and to shun the temptations of vice'.[441] This method also created a more compelling and relevant figure for the growing eighteenth-century readership of neoclassical histories. Historians thus made sure their comments and lessons of monarchs in battle were not just aimed at traditional statesmen, but ensured that their accounts also had a more general application for their audience during a period where their nations were almost constantly at war.

My research provides insight into the historical portrayal of the ideal qualities of kings who experienced military victory. I argue that the way in which historians presented kings at war contributed to the success of these works of history in eighteenth-century England. In order to understand these depictions, one must first assess the political climate of the period. After the Glorious Revolution, Britain was at war more frequently, for longer periods of time, and on a greater scale than ever before.[442] F. Crouzet has implied that, essentially, the long eighteenth century saw a 'Second Hundred Years War' between the French and the British.[443] Between 1744 and 1815 Britain and France were officially at war for forty-two out of seventy years. This estimation excludes the clashes between Britain and France in India and North America between 1759 and 1765. Moreover, Britain was nervous about the threat of invasion by the French during the years 1744-46, 1756-57, 1759, 1779, 1782, 1796-1805, and 1811.[444] Anthony Page has suggested that the period from 1744 to 1815 should be titled as a 'Seventy Years War' between France and Britain, since 'so continuous was the rivalry during these decades and so extensive and frequent the periods of open warfare'.[445] Page also sees this later period of conflict as its own era of warfare. During these years, Britain struggled to build and maintain the military power needed to defend

---

[441] Mark Salber Phillips, *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain, 1740-1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), p. 65.
[442] John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), pp. 27-28.
[443] F. Crouzet, 'The Second Hundred Years War: Some Reflections', *French History*, 10 (1996), 432-50 (pp. 432-433).
[444] Anthony Page, 'The Seventy Years War, 1744-1815, and Britain's Fiscal-Naval State', *War & Society*, 34:3 (2015), 162-86 (p. 164).
[445] H.M. Scott, *The Birth of a Great Power System, 1740-1815* (Harlow: Pearson, 2006), p. 74.

itself from the possibility of France's domination. The threat of invasion during the eighteenth century caused anxiety among the British public, who also feared financial collapse and revolution in the wake of an invasion.[446]

The prominence of war and the anxieties which it raised meant that qualities of traditional chivalry, such as bravery and prowess in war, were key components of eighteenth-century virtuous masculinity. Robert Jones has noted that during the period, especially with the advent of war with America, Britain was faced with 'emergencies of war' which 'demanded a return to more masculine values'.[447] Criticism of the absence of male virtues also occurred earlier. Following the declaration of war with France in 1756, the anonymous author of *A Modest Address to the Commons of Great Britain* argued that Britain's present rulers were 'filled with follies and vices of every kind' and were 'destitute of all manly virtues'. The behaviour of the ruling class was described as a 'corruption of manners' that endangered the entire nation, as the author believed that the elite were responsible for spreading immorality and effeminacy.[448] The onset of the Seven Years War was accompanied by a cultural crisis, as men grew increasingly concerned with political virtue and Britain's strength as a nation.[449] For the men not involved directly in the wars, the relentless presence of war news reminded them of their lack of involvement. The professionalization of war left men feeling exposed to the charge that they had abandoned the traditional masculine roles that once formed a very normal part of everyday life.[450]

---

[446] Page, p.164.
[447] Robert W. Jones, *Literature, Gender and Politics in Britain during the War for America 1770-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 2-3.
[448] Anonymous, *A Modest Address to the Commons of Great Britain, and in Particular to the Free Citizens of London; Occasioned by the Ill Success of Our Present Naval War with France, and the Want of a Militia Bill* (London: J. Scott, 1756), p. 4.
[449] Kathleen Wilson, *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 187-188; Philip Carter, 'An "Effeminate" or "Efficient" Nation? Masculinity and Eighteenth-Century Social Documentary', *Textual Practice*, 11 (1997), 429-43 (pp. 429-431); Matthew McCormack, 'The New Militia: War, Politics and Gender in 1750s Britain', *Gender & History*, 19:3 (2007), 483-500 (pp. 485-486).
[450] Carolyn Williams, *Pope, Homer and Manliness: Some Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Classical Learning* (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 36-37.

The public good was an important eighteenth-century notion, and the landowner's willingness and ability to bear arms in defence of this good was a longstanding characteristic of virtue within popular discourse.[451] The idea of citizenship encompassed military service, and encouraged all men of a certain fitness to serve within the militia. This notion essentially linked citizenship with masculinity, where 'every Subject, every Man, is a Soldier'.[452] Thus when eighteenth-century historians set out their standards of ideal kingship, they also commentated on the ideal qualities of all male citizens.

Scholars have explored these changes and apprehensions about masculinity in the eighteenth century. Michèle Cohen's study of the fashioning of English eighteenth-century gentlemen highlights the influence of French practices of sociability and conversation, and provides insight into the way in which the English created their own notions of ideal masculinity. Cohen argues that the anxiety over French influence, effeminacy and virtue created a national identity for the masculine Englishman by the end of the eighteenth century.[453] Cohen's argument thus provides a valuable perspective on the emphasis on chivalry, and its medieval ideals of masculine strength and bravery, in accounts of kings and warfare in eighteenth-century historical texts. While Cohen's work focuses on the fear of French influence, Philip Carter explores the impact of an emergent polite society on notions of manliness and the gentleman in the eighteenth-century Britain.[454] Using a variety of texts, Carter examines the social construction of masculine identity and the relationship between cultures of politeness and sensibility. Carter's exploration of these new concepts and their influence on masculine identities sheds light on the way eighteenth-century historians depicted what they deemed as honourable conduct in kings during periods of war. For historians, exemplary kings were the ones who demonstrated gallantry and politeness as well as bravery to their men as well as their enemies.

---

[451] J.G.A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), pp. 423-461.
[452] William Williams, *A Sermon, Preached in the Parish Church of Snaith* (York, 1757), cited in McCormack, p. 497.
[453] Michèle Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in The Eighteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 2014).
[454] Philip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society: 1660-1800* (Harlow: Longman, 2000).

In eighteenth-century historical texts, one of the ways that these anxieties about masculinity were addressed was through motifs from the genre of the epic. Epic verse and neoclassical history shared similar formal and thematic features. Both were well-respected forms of literature in the eighteenth century.[455] Contemporaries noted similarities between the two genres, and neoclassical *artes historicae* occasionally even described history as epic or labelled the epic as a form of history.[456] Eighteenth-century neoclassicists believed that the epic genre was the most reputable form of poetry writing.[457] John Barrell noted the influence of the epic as one of many genres that influenced history writing during this period. He argues that the increasingly diverse society of the eighteenth century 'necessitated the introduction of literary genres new to England', which included georgic poetry, the periodical essay and the picaresque or comic epic novel.[458] The aim of many of these works was to give people a 'wider experience of contemporary English society', and this new method allowed readers to understand the lives and events of their fellow countrymen.[459] Phillips argues that the variety of historical genres in the eighteenth century 'can tell us about how an ancient literary "kind" subtly and often silently transformed itself to remain relevant to the needs and interests of ever-new audiences'.[460] One of these transformations was the influence of the epic literary style on neoclassical historians who followed the eighteenth-century tradition of emulating the ancients. Levine noted that in the ancient versus modern debate, moderns argued that the manners and customs of the eighteenth century were different, and superior, to those of ancient Greek times, as represented in classical works by figures such as Homer.[461] Neoclassical historians, however, believed

---

[455] Noelle Gallagher, 'Historiography, the Novel, and Henry Fielding's Joseph Andrews', *Studies in English Literature*, 52:3 (2012), 631-650 (p. 635).
[456] Gallagher, 'Historiography, the Novel', p. 635.
[457] Kirsti Simonsuuri, *Homer's Original Genius: Eighteenth-Century Notions of the Early Greek Epic 1688-1798* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p. 14.
[458] John Barrell, *English Literature in History 1730-80: An Equal, Wide Survey* (London: Hutchinson, 1983), p. 19.
[459] Barrell, p. 19.
[460] Phillips, p. 12.
[461] Joseph M. Levine, *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1991), p. 131.

that Homer and especially Virgil were the greatest epic poets.[462] The works of Rapin and Millot were inspired by the classical and medieval epic genre. Their accounts of war and conflict featured kings who represented the epic image of the hero: the brave leader who precedes and guides his men into battle. This mimicry of the epic genre also presented an ideal eighteenth-century king and man through the use of eighteenth-century notions of reason and equanimity.

The formulation of characters in other genres, such as the epic, inspired historians to use their historical figures as behavioural models. The neoclassical tradition produced the notion that an epic poem reflected the contemporary notions of morality for the period in which it was written.[463] Figures or characters were used as examples of vice and virtue to the reader in both historical and epic accounts.[464] Richard Blackmore (1654-1729), in *Prince Arthur, A Heroic Poem in Ten Books*, argued that the purpose of the epic was to portray 'the action of some great person, about some noble and weighty affair'.[465] Like neoclassical history, the epic aimed to impart ideas of virtue. Gallagher argues that the epic was thought to be based on a form of historical truth and it would 'depict generic character "types" that, like those in neoclassical formal history, highlighted one or two personality traits'.[466] Levine argues that, in the battle between ancient and modern methods and style in both literature and history, the heroic devices for characters were adopted from the epic.[467] Jennifer Wollock notes that medieval epic, especially *chansons de geste*, were 'masculine war poems concerned with displaying their heroes' physical prowess and testing their feudal virtues or vices under difficult conditions'.[468] In the accounts of kings offered by eighteenth-century French and British historians, personality traits typically conveyed ideal notions of heroic masculine virtue. In the medieval, and classical epic, a pivotal hero was one who did great deeds in

---

[462] Simonsuuri, p. 14.
[463] Simonsuuri, p. 82.
[464] Gallagher, 'Historiography, the Novel', p. 635.
[465] Richard Blackmore, *Prince Arthur, A Heroic Poem in Ten Books* (London: Awnshaw and John Churchill, 1695), cited in Gallagher, 'Historiography, the Novel', p. 635.
[466] Gallagher, 'Historiography, the Novel', p. 636.
[467] Levine, p. 119.
[468] Jennifer G. Wollock, *Rethinking Chivalry and Courtly Love* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2011), p. 122.

chivalric and military settings while invoking notions of masculinity, such as King Arthur, Robin Hood or Hercules.[469] Eighteenth-century historians used this method in their depictions of monarchs as the heroic central figures of their works. By emulating the epic, eighteenth-century historians created characters out of monarchs who were exemplary as well as relevant to their audience.

Chivalry, a component of the medieval epic and literature, was used by eighteenth-century historians to reflect on ideal kingship and masculine behaviour.[470] In France, historians like Henri de Boulainvilliers (1658-1722) brought the noble view of chivalry into prominence, with a particular focus on its social function.[471] Historical works also promoted chivalry in association with the nobility as it had during the medieval period.[472] Eighteenth-century historians continued to link chivalrous deeds to the nobility in order to emphasize the use of monarchs as exemplary figures to their readers. In Britain, from the twelfth to the seventeenth century, chivalry was defined as 'bravery or prowess in war; warlike distinction or glory'; by the beginning of the nineteenth century it had been transformed into a 'more extended and complimentary sense: [a] gallant gentlemen'.[473] Riu Susato's study of David Hume's interpretation of chivalry identifies a similar definition. Susato argues that Hume understood chivalry as encompassing gallantry and honour. For Hume, to be chivalrous implied gallantry. Susato notes that this definition had several elements, which included 'courageous and humane behaviour in the battlefield or single combat' as well as 'complaisance and politeness'.[474] Both of these ideas recur in descriptions of positive kingly behaviour in

---

[469] D.R. Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 288, 306.
[470] Wollock, pp. 120-122; Maurice Hugh Keen, *Chivalry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), pp. 104-105.
[471] Lionel Gossman, *Medievalism and the Ideologies of the Enlightenment: The World and Work of LaCurne de Sainte-Palaye* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1968), p. 277.
[472] Gossman, pp. 276-295; David Green, *Edward the Black Prince: Power in Medieval Europe* (Harlow; New York: Pearson Longman, 2007), p. 74.
[473] OED Online, 'chivalry, n.', (Oxford University Press, 2017) < http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/31979?redirectedFrom=chivalry#eid> [Accessed 7 March 2017].
[474] Ryu Susato, 'The Idea of Chivalry in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Case of David Hume', *Hume Studies*, 33:1 (2007) 155-178 (p. 157). For more on Hume and chivalry, see Ernest Campbell Mossner, 'David Hume's "An Historical Essay on Chivalry and Modern Honour"', *Modern Philology*, 45:1 (1947), 54-60.

battle by other eighteenth-century French and British historians, and their accounts are indicative of their influence in the changing meaning of chivalry during this period. By the end of the eighteenth century, being chivalrous involved 'possessing all the virtues attributed to the Age of Chivalry; characterized by pure and noble gallantry, honour, courtesy, and disinterested devotion to the cause of the weak or oppressed'.[475] Histories written by both French and British authors present a notion of chivalry that fit these two definitions, and these accounts were instrumental for its changing meaning in the eighteenth century.

Eighteenth-century historical accounts were also influenced by Enlightenment thought, which questioned traditional authority and adopted the view that humanity could be improved through rational change. Eighteenth-century historical accounts were affected by the intellectual movement that began with the scientific revolution of the 1620s and which paved the way for the political revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As a result of these movements, eighteenth-century historians, especially Scottish historians like Hume, viewed their present as an age more enlightened than the past and this affected the way in which they interpreted history.[476] O'Brien argues that they viewed history as 'the transition from medieval, feudal to modern, commercial social systems'.[477] O'Brien also argues for the formation of 'stadial history' during this period as the notion implied a 'natural trajectory' that was the result of 'successive changes'.[478] Sophie Bourgault and Robert Sparling also note that 'rational conjecture was at the heart of stadial theory'.[479] French historians followed this ideal and implied that history, by its nature, was a progression. They used historical figures to address positive and negative elements of the past, indicating who should be emulated and which approaches were to be avoided. The Enlightenment affected the way in which

---

[475] OED Online, 'chivalrous, adj.', (Oxford University Press, 2017) < http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/31976 > [Accessed 7 March 2017].
[476] Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 10-11.
[477] O'Brien, p. 11.
[478] O'Brien, pp. 132-133.
[479] Sophie Bourgault and Robert Sparling, 'Introduction', in *A Companion to Enlightenment Historiography*, ed. by Sophie Bourgault and Robert Sparling (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2013), pp. 1-24 (p. 9).

masculinity was viewed. Eventually the idea that the control of passions and use of reason led to virtue was widely embedded.[480] While there was a movement away from religious zealotry, the drive towards a more enlightened age did not necessarily mean a simple process of secularization.[481] During the early Enlightenment, historical accounts moved towards the idea of rationalism as the enlightened values of personal freedom, religious toleration, and economic individualism were promoted.[482] The objection of Enlightenment thinkers to bigotry and zealotry was reflected in historical writing.

The periods of warfare examined in this chapter all involved both the English and the French. The chapter is divided into three sections in order to investigate three different types of warfare and to see how historians depicted ideal kingship in different contexts. The chapter evaluates the accounts written by Rapin, Millot and Raynal about the Norman Conquest, the Crusades, and the battles of Crécy, Poitiers and Agincourt. Where appropriate, these accounts will be compared with the writings of Jones, Rolt, Johnson and Hume in order to reveal similarities and differences in how French and British writers depicted ideal kingship. These three periods of conflict represent different periods of kingship, focusing on three key events in English history.

The first section examines the portrayal of ideal kingly behaviour during the conquest of England in 1066. The Norman Conquest was a swift and short event that brought about a new line of hereditary kings and type of rule. William won the throne of England in a day, and historians attributed this success in part to his military expertise and behaviour. They used the rash decisions of King Harold (1022-1066) and the confusion within London after the Battle of Hastings to argue that a monarch needed to conduct himself with equanimity in order to achieve military success.

---

[480] Susan Khin Zaw, '"Appealing to the Head and Heart": Wollstonecraft on Burke on Taste, Morals and Human Nature', in *Femininity and Masculinity in Eighteenth-Century Art and Culture*, ed. by Gill Perry and Michael Rossington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), pp. 123-141 (p. 135).
[481] O'Brien, p. 11.
[482] Okie, pp. 2-3; See also Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich, eds, *The Enlightenment in National Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 1-18.

The second section analyses the Third Crusade (1189-1192), also known as the Kings' Crusade. The French and English kings, Philip II (1180-1223) and Richard I (1157-1199), whose rumoured close relationship was largely ignored by French historians, provided an opportunity for historians to comment on the ideal secular qualities of kingship. These qualities included eighteenth-century notions of masculinity. The Third Crusade was not considered to be a defining event in English history but it became a controversial topic as new opinions of crusading emerged in the eighteenth century. Studying this crusade permits the examination of how ideal kingship was portrayed in matters of religion, from an increasingly secular eighteenth-century historical viewpoint. Historians made it clear to their readers that kings went on crusade for motives of glory, rather than religious fanaticism, and thereby circumvented a negative view of their participation in the Crusades.

The third section analyses kingship in the battles of the Hundred Years War (1337-1453), specifically the English victories of Crécy and Poitiers and Agincourt. The conflict was a prolonged event in England's past, and it paralleled the conflict between Britain and France in the eighteenth century. Writing about this period provided historians with an opportunity to depict kings in ways that drew inspiration from the epic, and to describe ideal qualities of strength and bravery while arguing for the need for contemporary masculine ideals such as reason and equanimity. Moreover, while the poor decisions of the French were deemed to have contributed to their loss at these three battles, French historians emphasized the courageous and rational actions of English monarchs to argue that these qualities contributed to their victories.

Section 1: The Norman Conquest

Historians used the Norman Conquest to comment on ideal kingship and masculine behaviour in the eighteenth century. As we have previously seen, historians presented the conquest in different terms to the events of 1688. French historians endeavoured to

demonstrate that the military aspects of each conflict were very distinctive from one another. Historians used the Norman Conquest to impart standards of ideal masculinity to readers. They used a combination of tradition notions of chivalry and contemporary concepts of self-control to present ideal masculine behaviour. Using both the virtues and vices of William, historical accounts imparted a notion of ideal kingship with these dual notions of masculinity. They applauded his military prowess, and moreover warned readers about the need for equanimity and reason in battle. The conquest itself and the Battle of Hastings provided an opportunity for historians to comment on the consequences of the conflict, and what the defeat of Harold meant for the development of England as a nation.

Historians presented the conquest as a pivotal moment in the history of Britain. For British historian Richard Johnson, the Battle of Hastings and the Norman Conquest 'laid the foundations of unspeakable mischiefs to France, the two kingdoms being for many years after perpetually at war'.[483] This quotation gives an indication of the historical legacy of the conquest for eighteenth-century readers and historians alike. The Norman Conquest of England was decided in a day, at the Battle of Hastings on 14 October 1066. The decisive battle with the Duke William II of Normandy and the Anglo-Saxon king Harold Godwinson began a new era in England's history. When King Edward (1003-1066) died childless at the beginning of 1066, it resulted in a succession dispute between several claimants to his throne. Even though Harold was crowned king shortly after Edward's death, he still had to contend with the invasions by William, his own brother Tostig (1026-1066) and the Norwegian king Harald Hardrada (1015-1066). The death of Harold, near the end of the battle, led to the retreat and ultimate defeat of the majority of his army. Although there continued to be resistance to William's rule, the Battle of Hastings essentially marked the conclusion of William's conquest of England.

---

[483] Richard Johnson, *The History of France, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (London: E. Newbery, 1786), p. 32.

As seen in the previous chapter, French historians highlighted the dissimilarities between the conquests of William I and William III, including the military aspects of their invasions. French historians circumvented any linkage between William I and William III to avoid criticizing the current monarch, so that their accounts remained attractive to British readers. They presented the military features of each conflict in distinctive ways in their works. For example, William III was supported by many English nobles and politicians, while William I's invasion was essentially a military conquest. However, both William I and III invaded at a time of monarchical turmoil, when the rights to the throne were being questioned and contested. As previously noted in Chapter 2, O'Brien argues that Rapin's account described William I 'as a type for' William III, where the conqueror became a 'military hero who pushes the insular English people into an international arena'.[484] Rapin did not intend to make a comparison with William III when he commended William I for his proficient military skills. Instead, Rapin wanted to emphasize to audiences that William III was not an unwelcome conqueror, by focusing on military dissimilarities between the two conquests. Rapin and other French historians argued that in addition to William's victory at the Battle of Hastings, the confusion and fear in London as William's army arrived contributed significantly to his victory. Millot attributed William I's success to his acumen in the Battle of Hastings, and 'the more dignified ecclesiastics' in London who were actually 'Frenchmen or Norman' who quickly began to 'declare in his favour, and justified an enterprise which was consecrated by papal authority'. Eventually, even 'the nobility, and Edgar himself […] requested him to accept the crown'.[485] Raynal presented the situation in similar terms, writing that 'the lords, magistrates, and prelates […] unanimously conjured William to take reins of the government'.[486] The descriptions of Millot and Raynal portray a king who was accepted into London because of his military prowess at the Battle of Hastings. The authors hinted that the people of London let William in as they were fearful, which was a contrast to how they responded to William III, who was invited to invade England months before the actual act. Rapin

---

[484] O'Brien, p. 17.

[485] Abbé Millot, *Elements of the History of England*, trans. by Mr Kenrick, 2 vols (Dublin: James Williams, 1771), I, pp. 69-70.

[486] Abbé Raynal, *The History of the Parliament of England*, trans. by [Anon] (London: T. Osbourne, 1751), p. 16.

emphasized this point more than Millot and Raynal, as he attributed William I's successful conquering of London to the clergy, who did not want to elect Edgar as King as it 'put their estates and tranquillity to the hazard of war' with William. The clergy hoped that their submission to a 'Religious Prince' whose 'enterprise had receiv'd the Pope's approbation' would save them a considerable war.[487] Others soon followed, as 'they were in no condition to defend a city'.[488] For Rapin, the indecisiveness of the English led to William I's accession, in addition to his actions in battle. This turmoil was very different from the arrival of William of Orange, who was welcomed willingly into London. Rapin thus ensured that his readers did not associate the two foreign kings of the same name too closely.

Like Rapin, Millot attributed the Conqueror's victory to William's past military experience. He described it in more straightforward terms, writing that William I 'had distinguished his earlier years by important victories over formidable enemies', and as a man with great military prowess, he was 'too intelligent not to profit by the Battle of Hastings'.[489] Here, Millot informed his readers that William was a formidable warrior, in addition to being an 'intelligent' conqueror who recognized when to take advantage of a political situation. Thus while the confusion in London contributed to William's accession to the throne, Millot accredited William's victory to his formidable military experience and reputation in stronger terms. As Millot's *History* was written over forty years after Rapin's original text, his greater distance from the events of the Glorious Revolution meant that he was more comfortable complimenting William I's military abilities.

William's actions in the conquest and at the Battle of Hastings allowed historians to impart their views of masculine virtue to their readers. As ideals of masculinity changed in the eighteenth century, and a fear of effeminacy increased, historians portrayed a mixture of masculine qualities in ideal kingship. A king had to be strong,

---

[487] Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, *The History of England*, trans. by Nicolas Tindal, 15 vols (London: James and John Knapton, 1725-1731), II, pp. 229-230.
[488] Rapin, II, p. 231.
[489] Millot, I, p. 69.

heroic and brave (more traditional views) and he was also expected to exert gallantry, patience and equanimity (qualities seen as more enlightened). In this respect, the depiction of kings reflected both the growth of the British 'military-fiscal state' and an effort to establish a culture of politeness.[490] Faced with a cultural crisis of masculinity, historians responded by representing heroic kingship in the past as an ideal to aspire to in the present. Both French and English historians continued to depict monarchs with traditional and contemporary masculine qualities in battle if they sought to portray these figures in positive terms to their readers. In their accounts, historians communicated that courage and bravery were obscured and forfeited when making rash decisions, thereby commending the modern notion of equanimity. Historians highlighted that a calm and level-headed, reasonable king therefore behaved bravely.

Historians used William I's ideal masculine behaviour, both in life and in battle, to explain why he was successful as a conqueror. Stephen Conway has argued that war in the eighteenth century produced two representations of men at war. In one, ideal men were portrayed as 'brave and fearless warriors'. In the second, men were presented as effeminate figures who had surrendered to a luxurious lifestyle and lost the manly valour needed to defend both family and community.[491] Raynal followed the trope of the former ideal in his depiction of the Conqueror. Raynal initially sets the stage with a description of William's tumultuous youth when he had many opportunities to exert his 'courage, strength and his politics' and defeated his competitors with 'his courage and his talents' that 'shone with the greater lustre'.[492] Raynal, however, then described William's adversary in similar terms, writing: 'Harold already wore the crown: this possession gave him the air of a legitimate prince, and threw the odious appearances of usurper on whoever dared to dispute it with him'.[493] Raynal presents William and Harold in an analogous way to argue that they were an equal match in terms of ideal masculinity and therefore both were appropriate as the ruler of England. Raynal used the

---

[490] Brewer, pp. 27-33; Andrew Lincoln, 'The Culture of War and Civil Society in the reigns of William III and Anne', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 44:4 (2011), 455-474 (pp. 454-455).

[491] Stephen Conway, *War, State and Society in Mid-Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 120.

[492] Raynal, p. 14.

[493] Raynal, p. 14.

comparison to emphasize the ideal masculinity of William, who defeated a man who was his equal match. This defeat thus added a certain glory to William's conquest as well as displaying his masculinity to readers.

At the start of the chapter on the Norman period, Rapin expressed the utmost respect and admiration for William's boldness in conquering England, writing: 'When one impartially considers the Duke of Normandy's expedition against England, one is at a loss which to admire most, either the grounds, or the boldness, or the success of his enterprise', especially as the Normans found his endeavours to be an 'undertaking which to them seemed equally unjust and rash'.[494] By using the terms 'grounds', 'boldness' and 'success' in quick succession, Rapin articulates that he is overwhelmed in his admiration for William's conquest. Yet Rapin also communicated to readers that reckless behaviour did not typically result in triumph through his use of the phrase 'unjust and rash'. Rapin supported this latter contention when he highlighted that William's forces were not nearly as strong as those of the English, nor did William have any strong alliances in the country he hoped to conquer. Indeed, on William's arrival, the conqueror 'found the least hopes of accomplishing his ends. Even after he had landed a powerful army, not so much as a single lord declared in his favour'.[495] Rapin presented William I as brave in this passage. However, by highlighting the circumstances, he subtly suggested that the conquest itself was precarious. Rapin was thus able to admire William's boldness while conveying to readers that such boldness was not normally so successful.

Rapin offered divine intervention as an explanation for William's success, given the circumstances of the conquest. As much as the conqueror's bravery was admirable, Rapin was still surprised that a potentially imprudent endeavour ended so well. Rapin expressed his astonishment when he wrote:

> That by one single battle he became Master of a country, which neither the
> Danes, nor the Saxons, nor the Romans themselves, were able to subdue till after

---

[494] Rapin, II, pp. 213-214.
[495] Rapin, II, p. 214.

132

numberless engagements, and the space of several ages […] God no doubt was pleas'd to make use of this Conqueror as his instrument to render the English Nation more illustrious than it had ever been before.[496]

Rapin appeared to be in awe of the conqueror and almost bewildered by his bravery. He listed the numerous attempts to conquer England before 1066 to emphasize the magnitude of William's success. Far from the impartial observer Rapin typically claimed to be, he praised William not because of the king's level-headedness, but for the 'boldness' which ultimately led to his victory. Nevertheless, Rapin defused the potential excess of William's boldness by suggesting that his victory was divinely ordained. Rapin legitimized William's rash behaviour in his suggestion that the conqueror was merely acting as the 'instrument' of God. This divine intervention thus informed readers that impulsive behaviour was not to be emulated, as William was successful because he was divinely chosen. By doing so, Rapin ensured that readers understood that William was the legitimate king. Although the notion of divine right had declined by the early eighteenth century in Britain, there was still a hint of its ideals in Rapin's description of why William was chosen by God to make England 'illustrious'.[497]

The Norman Conquest of 1066 allowed historians to educate their readers about the significance of equanimity, as self-control was an important virtue for eighteenth-century men. Historians judged the king in battle on the grounds of whether he fought with sound reason and judgment. As Carter has argued, 'independence, moderation, courage and self-command' were central virtues of the ideal gentleman of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These views were attributed to the emergence of popular Roman stoic philosophers, such as Epictetus. This form of stoicism was still an ideal masculine quality in the eighteenth century. Forbearance and self-command were important qualities for the image of the dignified man who was interested in the public good.[498] Therefore, kings in their roles as exemplars, as they were presented in historical accounts, were expected not to succumb to any arrogance or sudden impulses without considering the consequences. William's boldness in his conquest was excused as it was

---

[496] Rapin, II, pp. 215-216.
[497] Paul Langford, *The Eighteenth Century: 1688-1815* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 47.
[498] Carter, *Men and the Emergence*, p. 70.

depicted as a sign of bravery or because it was deemed to be a result of divine intervention. By contrast, historians argued that King Harold lost to William as he lacked self-control. To French historians, the absence of equanimity was a key factor which contributed to Harold's undoing and provided a key lesson to their male readers.

Raynal portrayed William's behaviour during the conquest as rash and a cautionary tale of undesirable conduct in conflict. He presented William's decision to burn his ships to ensure his men fought bravely as an example of behaviour that was precarious to the safety his men. Raynal wrote that William 'burnt his vessels' on his arrival to England, 'to leave his followers no recourse but their courage'.[499] While this comment presented his arrival and lack of possible retreat as a bold move, the phrase 'no recourse' underlines how William's men had no choice other than to be brave. Raynal inferred that William risked the lives of his men.

Rapin argued for the importance of equanimity in battle in his account of Harold's behaviour leading up to the Battle of Hastings. For Rapin, Harold's loss could be attributed to his decision to fight William immediately after his battle with the king of Norway, at which Harold had 'lost his best troops'. Rapin found fault with Harold's choices:

> That same victory inspir'd him with a fatal contempt of the Normans, which prov'd his ruin. Had it not been for that, he would have avoided coming to a battle, according to his Brother's advice, and by that means suffered the Norman Army to diminish daily in an enemy's country, where there was no possibility of being reinforc'd.[500]

Rapin argued that Harold's disdain for the Normans led to his decision and his demise. Ignoring the sage council of his brother, Harold made a decision led by his emotions, rather than his reason. In addition, Harold 'rais'd discontents' among his army after fighting the Norwegians, 'by not giving them a share of the spoils'.[501] This greed led to dissatisfaction and undermined the view of Harold as a just king. As we will also see in

---

[499] Raynal, p. 15.
[500] Rapin, II, p. 215.
[501] Rapin, II, p. 215.

the final section of this chapter, in the battles of the Hundred Years War, eighteenth-century historians felt that an army's faith in its king was necessary for victory.

Raynal also highlighted the consequences of unrestrained passion in his description of Harold in his argument for the necessary virtue of prudence. Raynal believed that Harold could have merited success 'had he avoided an engagement which his rival wanted to bring on'. But, 'happily for the Normans, the English monarch consulted more his valour than his prudence; he might have conquered without drawing a sword'.[502] Raynal criticized Harold as he valued his 'valour' more than the safety of his nation. Ignoring 'prudence', Harold prioritized his personal emotions over equanimity, and as a result, Raynal argued that 'he lost his crown, his glory and his life, fighting valiantly'.[503] According to Raynal, had Harold been more cautious, the outcome of the Norman Conquest could have been very different. He employed the adjective 'valiantly' to highlight Harold's military prowess and to hint at the possibility that he could have succeeded. For Raynal, the absence of self-control and prudence made a significant contribution to the downfall of the Anglo-Saxons. In the eighteenth century, self-control was perceived as manly, and excessive passionate behaviour was seen as effeminate.[504] Both ideas were features of Raynal's work. He used Harold to argue for the necessity of reflection and levelheadedness, to demonstrate how the history of England had been transformed as a result of the Anglo-Saxon king's decision to ignore the virtue of prudence.

The Norman Conquest and Battle of Hastings allowed historians to comment on the development of England as a nation. Historians discussed William, Harold and Edgar to evaluate whether the Norman Conquest was a positive development. Raynal used the first sentences of the chapter to explain who was in contention for the throne. While he described Edgar as the one with 'the royal blood', William 'reigned in Normandy with great reputation and dignity', and 'Harold was the man in England most

---

[502] Raynal, p. 15.
[503] Raynal, p. 15.
[504] Cohen, pp. 4-5; Robert W. Jones, *Gender and the Formation of Taste in Eighteenth-Century Britain: The Analysis of Beauty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 5.

powerful, most feared, most esteemed, and yet most beloved'.[505] In his complimentary

depictions of William and Harold, Raynal suggested to readers that they were equally

matched in their abilities and were worthy of the crown, while Edgar was never a

serious contender. David Hume referred to Harold in similarly respectful terms in his

History of England. For Hume, Harold's loss at the Battle of Hastings was sorrowful for

the British because he was a well-liked king. Hume communicated this sentiment at the

start of his chapter on William the Conqueror with the words: 'Nothing could exceed the

consternation which seized the English, when they received intelligence of the

unfortunate Battle of Hastings, the death of their king, the slaughter of their principal

nobility, and of their bravest warriors'.[506] Hume described the battle as 'unfortunate' and

the Anglo-Saxon warriors as the 'bravest' in order to convey his admiration for a

popular historical figure and his people.

But the prevailing view amongst French and British historians was that the

Anglo-Saxons were improved by the Norman Conquest. Hume presented William's

conquest as an opportunity for the civilization of the Anglo-Saxons and the events

supported his view of the progressive unfolding of history. As O'Brien highlights,

Hume viewed the past as a natural trajectory and wrote a form of 'stadial history'.[507]

Hume argued that the Anglo-Saxons were a 'rude, uncultivated people, ignorant of

letters, unskilful in the mechanical arts, untamed to submission under law and

government, addicted to intemperance, riot and disorder'.[508] For Hume, the Normans

won because they were more civilized. According to Forbes, Hume was pleased the

Anglo-Saxons lost as their constitution had a number of flaws that hampered them from

defending their moral and political liberties.[509] Hume's description of the Anglo-Saxons

supports Forbes' argument, and the historians' description of 'riot', 'disorder', 'rude',

'uncultivated' and 'ignorant' conveyed his perception of the need for progress.

Moreover, Hume wrote that 'the conquest put the people in a situation of receiving

---

[505] Raynal, p. 13.

[506] David Hume, *The History of England*, 2nd edn, 8 vols (London: A. Miller, 1763), I, p. 246.

[507] O'Brien, pp. 132-133.

[508] Hume, I, p. 245.

[509] Duncan Forbes, *Hume's Philosophical Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), p. 226.

slowly from abroad the rudiments of science and cultivation, and of correcting their rough and licentious manners'.[510] Hume's description of a people who needed 'science and cultivation' was reinforced by the use of the term 'correcting' to indicate the need for improvement. He implied that the Anglo-Saxons were fortunate that William invaded because the conqueror introduced feudal law to England. These laws were already established in France and Normandy, and Hume believed that 'during [the Anglo-Saxon] age … the foundation both of the stability and of the disorders in most of the monarchical governments of Europe' had been established.[511] Hume argued that the conquest may have civilized the Anglo-Saxons because of the imported Norman laws that William brought with him. Hume argued that the new laws were the most significant result of the conquest, because they introduced what he viewed to be the political ideals that were present in the eighteenth century. His contrast between 'stability' and 'disorders' confirms that the system introduced by William had a positive as well as a negative impact. As Hume felt that the conquest brought civility and reason to the Anglo-Saxons, it is not surprising that he formulated a stadial account in order to express its significance in Britain's development.

In their accounts, Hume and Millot described the Anglo-Saxons as barbarians in order to argue that William brought civility. Historians writing at this time often described people in the past as barbarians. The etymology of the term 'barbarian' evolved over time and the word had several meanings in the eighteenth century. 'Barbarian' originally described a foreigner with different customs and language, and by the eighteenth century it also signified a rude and wild person who was lacking in culture and civility.[512] The evolution of the term suggests that historians employed the language to distance themselves from their predecessors, who they viewed as foreign due to their remoteness from current events, politics, and cultural beliefs. In describing historical figures as barbarians, historians conveyed a general sense of progression, as well as offering a specific excuse for the subjugation of a group of people. In Pocock's

---

[510] Hume, I, p. 245
[511] Hume, I, p. 270.
[512] OED Online, 'barbarian, n. and adj.', (Oxford University Press, 2015)
<http://0www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/15380?redirectedFrom=barbarian> [accessed 11 February 2016].

assessment of Hume, he notes that the further the historian went into the past, the more he described figures and events using notions of barbarity.[513] This practice also characterised Millot's work. Millot concluded his chapter on the Anglo-Saxon reign with ideas of civility and barbarism which were similar to those in Hume's writings. For example, Millot wrote that he would 'say nothing of the inhumanity, the habits of intemperance, and the ignorance of the Anglo-Saxons. Even the Normans, notwithstanding the low state of the arts in their own country, treated them as barbarians'.[514] Millot, while criticizing the eleventh-century Normans, nonetheless felt their arrival improved England's civility. This notion of barbarity in the historical past also featured in accounts of the Crusades, as discussed in the next section of this chapter.

The Norman Conquest was a significant event in England's history. French historians described William and his opponent King Harold as formidable warriors. They highlighted William's positive and negative qualities to argue that these attributes created a risk of defeat but ultimately led to his victory. They warned their readers that had Harold listened to his advisors, and not rushed to attempt to defeat the Normans he so hated, he may have seen reason and allowed his army to recuperate before attacking William, who had no allies waiting for him in England. The assessment of the personal qualities and behaviour of kings led historians to conclude that the conquest brought stability, and reason, to the English.

Section 2: The Crusades

This section analyses the Third Crusade (1189-1192), also known as the Kings' Crusade. The focus on this event is valuable because it involved a French king and an English king: King Philip II of France and King Richard I of England. In the eighteenth-

---

[513] J.G.A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion Volume 2: Narratives of Civil Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 222-223.
[514] Millot, I, p. 68.

century, historians drew on new interpretations of the Crusades to explore ideal kingship in periods of war. Historians wrote about King Richard I's participation in the Crusades to explore eighteenth-century notions of masculinity and to demonstrate the dangers of religious fanaticism. Historians had to find motivations for crusading that were not solely religious in order to portray kings positively. They often focused on plunder and glory, which were not presented as completely unproblematic, but rather as motivations which readers could understand. The early retreat of the French king was used to critique deceit and dishonourable behaviour. Historians discussed the events leading up to the Crusade as well as the Crusades themselves to warn against the vice of the loss of self-control in combination with unenlightened and unvirtuous behaviour.

Historical views of ideal kingship and masculine behaviour were influenced by the fact that the Crusades were viewed in the eighteenth century to be a result of religious zeal. These wars were portrayed in similar ways in French and English histories, and are indicative of the transformation of historical thought in the eighteenth century due to a new enlightened discourse. White argues that for Enlightenment thinkers 'the past to them was unreason, the present was a conflict of reason and unreason, and the future alone was the time which they could envision as that of the triumph of reason'.[515] Eighteenth-century historians therefore commented on the Crusades as a period that was lacking in reason. They criticized religious fanaticism in order to provide instruction to readers and to prompt them to embrace 'reason'. Crusades were critiqued according to eighteenth-century notions of virtue and presented as cautionary tales of excess on both sides of the channel. When positive qualities were attributed to kings involved in crusading, it was made clear to the reader that these monarchs had reasons other than religious fanaticism for going on the Crusade.

Many seventeenth-century works questioned the Crusades, and these texts set the stage for further critique in the age of Enlightenment. Thomas Fuller's *Historie of the Holy Warre* (1639) was the first major general history of the Crusades that questioned

---

[515] Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), p. 62.

their legitimacy. Fuller was a Protestant minister who wrote from a strongly anti-Catholic view and his work was well-received.[516] In France, views about the Crusades were slower to change. Louis Maimbourg wrote a pro-Catholic work that supported the Crusades, *Histoire des croisades,* which was published in the 1670s and which began with a dedication to Louis XIV. It was translated into several languages and continuously reprinted for several decades.[517] This work was successful because in the 1660s, during French expeditions against Islamic adversaries in North Africa, Hungary and Crete, Louis XIV's government invoked the language of holy war to garner support for these conflicts. A crusading theme continued to resonate for the rest of Louis' reign, in some measure owing to the king's attempts to identify himself with the cult of Saint Louis.[518] After Louis XIV's passing, anti-crusading views began to take hold in France and influenced the emergence of negative portrayals of the Crusades in French accounts of English history.

By the middle of the eighteenth century the Crusades were viewed in both Britain and France as a futile and deceitful charade. Most authors during this period believed that the Crusades were a result of religious zeal and ecclesiastical interference.[519] In France, Voltaire described the Crusades as 'une maladie épidémique' and labelled the crusaders as outlaws and adventurers who were encouraged by 'the thirst for brigandage'.[520] This interpretation presented crusaders as depraved individuals who participated in the conflicts to plunder rather than on account of their faith. Writers criticized this behaviour as another form of excess. Voltaire expressed the view that the common man involved in the Crusades was immoral. In describing the events as an epidemic disease, Voltaire suggested that the Crusades were not motivated by reason or logic. Comparably, David Hume described the Crusades 'as the most signal and most

---

[516] J.E. Bailey, *The Life of Thomas Fuller, D.D*. (London, Manchester, 1874), pp. 173-181.
[517] Giles Constable, 'The Historiography of the Crusades', in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, ed. by Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001), pp. 1-22 (p. 7); Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1994), p. 28.
[518] Phil McCluskey, '"Les ennemis du nom Chrestien": Echoes of the Crusade in Louis XIV's France', *French History*, 29:1 (2015), 46-61 (p. 61).
[519] Constable, p. 8.
[520] Voltaire, *Essai sur les moeurs*, cited in J.H. Brumfitt, *Voltaire Historian* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 68.

durable monument of human folly, that has yet appeared in any age or nation'.[521] The derision with which Hume held the Crusades above all the other events he recounted in his history of England exemplifies contemporary attitudes towards religious war. Similarly, in *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Edward Gibbon wrote that 'the principle of the Crusades was a savage fanaticism' and that it 'had checked rather than forwarded the maturity of Europe'.[522] Written almost two decades after Hume, Gibbon's criticisms of the Crusades indicate that contempt for the events had grown stronger over the course of the eighteenth century. The religious wars came to be viewed as events that impeded the British nation rather than helping it to progress.

Historians emphasized Richard's secular qualities and non-religious motives, and their accounts reflected a declining belief in the divine right of kings in the eighteenth century. In France, the strongest challenge to the divine right of kings came at the end of the eighteenth century; in Britain, the idea had already changed due to the arrival of William III in 1688. In the seventeenth century, James I and Charles I both felt obliged to defend the idea that they derived their authority from God. The divine right of kings was reasserted during the later Stuart period and was then diluted by the Glorious Revolution.[523] Many Enlightenment thinkers embraced secularism and rationalism and eighteenth-century philosophers celebrated a more secular model of kingly authority. Writers now equated barbarism with religion, superstition and the Middle Ages.[524] The Bill of Rights, not divine right, came to be what validated the authority of a monarch, especially for the Whigs in Britain.[525] As we saw in Chapter 1, Rapin can be considered as a Whig historian. This position was reflected in his *History* by an emphasis on the secular motives of kings at war, at the expense of assertions of divine authority. Yet Millot also criticized the Crusades, and he was a Catholic and not considered to be a

---

[521] Hume, I, p. 314.
[522] Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 4th edn, 6 vols (London: W. Strahan, and T. Cadell, 1781-1788), VI, pp. 209-210.
[523] Langford, p. 47.
[524] Okie, pp. 2, 4-6; J.G.A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 136.
[525] James Sambrook, *The Eighteenth Century: The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1700-1789* (London: Longman, 1986), pp. 71-74. For Tory ideology and historiography on the divine right of kings see also Hicks, pp. 84-90.

Whig historian. Moreover, Millot's account also draws similarities to Hume's opinion of the Crusades. Historians of different confessions, political affiliations and nationalities shared a view of the Crusades that demonstrated both the contemporary disdain for religious campaigns and a shared historiographical culture.

Historians thus had to circumvent the perceived religious fanaticism of the Crusades, and explain Richard I's involvement using reasons other than faith in order to discuss ideal monarchical behaviour. Eighteenth-century notions of masculinity were a central part of their explanations. The view of the Crusades as an immoral war meant that Richard's involvement was not virtuous if he had participated in the name of Catholicism. Rapin, a Huguenot, understood this view and thus gave alternative motives for Richard I's participation. When Rapin described the enthusiasm of Richard I as he embarked on the Third Crusade, he deliberately obscured his motivations: 'whether [Richard I] acted from pure principle of Zeal and Devotion, or from an eager desire of acquire Fame, is what [Rapin] dare not determine'.[526] Rapin's use of 'pure principle' diffused the danger of the religious connotations. His criticisms also highlighted that Richard's desire for fame was just as sinful in its suggestions of the monarch's ambition. Furthermore, Rapin commented that 'if one may be allowed to pass a judgement from the Character of Richard, it may be presumed that he was swayed more by motive of Glory than of Religion'.[527] Rapin then described Richard's exploits as impressive military endeavours, as in his portrayal of the attack on Messina, which took place 'so furiously, that he became Master of it in the first assault'.[528] In this way, Rapin drew the focus away from the king's religious motivations.

Historians also highlighted the importance of a personal reformation in Richard's religious experience. This helped Rapin to portray Richard in a positive light because the king was reformed after an encounter with the missionary Fulk of Neuilly (d. 1202) just as he was about to continue his crusading voyage. According to Rapin, Richard was 'touched with remorse of conscience, made a general confession of all his sins, which

---

[526] Rapin, III, p. 97.
[527] Rapin, III, p. 97.
[528] Rapin, III, p. 104.

was followed by a very visible reformation and amendment of life'.[529] The idea of a reformation of conscience indicated to readers that Richard had characteristics that needed improvement. Richard's transformation signified that his religious beliefs were unconnected to problematic ideas of bigotry and zeal. Rapin's description of Richard's encounter with the missionary presented the king as introspective about his faith and thus redeemable. This approach allowed Rapin to present a king who had qualities to be emulated. Richard's religious transformation therefore became a positive character trait. Voltaire's view of the Crusades was similar. He wrote that he was 'delighted to be able to show that the Crusades were not the result of lofty religious motives, but of a desire for plunder'.[530] This 'desire for plunder' was more understandable to eighteenth-century readers than religious fanaticism.

Millot also attributed Richard's involvement in the Crusades to the pursuit of glory. However, Millot did not consider Richard's desire for glory to be a redeemable quality. To the historian, Richard 'was more governed by the sallies of passion, than by settled principles', and the king's actions were not always 'from a solid foundation of wisdom or of virtue'.[531] Again, the king's motivations were called into question, and were attributed to the desire for glory rather than the pursuit of religious fanaticism. Millot moreover emphasized that Richard's uncontrolled 'passion' went against eighteenth-century ideals of masculinity.[532] Millot's view was not unusual, as Edward Gibbon presented Richard I as a complete brute, writing: 'if heroism be confined to brutal and ferocious valour, Richard Plantagenet will stand high among the heroes of the age'.[533] Gibbon argued that Richard should only be considered a hero for his military exploits. The historian undermined the king's achievements by labelling them as 'brutal and ferocious' and this description implied that Richard had an unrestrained passion for battle. For Millot, Richard was a king who was 'impelled by military glory, who was

---

[529] Rapin, III, pp. 106
[530] Voltaire, *Essai sur les moeurs* (1756), cited in Brumfitt, p. 68.
[531] Millot, I, p. 125.
[532] Zaw, p. 135.
[533] Edward Gibbon, '*The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776-1789), cited in Patricia Craddock, 'Contemplative Heroes and Gibbon's Historical Imagination', in *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, And Fiction, 1500-1800*, ed. by Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 343-360 (p. 346).

impatient to signalize his courage'.[534] Millot implied that Richard's military fervour was base and foolish, as it affected his decisions and ultimately his country. Machiavelli and Hobbes had written in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that sovereignty was always under threat due to the tendency of rulers to desire increased power.[535] This notion was still a part of eighteenth-century discourse, as we see in Millot's account which was written over a century later. In his search for glory, Richard went against the eighteenth-century ideal masculine qualities of reason and restraint, and consequently Millot did not promote him as a figure to emulate.

Richard was criticized by Millot for his uncontrolled desire to participate in the Crusades and for his lack of prudence in his crusading endeavours. Millot was the only historian to report the speech of Fulk, the missionary who chastised Richard on his way to the Holy Land. This missionary advised Richard 'to rid himself of his vices, particularly his pride, avarice, and voluptuousness'.[536] While Rapin had written that Richard had a personal reformation on his way to the Crusades, Millot instead used the interaction with the missionary as an opportunity to highlight Richard's corrupted character. This criticism emphasized how Richard's pursuit of crusading was immoral behaviour. Millot noted that Richard was desperate to leave for the Crusade, and tried to procure funds by any means and at any cost to England. For Millot, these were 'imprudent steps', and he stressed his point with the rhetorical flourish that Richard 'would sell London itself if he could find a purchaser'.[537] Richard's willingness to forgo the wellbeing of his country and to participate in an unnecessary war demonstrated immoderate behaviour. With this description, Millot reinforced the need for self-control in ideal kingly, and masculine, behaviour.

In accounts of France's involvement in the Crusades, analysis of the behaviour of King Philip II of France allowed eighteenth-century historians to comment on dishonour. Philip left the Third Crusade prematurely and attacked England and these

---

[534] Millot, I, p. 126.
[535] David Wootton, 'Thomas Hobbes' Machiavellian Moments', in Kelley and Sacks, pp. 210-242 (p. 230).
[536] Millot, I, p. 126.
[537] Millot, I, p. 127.

actions were viewed as cowardly and dishonourable by historians. Both were unwanted

qualities in a king and in the ideal eighteenth-century man, especially in times of war.[538]

Historical accounts therefore drew attention to Philip's retreat from the Crusade,

depicting the event as deceitful. Richard Johnson's *History of France* provided much

more emphasis on this invasion of England, and focused on Philip's dishonesty, who

'feigning illness, returned home' where he then invaded Normandy. The troops he left

behind, 'instead of assisting Richard, frustrated his attempts upon Jerusalem'.[539] Jones

was critical of Philip's treachery, especially as the king had his troops impede rather

than help Richard as was promised. Johnson's description of a king who 'feign[ed]

illness' implied that Philip was cowardly. Johnson only wrote one page on Philip, half

of which analysed Philip's treatment of the English king. Johnson wrote that Philip was

'not satisfied with taking from him [Richard I] Normandy, Anjou, Maine, Tourrain,

Berry and Poitou; he seconded the endeavours of his brother John to supplant him in

England'.[540] Johnson listed the territories to emphasize that Philip's actions were

excessive, and referred to the monarch's attempts to use Richard's own brother against

him as further support for the French king's dishonour. The portrayal of French greed

for English territories reflects the period in which the author wrote his history, and

Britain's discontent and frustration about the ongoing war with France.

      Criticisms of Philip's behaviour were prominent in British accounts. Richard

Rolt, writing in 1754, expressed disapproval of Philip's early return, describing it as a

'perfidious action' and claiming that it 'redoubled' the war between France and

England.[541] Philip's actions were thus used as a warning, as his dishonourable behaviour

led to further strife between the two nations, ultimately putting his own country at risk.

While historians Richard Johnson and Richard Rolt hinted that Philip's illness and

departure from the Crusades was a ruse to invade England, David Jones believed the

illness may have been genuine. Jones' *History of France* informed its readers that Philip

promised Richard to 'not in the least disturb his territories' until forty days after Philip

---

[538]Carolyn Williams, pp. 36-37.

[539] Johnson, p. 34.

[540] Johnson, pp. 34-35.

[541] Richard Rolt, *A New History of France, by Question and Answer* (London: W. Owen, 1754), p. 85.

had arrived in France.[542] The inclusion of this promise suggests that Richard had an awareness of the possibility of invasion, and thus had some responsibility for defending the nation against it. This awareness, moreover, hinted that Richard chose to crusade rather than defend his own country.

Historians therefore argued that both French and English monarchs acted with dishonourable behaviour during the Third Crusade. When Richard was freed from Germany, Jones wrote that the English king wanted revenge on Philip 'and both of them for two years together destroyed one another's countrys [sic] by fire and sword'.[543] Even if Philip was primarily responsible for the war, Jones argued that Richard's desire for revenge contributed to the conflict. In so doing, Jones attributed responsibility for the suffering of both countries to both monarchs. The two nations eventually reached a peace, but to Jones 'these bloody and destructive Wars did much mischief to France' which made Philip 'covetous'.[544] This choice of language placed more emphasis on Philip's actions as immoral. Jones concluded that Philip's behaviour was more dishonourable, as Richard continued his brave exploits in the Holy Land while Philip returned home. Yet both monarchs were held accountable for their actions by historians. Rolt stated that during the siege of the city of Acre, Richard and Philip had 'continual dissentions' and 'continually disagreed' because of 'mutual hatred they bore to each other'. Because of this discord, 'the English, through jealousy of the French, behaved ill in the siege, and did not arrive till towards the end of it; nevertheless, they would not allow the French the glory of having reduced it'.[545] In criticizing the actions of his own countrymen, Rolt revealed that he considered this behaviour to be unacceptable. According to Rolt's eighteenth-century standards, Richard's actions were lacking in honour.

Unvirtuous behaviour was similarly depicted and criticized in the events leading up to the Third Crusade. Historians, both Catholic and Protestant, condemned the

---

[542] David Jones, *The History of France from the Origin of that Nation to the Year 1702*, 2 vols (London: D. Brown and A. Bell, 1702), I, p. 164.
[543] David Jones, I, p. 165.
[544] David Jones, I, p. 166.
[545] Rolt, pp. 84-85.

English for their massacre of the Jews in 1189 before Richard left for the Crusade, and used this event to warn their readers against excess and unenlightened behaviour. Both Rapin, a Huguenot, and Millot, a Catholic, criticized the persecution of the Jews. Millot described the event as a 'massacre', at which English men used any type of pretence 'for exercising every kind of cruelty against them'.[546] The mistreatment of the Jews was considered to be the result of religious excess by Millot, who referred to 'every kind of cruelty' to underscore the magnitude of these unenlightened actions. Millot's position reflects the eighteenth-century belief in the need for restraint, as well as contemporary concern with religious zealotry. Rapin also used the term 'massacre', but defended Richard because the king had 'ordered a strict enquiry', following which the chief ringleaders 'were put to death'.[547] While both authors condemned the treatment of the Jews, only Rapin defended Richard. Despite Rapin's support for Richard's behaviour, the criticism of the massacre demonstrates how historians tended to treat religious fanaticism as barbaric in the eighteenth century.[548] Both before and during the Crusades religiously-motivated actions were depicted as barbaric by historians on both sides of the channel.

As we have seen, the Crusades were viewed as being the result of fanaticism and excess, which contradicted contemporary beliefs in reason and the virtue of equanimity. French historians circumvented excessive criticism of Richard I by ensuring that readers were aware that he embarked on the crusade to seek plunder and glory, not because of religious fanaticism. If a historian wanted to portray a king in positive terms, moreover, the author downplayed the religious aspects of their actions and highlighted their masculine qualities, such as bravery in battle.

---

[546] Millot, I, p. 126.
[547] Rapin, III, p. 95.
[548] Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History*, p. 136.

Section 3: The Hundred Years War

Accounts of the Hundred Years War contain well-defined expressions of eighteenth-century ideas of masculinity. The Hundred Years War comprised a series of conflicts waged between the French and the English from 1337 to 1453. This section will analyse historical depictions of the battles of Agincourt, Crécy and Poitiers during one of the most notable periods of warfare in the Middle Ages. All three battles were renowned for extraordinary victories by the English and accounts exemplify how eighteenth-century historians depicted ideal kingship according to contemporary notions of masculinity, while displaying the influence of the epic within the writing of history. The epic genre often presented a central heroic figure, through which the author offered moral lessons.[549] The influence of this genre is apparent in the ways in which historians portrayed kings and princes who participated in military conflicts. This section demonstrates the influence of the epic through the examination of the ways in which historians reported on the heroism displayed by English kings. Historians placed monarchs as the central hero in their accounts in order to display ideal kingship and masculinity through traditional concepts of strength and bravery, in addition to the more contemporary qualities of reason and equanimity. Historical accounts of these battles depicted the bravery and perseverance of the English against insurmountable odds. These works reminded readers of the need for self-control in conflicts and expressed the ideal leadership role of a king during war. In these accounts, the defeated French were used to reflect on the undesirable behaviour one can display in conflict. Historians used these victories to depict kings with eighteenth-century notions of model masculinity, and these ideals included the traditional medieval epic notions of heroism and chivalry.[550] These depictions allowed historians to present their monarchs in the more traditional form of the epic hero, while including eighteenth-century notions of ideal masculinity.

---

[549] Gallagher, 'Historiography, the Novel', p. 636; Woolf, *The Social Circulation*, p. 306.
[550] Wollock, pp. 120-122; Keen, pp. 104-105.

These contemporary notions included self-control, moderation and independence, which were central to the ideal of polite male conduct in the eighteenth century.[551]

Edward, the Prince of Wales (1330-1376), often referred to as the Black Prince, was depicted by both French and British historians with many qualities of traditional chivalry. Historians contended that these ideal masculine attributes contributed to England's success at the battles of Crécy and Poitiers. This emphasis on chivalry can be found in eighteenth-century historical accounts of the French and the British battles of the Hundred Years War, in the depiction of kings and princes as heroic figures who served as moral lessons for their readers. Rapin's account of Crécy underlines the importance of the Prince of Wales' actions and the ways in which he represented the more traditional norms of masculinity, which included bravery and heroism, both of which were also qualities drawn from the medieval epic. The epic presented archetypal figures, like those found in works of neoclassical history, where the aim was to provide universal lessons on morality.[552] In the epic, a pivotal hero, such as King Arthur or Beowulf, did great deeds in chivalric and military settings while invoking notions of masculinity.[553] Rapin used these notions when he informed his readers of the Prince of Wales' bravery, writing that the prince 'fought with an heroic courage determined to conquer or dye upon the spot'.[554] Rapin used a similar sentence when he described the prince's actions ten years later at the Battle of Poitiers, writing: 'that for his own part, he [the Prince of Wales] was determined to conquer or dye, and that he would not expose his country to the disgrace of paying his ransom'.[555] The repetition of the phrase 'to conquer or dye' underlined how the Prince of Wales consistently fought bravely in battle, and was ready to sacrifice himself heroically for his men. Thus we see how historians imparted ideas of ideal kingship through the more traditional influence of the epic by displaying the positive outcomes of the virtues of bravery and heroism.

---

[551] Carter, *Men and the Emergence*, p. 74.
[552] Gallagher, 'Historiography, the Novel', p. 636.
[553] Woolf, *The Social Circulation*, p. 306.
[554] Rapin, IV, p. 266.
[555] Rapin, IV, p. 285.

A monarch's gallantry played a key role within the portrayal of ideal kingship in eighteenth-century historical texts. The early modern period saw a drive towards modes of conduct that were more refined and benevolent, especially with the emergence of a new commercial and polite society in the eighteenth century.[556] Philip Carter has argued that modern honour 'was a quality less associated with warriorship than with lawfulness, religious respect and sociability' in this period.[557] Respect and sociability became central facets of the ideal monarch in battle in eighteenth-century historical texts. These contemporary notions of honourable qualities were represented in acts of the English royals, who treated their prisoners and enemies with respect and politeness. Rapin's writings support Carter's interpretation. With regard to the Prince of Wales' gracious actions in victory at the Battle of Poitiers, Rapin wrote that 'if the victorious Prince distinguished himself by his conduct and bravery in this glorious day, he was no less admired after his victory, for his modest and generous behaviour towards his prisoner'.[558] This prisoner, King John of France (1319-1364), was well treated by the English, and the Prince of Wales' behaviour towards the king epitomized the eighteenth-century virtues of politeness and sociability, and the contemporary belief that polite manners were crucial in a society of masculine equals.[559] This behaviour was also exhibited by King Edward III (1312-1377), 'in a noble and generous manner', who 'received him with as cordial embraces, as if he had been his own brother, or as if he was come on purpose to pay him a visit'.[560] Rapin made comparisons between prisoner and brother to emphasize the respect with which Edward treated his enemies. Rapin intimated that the king wanted to put his prisoner at ease, which was a sign of considerate politeness.[561] Rapin made it clear in other descriptions that both the prince and king of England treated their French prisoner with great respect, so as to 'avoid everything that might put him in mind of his misfortune, or be offensive to his eyes'.[562] Rapin argued that Edward and his son were benevolent royals who made great efforts to ensure their prisoner was comfortable. Thus, they were portrayed as brave and heroic, as

---

[556] Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History*, p. 198.
[557] Carter, *Men and the Emergence*, p. 72.
[558] Rapin, IV, p. 287.
[559] Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, pp. 188-189.
[560] Rapin, IV, p. 289.
[561] Carter, *Men and the Emergence*, pp. 2-3.
[562] Rapin, IV, p. 289.

well as polite and considerate, all of which were positive traits to which eighteenth-century men were expected to aspire.

Millot's history contains similar descriptions which convey the importance of contemporary chivalry. Millot praised the Black Prince after the English victory at Poitiers, calling him a 'conqueror' for his treatment of John and his French prisoners, while using terms such as 'valour' and 'humanity' in his description to provide balance to the more traditional ideals of masculinity exhibited through the Black Prince's military prowess. When King John of France refused the Black Prince's offer of a truce of seven years and asked him to be a prisoner instead, Millot argued that 'his reply to John was that of a hero, who is less afraid of death than dishonour'.[563] Millot admired the Black Prince for his choice of death over 'dishonour', and with this comment he subtly suggested that, of the two opposing royals, the Black Prince was the more honourable, and therefore admirable, figure of this account. The Black Prince's father was then depicted as gallant. When King Edward obtained John as a prisoner, he 'received him with the same courtesy as if he had been a neighbouring potentate, who had voluntarily come to pay him a friendly visit'.[564] Here, like Rapin, Millot emphasized the commendable actions of the English towards both the prince and his father in the politeness and sociability of Edward's actions. The historian used them as a contrast to the French, when he described France's troubles in the following sentence, stating that the country 'was reduced to despair, and seemed to be on the brink of ruin. Seditions, treasons, murders, and rapines, made it a scene of the most destructive horrors'.[565] This dramatic description functioned as a contrast with the behaviour of the English prince and only further emphasized the gallant nature of the English prince and king, which underlined how their chivalric behaviour should be emulated.

Historians thus employed the Black Prince to provide examples of masculine behaviour that combined traditional and contemporary ideals. Both French and English historians agreed that Edward the Black Prince was the epitome of chivalry and should

---

[563] Millot, I, p. 220.
[564] Millot, I, p. 220.
[565] Millot, I, pp. 220-221.

be emulated. Rolt, as in his account of Crécy, described the battle as 'very glorious for the Prince of Wales'.[566] The use of 'glorious' intimated that the prince's valiant behaviour resulted in his success. David Jones drew comparisons between the French king and the young prince to emphasize the stark differences between the two, especially in France's defeat. Initially positive about King John of France, Jones wrote that 'the king indeed acted the part of a valiant prince' but unfortunately, he was not 'seconded by his other dastardly troops, and [was] beginning now to sink under the weight of the English fury and prowess'.[567] According to Jones, John was initially a heroic figure, yet his character altered due to his inability to defeat the English. Jones' reference to the 'dastardly troops' expressed the need for bravery and honour in battle. Faced with the 'prowess' of the English, John chose to surrender with his son Philip. Jones explained that 'on the other hand, Edward, a young prince as courteous and generous as he was heroic and valiant, treated the king with the greatest respect'.[568] With these contrasting terms of 'courteous and generous' and 'heroic and valiant', Jones drew together ideas of the epic hero and the eighteenth-century sociable man, finding a middle ground between the ideal notions of masculinity within the period.

The Battle of Agincourt allowed historians to argue that ideal kingship could be achieved through a reformation of character. This reformation was discussed by historians to highlight why Henry V's (1387-1422) triumph was such a success. Millot had a high opinion of Henry V, even if he had a tumultuous start to his reign. According to Millot, if the readers were to 'judge men from the follies of their youth, Henry V ought to have been a monster on the throne'. Yet this behaviour was due to 'the distrust and jealousies of his father, having removed him from all share in public business, and from all command in his armies', and to distract himself, 'he plunged himself with the utmost violence into all the extravagancies of debauchery, and blushed not for a conduct the most disorderly and licentious'. Millot listed Henry's previous debauchery in order to emphasize his upcoming transformation. Despite his youthful exuberance, ultimately Henry saw what was needed for his country, and 'he was scarcely seated on the throne

---

[566] Rolt, p. 119.
[567] David Jones, I, p. 250.
[568] David Jones, I, p. 250.

when his vices were changed into virtues'.[569] For Millot, not only was Henry a virtuous king, but he had seen the error of his ways and transformed and redeemed himself. Moreover, the transformation took place when he sat on the throne, which suggested to readers that an ideal king realizes the magnitude of his responsibilities and changes his behaviour accordingly. To Millot, Henry should have been commended for rising above his youthful disposition. Ultimately, these new virtuous qualities led to Henry's success in battle and this example reminded readers of the positive consequences of a reformation in character.

Henry's transformation allowed historians to promote the virtue of moderate religious piety. Rapin informed his readers that Henry's reign began with a 'reformation' in his character once he became king. Henry V's transformation when he ascended to the throne was already a part of popular myth by the end of the sixteenth century and thus appealed to eighteenth-century readers in its familiarity.[570] According to Rapin, previously Henry had 'ran into dishonourable courses' and 'abandoned himself to excesses'.[571] After describing his new virtuous actions and traits, which included 'generosity' and 'moderation' and 'wisdom', Rapin proclaimed that 'nothing remained to confirm the good Opinion all had conceived of him, but to show his Martial Virtues, and give some proofs of his piety'. These proofs included the 'sincere intentions of a prince to promote the Glory of God: I mean the Condescension he had for the Clergy', because he had to promise them to persecute the Lollards.[572] For Rapin, Henry's response to religious zealotry was ideal. Rapin was not against religion per se, but abhorred the extremes that arose from it. Henry V was esteemed highly by Rapin because he reformed his character, which in turn led to a level-headed approach to his faith. Henry's equanimity and reason were offered as a moral lesson to Rapin's readers. Rapin presented this ideal of self-control and prioritisation of reason in his depictions of the transformation of Henry V and his new-found religious piety.

---

[569] Millot, I, pp. 241-242.
[570] Richard Dutton, '"Methinks the truth should live from age to age": The Dating and Contexts of Henry V', in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 169-200 (p. 185).
[571] Rapin, V, p. 89.
[572] Rapin, V, pp. 90-91.

Following Henry's reformation in character, his ideal kingship was confirmed by his actions at the Battle of Agincourt. Rapin gave an extensive description of the days leading up to the Battle of Agincourt, as well as of the battle itself, all of which emphasized Henry V's bravery according to traditional notions of chivalry and masculinity. For example, Rapin refuted the attempts of other French historians to depict Henry as cowardly. Writing about when Henry was trapped near Agincourt, Rapin informed his readers that 'the French Historians affirm, that Henry seeing himself in this wretched situation, offered to restore Harfleur, and repair all the damages he had caused in France since his landing, if he might have liberty to march on unmolested'.[573] The historians to whom Rapin referred implied that Henry was cowardly and weak in his decision to now repent and repair all the damage his army had done. Rapin, 'on the contrary' thought that Henry had told the French that he had been on his march to Calais 'for a good while' and 'it was their fault they had not fought him […] that he was resolved to pursue his March, and they should always find him ready to receive them'.[574] Rapin did not agree with previous depictions of Henry as cowardly by French historians, as they did not reflect the ideal kingship that he admired in the reformed monarch. Instead, Rapin sought to portray a king who was heroic and brave both before and during battle.

Charles VI's (1368-1422) inability to participate in the Battle of Agincourt due to mental illness ensured that Henry V became the prominent historical figure of the battle, allowing historians to present him as the central exemplary hero. Henry thereby fulfilled the medieval and classical epic trope of the virtuous, and central, heroic figure in historical accounts of the Battle of Agincourt.[575] While Henry V was actively involved in the conflict, by leading his troops into battle and participating in hand-to-hand fighting, Charles VI, the French king, could not command the French army himself due

[573] Rapin, V, p. 124.
[574] Rapin, V, p. 124.
[575] Woolf, *The Social Circulation*, p. 306.

154

to mental illness.[576] The French were commanded instead by Constable Charles d'Albret, in addition to other various prominent French noblemen of the Armagnac party. In the eighteenth-century British accounts of the Battle of Agincourt, historians referred to Charles' mental affliction. Richard Johnson claimed that even before his first bout of mental illness, the French king's 'constitution was much impaired by the debaucheries of his youth'.[577] These words further undermined the French king's image, as it suggested that the king had a weak constitution that may have contributed to his illness. Johnson then wrote that Charles went mad on his journey to Brittany, when 'one of his attendants, overcome with sleep, let his lance fall upon the helmet of another who rode next before him; at which the King, imagining it to be a signal, was exceedingly frightened'.[578] The extent to which the king was startled by this minor occurrence implied that he was easily alarmed and therefore unfit to lead his men into battle. Charles' weakness therefore contrasted with the strong and heroic figure of Henry. Richard Rolt gave his readers a similar account, but claimed instead that Charles killed a few men around him in his fear and confusion.[579] Whether Charles killed his friends or not, both depictions show a king who was unable to serve his kingdom in conflict, thus allowing Henry to remain the heroic focus. The depictions of a French king who was confused and ineffectual in battle served as a great contrast to Henry V's famous bravery.

In contrast to the portrayal of Charles, historians argued that Henry was a man in control of his passions, evidenced by his wariness of war with France. For historians, the English king was not at fault for the 'renewed' war with France, and Rapin told his readers of the 'just idea of the motives which induced Henry to carry his army into France'.[580] Rapin identified the motives as 'just' in order to convey to readers that Henry had no choice but to go to war, and was thus admirable for his desire to avoid military conflict, and this decision corresponded with eighteenth-century discourses

---

[576] R.C. Famiglietti, *Royal Intrigue, Crisis at the Court of Charles VI 1392-1420* (New York: AMS Press, 1986), pp. 1-21; V. Green, *The Madness of Kings, Personal Trauma and the Fate of Nations* (New York: Allan Sutton, 1993), pp. 70-86.
[577] Johnson, p. 52.
[578] Johnson, p. 52.
[579] Rolt, p. 126.
[580] Rapin, V, p. 94.

about the value of human life.[581] When Rapin described the negotiation for peace between the two nations in 1414, he gave many more details about the demands and processes than any other historian. He argued that even though the English had 'reduced at length all their demands', the French were inflexible and felt their enemy was being 'exorbitant'.[582] He portrayed the French as unreasonable, and argued that Henry had to go to war in 1415. Thus, Henry was not war-hungry, as he rose to the occasion when needed, emulating eighteenth-century notions of ideal masculinity with the portrayal of the king's reason. Rapin then argued that France experienced a great deal of turmoil because of Charles' mental illness, and as a result the different men fighting for power made France very volatile. Although Henry was a brave warrior, he was a reluctant one, and humility and prudence made him appear admirable to eighteenth-century readers. In contrast, the French appeared quite cowardly. Indeed, they contemplated shameful behaviour, as Rapin noted, writing: 'If we may believe the English Historians, the Court of France, dreading the issue of war, had employed vast sums of money to bribe some persons to kill the King'.[583] While Rapin questioned whether this anecdote was accurate, it nonetheless portrayed the French as weak because of their plan to assassinate Henry V. The recourse to bribery emphasized how the French feared England's prowess in battle. This image of a scared nation with an ill king cemented the heroic portrayal of the healthy and strong Henry V.

All three battles, which saw the English at a tactical disadvantage, were used by historians to depict the bravery and perseverance of the English monarchs, who were able to overcome insurmountable odds on all occasions. Rolt emphasized that the English were vastly outnumbered at the Battle of Poitiers, with 80,000 troops for the French and 12,000 for the English, under the leadership of the Black Prince.[584] By highlighting the great difference in the size of the French and English army, Rolt underscored the bravery of the English for fighting an army that was noticeably larger

[581] Roy Porter, *Enlightenment: Britain and the Creation of the Modern World* (London: Allen Lane; Penguin Press, 2001), p. 3; Milan Zafirovski, *The Enlightenment and Its Effects on Modern Society* (New York; London: Springer, 2010), p. 132.
[582] Rapin, V, pp. 104-107.
[583] Rapin, V, p. 118.
[584] Rolt, p. 118.

than their own. As Millot set the scene for the Battle of Agincourt, he informed his readers that Henry 'was followed by a French army, which was four times more numerous than his own'.[585] Millot compared the size of the armies to highlight England's impressive victory in a difficult conflict. Rapin reported a disparity in the number of troops at Agincourt, but he challenged exaggerations by unnamed previous historians of the size of the armies, writing: 'The English Writers make the difference between the two Armies much greater, affirming the French amounted to one hundred and fifty thousand, and the English but to nine thousand. Be this at it will, it is certain the superiority of the French were vastly great'.[586] Even though Rapin considered the numbers to be an exaggeration, he still included them to underscore his point that the difference in the sizes of the army were 'great' (a term used twice in this quotation), in order to convey the difficulties that the English had to surmount in order to succeed. Johnson also reminded readers that the English were greatly outnumbered. He wrote that French historians had previously stated that the French army had

> at least four times the number of the English. Notwithstanding this great inequality, and the sickness which reigned amongst the English, they fought so desperately, that 6000 of the French were killed on the spot, and a great number taken prisoner, amongst whom were many of the first rank.[587]

Johnson cited unnamed French historians to question the reliability of these numbers. Like Rapin, he included them to call attention to the great odds that the English faced in the Battle of Agincourt. Moreover, he included prisoners 'of the first rank' to highlight the admirable proficiency of the English army. While historians were aware that there would be a disparity in figures, they nonetheless accept that the English were vastly outnumbered, making the English victory all the more thrilling to readers.

Historians highlighted the great differences in the size of the French and English armies in order to commend the English king and soldiers for their perseverance and resolve. Rapin emphasized the impressiveness of English victory by flagging a number of factors which might have hindered the English, including dysentery (referred to as

---

[585] Millot, I, p. 245.
[586] Rapin, V, p. 125.
[587] Johnson, pp. 53-54.

'flux'), limited provisions and exhaustion from days of marching. By contrast, the French 'were fresh and healthy, abounding with plenty of provisions, and labouring under no inconveniency'.[588] By suggesting that the French were in much better condition to fight, Rapin was able to claim that the English did not despair in times of hardship. Rapin argued that the English king and his men had a key advantage, which Henry himself expressed to his men before the battle, when he told them 'that the obtaining of victories depended not on numbers, but on bravery'.[589] The Prince of Wales had reportedly said this exact phrase at the Battle of Poitiers; its repetition underlined the significance of bravery in allowing the English to overcome overwhelming odds.[590]

David Hume did not share the prevalent view that commended the military prowess of the English at the three battles. Instead, Hume argued that both armies displayed undesirable behaviour. Hume argued that the victories of Agincourt, Poitiers and Crécy resulted from French failures rather than the achievements of the English. The historian summarized the similarities of the three battles and why all three were victorious for the English:

> The three great battles of Cressy [sic], Poitiers, and Azincour [sic] bore a singular resemblance to each other, in their most considerable circumstances. In all of them, there appears the same temerity in the English princes, who, without any object of moment, merely for the sake of plunder, had ventured so far into the enemies country as to leave themselves no resource; and unless saved by the upmost imprudence in the French commanders, were, from their very situation, exposed to inevitable destruction.[591]

Hume suggested the battles were only won because of French failures and omitted any mention of brave English soldiers. Instead, Hume depicted armies that ignored reason 'for the sake of plunder' and greatly risked their own lives, and country, as a consequence. The historian viewed the attitude of the English armies as a form of excessive behaviour, as they were unable to resist their need to 'plunder'. For Hume, the

---

[588] Rapin, V, p. 125.
[589] Rapin, V, p. 127.
[590] Rapin, IV, p. 285.
[591] Hume, III, pp. 108-109.

actions of the English demonstrated a lack of self-control. Hume employed the term 'temerity' to criticize the English for their bold, and somewhat rash, conduct, while censuring the French for their 'imprudence' to convey that both sides should be criticized for the precariousness of their behaviour. Even though the English were victorious, Hume argued that their boldness should not be emulated because it was inspired by excessiveness and greed. Ultimately, the English should never have been in these situations in the first place. They were simply lucky that they were not severely punished for their lack of self-control. Hume went on to say that even after these victories, the kings did not take 'advantage of their consternation'; instead, they 'relaxed their efforts, and … allowed the enemy leisure to recover from his losses'.[592] According to Hume, even in their success the English still failed in their inability to take 'advantage' during their victory. Unlike French historians, Hume did not believe that the three triumphs were deserved as they went against the ideal behaviour of eighteenth-century men and monarchs.

Both British and French historical accounts of the conflicts argued that the French made inferior tactical decisions in all three battles due to their inability to act with self-control. Johnson chastised the French King John in the Battle of Poitiers for not listening to King Edward's 'reasonable' terms for the damage he had caused and for ignoring the 'advantageous situation' of the English position.[593] Johnson thus argued that the French would have won in Poitiers had they controlled their impatience. Jones described a similar situation, as John, 'strangely elated with an assurance of Victory and success, rejected all these submissive proposals' from the Black Prince. Thus the French lost at Poitiers, like at Agincourt, because of poor military tactics in addition to their lack of level-headedness.

Through their critical depictions of French behaviour during the battles of Crécy, Poitiers and Agincourt, historians were able to highlight undesirable qualities to have in battle as well as the necessity of learning from the mistakes that resulted from them. The

---

[592] Hume, III, p. 109.
[593] Johnson, p. 46.

French losses at all three battles were used by historians to remind their readers of the need for self-control and reflection. Millot's description of Crécy was similar to his later account of Agincourt, reminding the reader that the English were vastly outnumbered but in a more 'advantageous' position, and that Philip 'could not be persuaded to defer the engagement to a more favourable opportunity' since he was 'impatient to take revenge'.[594] The reference to impatience insinuated that the French lacked self-control, which led to their defeat. Like Millot, Rapin used terms like 'impatience' and 'reveng[e]' to explain why the French attacked when they did not have the advantage at Poitiers.[595] The use of these terms emphasized the moral weakness of the French kings' character, while stressing the importance of self-control in times of conflict. Most historians, then, argued that the battles of Agincourt, Poitiers and Crécy were won thanks to the English king's model judgment and the French's tactical errors and inability to learn from past mistakes. For historians, the English kings were intelligent and level-headed in their battles, never rushing in, unlike the French.

Several historical accounts used metaphors of blindness to emphasize the detrimental effects for the French due to their lack of self-control, combined with their failure to learn from the past. For Jones, the French king at the Battle of Poitiers was 'blinded with passion and fury, instead of hemming in and starving the enemy, which he could not have failed in three days time'.[596] Jones placed much of the responsibility for France's failures at Poitiers with King John, and discussed the king to argue that passion robs men of authoritative, informed judgment. In his account of Agincourt, Rapin called the French choice of battleground an 'unpardonable blunder'. Given that the French could have chosen to have a battle at any location on the English's route to Calais, Rapin criticized Constable D'Albret's decision, writing: 'one cannot enough wonder at his blindness, which can be ascribed to nothing but his presumption'.[597] Moreover, D'Albret was 'blinded by the number of his troops'.[598] Like Jones, Rapin employed the term 'blinded' to demonstrate how passion took away one's ability to see reason, and

---

[594] Millot, I, p. 215.
[595] Rapin, IV, p. 286.
[596] David Jones, I, p. 249.
[597] Rapin, V, p. 126.
[598] Rapin, V, p. 126.

thus act wisely. Moreover, to be 'blinded' further explained why the French made the same mistakes time and time again. Rapin portrayed the French as arrogant and short on self-control. Millot claimed that the French lost at the Battle of Poitiers due to their 'impatience', in addition to their 'blind confidence'.[599] Millot used these terms to argue that the French failed to control their emotions and were unable to reflect effectively on past behaviour. As the French failed to learn from past mistakes in every battle, historians highlighted to readers their absence of reason and expected foresight.

With the Battle of Agincourt, historians argued that the French lost because they again had the recklessness and lack of prudence that they presented at the battles of Crécy and Poitiers. Millot argued that, in contrast to the French, the English soldiers had 'no recourse but in courage, in despair, and in prudence', and moreover Henry had the foresight to seize 'an advantageous ground, between two woods, in the plains of Agincourt'.[600] The description of the 'prudence' of the English formed a contrast with the poor decisions made by their French enemies. Millot argued that had the French 'declined an engagement' and waited for the English to abandon their position, then they could have been 'certain of prevailing'.[601] Millot thus contended that the French failed to learn when to act upon a tactical advantage in battle. Millot argued that the French ultimately lost because they again had 'the temerity and imprudence' that was present at 'the disasters of Crécy and Poitiers' where 'the whole army was a scene of confusion, terror and dismay'. Millot compared the three battles and used similar language in order to emphasize that the French defeat resulted from both their inability and unwillingness to learn from past mistakes, and to underscore the recklessness that they showed in battle time and time again. In the end, Millot wrote that only forty men perished fighting for England in the battle of Agincourt, while 'the constable [D'Albret], several princes of the blood, and above nine thousand knights or gentlemen lay dead on the field of battle'.[602] By highlighting French deaths, Millot was able to make the English look even more impressive. The implicit suggestion by these historians is that the French could

---

[599] Millot, I, p. 220.
[600] Millot, I, p. 245.
[601] Millot, I, p. 245.
[602] Millot, I, p. 245.

have won the battles had the French remained as level-headed as the English monarchs, exercised prudence, and applied the knowledge they had gained from past mistakes.

Historians argued that the French could have been successful were it not for their cowardice. Jones and Johnson issued similar messages about the Battle of Crécy. To Johnson, the English were vastly outnumbered, according to French historical source material that he had found.[603] According to Johnson, the English had favourable circumstances, as the French had a 'long march on the day of battle', further to the fact that the English had 'four or five large pieces of cannon, which as they had not heard anything of the kind before, struck terror into the French'.[604] Johnson was subtly arguing that, while understandably frightened, the French should have fought their internal fear and ignored the cannons. Like Johnson, Jones told his readers about the 'four or five pieces of Cannon, which much terrified the enemy, it being the first time they ever saw those murdering engines'.[605] These great cannons were used by both historians to express the need to ignore strong emotions in order to succeed. As the French were unable to control their reaction, it resulted in their defeat. The French reactions to the cannons were also included as a lesson for modern readers in both France and Britain, because warfare in the eighteenth century increasingly involved heavy artillery.[606] Jones also emphasized that the French were tired from a long march before the Battle of Crécy, 'while the English were both fresh and desperate'.[607] He then informed readers of 'a great flight of Ravens, which little before the fight were observed to hover over the French army, [and were] esteemed as a presage of their defeat'.[608] Jones mentioned the birds either to highlight that even nature itself was aware that the French were going to lose, or to suggest that the French lost due to their fear and inability to deal with a superstitious omen. Either interpretation by an eighteenth-century reader supported the idea of French weakness. Historians thereby sought to warn their readers of the dire results of cowardice as a form of the loss of self-control.

---

[603] Johnson, p. 44.
[604] Johnson, p. 44.
[605] David Jones, I, p. 239.
[606] Larry H. Addington, *The Patterns of War Through the Eighteenth Century* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), p. 141.
[607] David Jones, I, p. 239.
[608] David Jones, I, p. 239.

The cowardice of the French was further highlighted in references to the retreat of three of the French king's sons from the Battle of Poitiers. These descriptions formed a pointed comparison with the English monarchs and princes who led and inspired their men in all three battles. Jones argued that their craven actions 'gave a plausible pretence for other cowards to follow them'.[609] The princes' retreat was significant because it highlighted the king's identity and authority as a father, both to his sons and his soldiers. The princes, in their retreat, represented the disconnection between the king and his soldiers. A king was a father to his nation, and the relationship to his people was an extension of the relationship to his sons. Princes also had an imagined relationship with the nation. By abandoning their men, the princes were abandoning their country, an act that was viewed as being as dishonourable as a man abandoning his children. For Millot, the 'sudden flight' of John's son, the dauphin, 'added to the confusion and terror of the French army'.[610] The retreat of the French princes and the abandonment of their armies caused great anxiety to the soldiers. Historians argued that the princes' behaviour made it difficult for the French soldiers to control their emotions because they had not exhibited exemplary leadership.

British historians suggested that the unvirtuous actions of the French monarchs led to dishonourable behaviour in their men. Johnson wrote that France 'was reduced to a miserable condition. The people having been a long time oppressed, would not submit to the Dauphin, who took upon him the administration of affairs; the peasants paid no regard to the authority of the nobility, and the soldiers being ill paid, lived by plunder'.[611] This conduct of the French monarchy provided further explanation for the French loss at Poitiers, and made a broader statement about the importance of social hierarchy and the responsibilities of the elite. Historians argued that the social fabric would disintegrate if the social elite failed to accept their responsibilities. This belief was connected to medieval notions of chivalry, in which the actions of the nobility

---

[609] David Jones, I, p. 250.
[610] Millot, I, p. 220.
[611] Johnson, p. 46.

163

inspired others to behave chivalrously.[612] Historians hence suggested that the French could have been successful at Poitiers had their monarch had a better relationship with his people, and displayed more virtuous qualities. Ultimately, by not behaving in an exemplary manner, the French king did not inspire his men, and this behaviour led to cowardice and defeat. Historians used this example to argue that the conduct of an individual resonates outwards.

Rapin utilised the battles of Crécy and Poitiers to demonstrate how a brave and heroic monarch could inspire his men to victory. Claude Rawson argues that the 'old fashioned notion of chivalric war' from the medieval period meant gallant leaders personally led their troops into battle.[613] This concept still influenced the neoclassical writing of history in the eighteenth century. David Morse has noted that when the idea of virtue flourished between 1700 and 1800, it encouraged the ideas of 'heroic play' and of 'royal heroes' who were both 'magnificently noble and virtuous'.[614] Rapin created a heroic figure in Edward III, as he wrote that at the Battle of Crécy, the English soldiers, 'in sight of their King, witness of all their actions, marched through all these obstacles to a certain victory. It was not possible for the French to sustain so furious an attack'.[615] Here, Rapin suggested that the soldiers drew encouragement from the king's presence because they could physically see him. This perceived connection with their monarch was an illustration of the benefits of a positive relationship between a king and his men and offered a stark contrast to the depiction of the retreating French princes. Rapin also noted that the victory at Crécy was partly due to the 'the valour of the Prince of Wales, which filled the English Generals with admiration'.[616] Noble monarchs led by example, and the Prince of Wales inspired his men to victory. Although not yet king, the young prince still functioned as a lesson in ideal kingship. At the Battle of Poitiers itself, soldiers were 'encouraged by the example of the prince'.[617] Rapin thus argued that the

---

[612] Gossman, pp. 276-295; Green, p. 74.

[613] Claude Rawson, *Satire and Sentiment 1660-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 56.

[614] David Morse, *The Age of Virtue: British Culture from The Restoration to Romanticism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), p. 1.

[615] Rapin, IV, p. 264.

[616] Rapin, IV, p. 266.

[617] Rapin, IV, p. 286.

English saw great success at Poitiers because the men sought to emulate their prince. Had the prince not demonstrated such heroic qualities, the battle could have been lost. According to Rapin, the prince 'performed that day acts of wisdom and valour comparable to those of the most renowned generals'.[618] The historians characterized the prince as possessing both 'wisdom and valour'; the latter term referenced traditional heroic courage and was combined with the contemporary virtue of reason in the form of 'wisdom'. To Rapin, moreover, the Prince of Wales should be applauded because he was a humble warrior, and saw the victory as a joint effort between him and his troops. He showed his humility by thanking 'his victorious troops in such terms as ascribed to them the honour of the day, without the least mention of himself'.[619] Thus Rapin portrayed the prince as all the more virtuous because of his selflessness. This idea of humility was emphasized by the historian when he noted that the king ordered a public thanksgiving 'to be offered up to God for eight days together in all the churches of the kingdom', and that when the Prince of Wales arrived back to London, he was 'received there with effective joy' yet he 'constantly refused all the honours they would have done him'.[620] Rapin used the characteristic of humility to portray a virtuous monarch while emphasizing that this type of king was well-liked by his people.

Historians indicated that these three victories were won because the English soldiers adored and respected their king, while the French monarchs failed to inspire such loyalty, or bravery. Esteem for their monarch meant that men followed him bravely into battle. The accounts suggest that the French lost because they did not hold the same respect and adoration for their monarch. According to Johnson, 'many French Lords being dissatisfied with their king, were indifferent about his success'.[621] Johnson argued that the necessity of respect for a king for military success was demonstrated by the French demise at Crécy. For Rapin, Henry's 'bold action' inspired his men, despite the resulting blow to his head that made him fall to his knees. Rather than letting his injuries overcome him, Henry rose again, and 'the hazard the King was exposed to, and the

---

[618] Rapin, IV, p. 286.
[619] Rapin, IV, p. 288.
[620] Rapin, IV, p. 288.
[621] Johnson, p. 44.

wonders he performed, inspired his troops with a sort of fury'.[622] Henry gave his men the courage to fight and, ultimately, to win the Battle of Agincourt. The 'wonders' that Henry exhibited corresponded with the deeds of epic heroes, who were exceptional individuals who often received supernatural assistance, which allowed them to surpass normal human limits. The king led by example, and was so inspirational to his men that he gave them a furious strength. Rapin argued that the king's 'exhortations had so wonderful an effect, that officers and soldiers, far from dreading the great number of their enemies, wanted nothing more than to join Battle with them'.[623] The king's ability to overcome his pain enabled him to motivate his men. His ability to ignore injury suggested he had admirable self-control. Rapin also attributed the good relationship between the king and his soldiers to the king's behaviour in the three days before the Battle of Agincourt, where 'Henry never ceased to inspire his Troops with Courage'.[624] Henry was inspirational to his men, and well-liked due to his bravery. Rapin measured Henry's reign according to how he was esteemed by his people, and how Henry's own chivalric deeds inspired his men. In his lengthy descriptions of Agincourt, Rapin had nothing but praise for Henry's valour, noting that the king was 'still more animated by the danger he had run'.[625] Rather than showing fear, the account demonstrated Henry's ideal behaviour in battle in his ability to overcome, and thrive on, danger. Rapin had asserted even before the battle that Henry was 'naturally very bold and courageous'.[626] With these numerous positive attributes, the historian displayed his great admiration for Henry. To Rapin, Henry's bravery ultimately led to the victory at Agincourt, due to the bond it created with his men. Henry led by example and historians used him to express the idea that ideal kingship that was generated by the powerful bond between a monarch and his people. According to eighteenth-century historians, the ideal monarch was able to control his emotions in war, inspire his men, and learn from past mistakes.

Accounts of The Hundred Years War, especially the battles of Agincourt, Poitiers and Crécy, conveyed the views of both French and British historians about ideal

---

[622] Rapin, V, p. 130.
[623] Rapin, V, p. 125.
[624] Rapin, V, p. 124.
[625] Rapin, V, p. 130.
[626] Rapin, V, p. 101.

kingship and masculinity. Drawing on the epic, eighteenth-century historians used the battles to provide instruction on virtuous behaviour in conflict. English monarchs were used to depict eighteenth-century notions of chivalry and masculinity, and the brave king who heroically led his men into battle was a trope that drew inspiration from the epic. Hume believed these battles were only successful for the English due to French folly as he saw the behaviour of the English as imprudent and unreasonable. Although all authors agreed that French failures played a part, French and British historians, Hume excepted, placed more emphasis on the brave actions of English monarchs who were able to overcome insurmountable odds.

Conclusion

In the eighteenth century, French and British historians approached ideal kingship according to the types of conflict in which a monarch was depicted. French historians used the Norman Conquest, the Crusades and the battles of Crécy, Poitiers and Agincourt to examine the ideal kingly behaviour of English monarchs. Moreover, the typical audience of neoclassical histories was extended by the historians to princes as well as the middling sort. Historians wrote their accounts in an accessible way, to help their widening readership to connect to and understand the motives of historical figures and events.[627] The way historians wrote about conflicts demonstrates that they wrote their accounts with varied audiences in mind. Historians thus used deliberate narrative strategies to convey eighteenth-century notions of masculinity in periods of war. These ideal qualities included several virtues which were prominent in the epic, such as bravery, and heroism, as well as eighteenth-century ideals of honour, patience, and self-control.

The accounts of Rapin, Millot and Raynal demonstrate how neoclassical historians drew inspiration from both the classical and medieval epic, as they

---

[627] Phillips, p. 65.

transformed the ideals of the epic to fit with eighteenth-century notions of morality and masculinity. Their combination of traditional and contemporary ideals meant that these eighteenth-century historians' accounts were widely accepted. Inspired by the medieval epic, historians contended that contemporary and traditional notions of chivalry produced the ideal king, prince and man. The ideal king led his men by example, and could encourage a willing and adoring army into battle by exhibiting bravery. He was well-liked by his people, which furthered a monarch's advantage. Notions of honour also blended with notions of gallantry, as evidenced by the polite treatment of the King John of France when he became the prisoner of the English after the Battle of Poitiers.

Eighteenth-century historians, both French and British, perceived the notion of self-control to be incredibly important to the lessons on virtue that they imparted in their historical accounts. Historians employed the term 'prudence' in accounts of all three conflicts to convey the importance of equanimity. The ability to control one's passions was necessary for ideal kingship, as well as ideal masculinity. Historians portrayed the exemplary monarch as a man in control of his emotions who could ignore the natural instincts of anger, and revenge, and accept patience and reason instead. The term 'blindness' was used repeatedly to convey that a failure to control passion took away the ability to see reason. If a king possessed these negative qualities, he would fail and jeopardize his country, as in the case of King Harold and the Anglo-Saxons, or King John of France at Poitiers. Historians also argued that uncontrolled passions and the absence of reason resulted in religious zealot. Fanaticism was criticized greatly by historians, and the massacre of the Jewish people in England before Richard I embarked on the Third Crusade was presented as an example of its consequences. Historians believed that self-control could be an acquired virtue, as they explored in accounts of Henry V's reformation of character when he inherited the throne of England. The virtue of equanimity was likewise achieved when a monarch was able to ignore his fears, and behave bravely instead. Ultimately, self-control led to model kingship and ideal masculinity.

French historical accounts of English kingship, in which interpretations changed according to the type of warfare in which the king was involved, demonstrate the shifting ways in which people viewed their past in the eighteenth century. The way in which historians depicted certain events and figures as barbarous shows that the philosophical view of progressive history had started to take hold during the period.[628] When a historian used the term 'barbaric', as Millot did when discussing the Anglo-Saxons, or Hume did in describing Richard I, he achieved three things. He distanced himself from the past, subscribed to a progressive form of history, and argued that the behaviour was not to be emulated.

In their accounts of periods of war, eighteenth-century historians commented on ideal behaviour for kings, princes and men. While they provided many examples of vices as contrasts to virtues, they also argued that anybody could achieve the model behaviour exhibited by venerated historical figures. In the depiction of some figures as heroes, emulating the epic, they argued that ideal masculinity or kingship could still be achieved after a transformation. Richard experienced a religious transformation on his way to the Third Crusade. When Henry V became king, he was able to rise up and accept his responsibilities with grace. These examples conveyed to readers that they could emulate such behaviour regardless of their own history.

The continuous conflict between France and Britain in the eighteenth century and the resounding effects it had on British society did not affect the prevalence of histories of England written by French authors. With the exception of Hume's analysis of the battles of Crécy, Poitiers and Agincourt, French and British historians portrayed kings in conflict in very similar ways, using the same notions of ideal behaviour to critique figures of the past. These correspondences between their accounts confirm the presence of shared Franco-British historiographical cultures. Parallel interpretations of conflicts in historical texts written by authors from both nations emerged from the shared experience of war. The shared approach to neoclassical history writing produced accounts on both sides of the Channel that aimed to impart ideas of virtues to French

---

[628] O'Brien, pp. 132-134; White p. 62.

and British readers. These similarities meant that the works of Rapin, Millot and Raynal were relevant to, and understood by, their British readers.

Chapter 3: The King as a Husband and Father

In this chapter I argue that historians examined kingship to give moral instruction in ideals of masculine and feminine domestic behaviour. French historians discussed the reign of Henry VIII (1491-1547) and the king's relationships with his family, court and household to explore the changing patriarchal and paternal roles of the eighteenth-century man. Historians wrote the history of Henry's reign and the lives of his six wives, especially Catherine of Aragon (1485-1536) and Anne Boleyn (1501-1536), in a manner that imparted their ideas of eighteenth-century virtuous behaviour. Rapin, Millot and Raynal presented ideals of kingship and gender roles in their writings about these historical figures. Their accounts will demonstrate how historians explored the inner and outer selves of the historical figures they discussed, in order to explain each individual's motives and actions within both the public and personal spheres.[629] These authors assessed Henry against eighteenth-century notions of masculinity and virtue, and criticized the king for his lack of equanimity and fiery temper. This approach enabled them to instruct male readers on ideal masculine behaviours for husbands and fathers, as eighteenth-century readers were aware of the notion of the king as a father to his household.[630] Writers also sought to draw attention to the relationship between a king's personal life and his public role. This chapter will argue that French historians did not portray an ideal father and king as an absolute ruler of his household and kingdom. Instead, they included notions of eighteenth-century sensibility to prescribe notions of the model father that fit with contemporary ideals.

This chapter examines the ideal patriarchal and paternal roles which featured in eighteenth-century French historical writing of English history, especially works by Rapin, Raynal and Millot. David Hume's *History* will form a point of comparison. A

---

[629] Neil Hargraves, 'Revelations of Character in Eighteenth-Century Historiography and William Robertson's *History of the Reign of Charles V*', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 27:2 (2008), 23-48 (p. 24).
[630] Melissa A. Butler, 'Early Liberal Roots of Feminism: John Locke and the Attack on Patriarchy', *The American Political Science Review*, 72:1 (1978), 135-150 (pp. 135-136).

close reading of these texts and their depictions of Henry VIII as husband and father provides insights into eighteenth-century masculine ideals of honour, morality and patriarchy. The figure of Henry VIII held a particular resonance in eighteenth-century British culture. In literature and art, he was predominantly presented as an impulsive, despotic king, whose actions were nevertheless forgivable as he created stability for Britain through his establishment of the Church of England.[631] Others took a different view of Henry's legacy. For the author of a *Tatler* article published in 1710, Henry 'only usurped ecclesiastical power from pope and priests but kept the popish doctrine'.[632] Although debates about Henry VIII's personal faith continued, eighteenth-century authors accepted that he had been instrumental in the creation of the Anglican Church. In commenting on Henry VIII's behaviour, French historians assessed ideal kingship and masculinity.

Historical accounts of Henry VIII provide a means of examining the ways in which the concept of virtue changed in the eighteenth century. As Marisa Linton argues: 'it was no longer enough to feel virtuous; one also ought to act virtuously'.[633] This change meant that virtue became a more public act and was expected to be a visible part of one's character. In Britain, eighteenth-century notions of virtue, inspired by republican ideals, were often expressed in terms of devotion to the public good.[634] Morse argues that 'those who acted not selfishly but in the best interests of the state and the people were virtuous'.[635] He also listed the first definition of what he believed to be virtue in the eighteenth century to be '*promoting and advancing the public good*'.[636] The new application of virtue is found in the way eighteenth-century historians judged virtuous qualities of both the private and public actions of English monarchs, especially Henry VIII. In France, the religious

---

[631] Ronald Paulson, 'The Henry VIII Story in the Eighteenth Century: Words and Images', in *Henry VIII and His Afterlives: Literature, Politics, and Art*, ed. by Mark Rankin, Christopher Highley, John N. King (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 115-139 (pp. 124-128).

[632] Tatler, *issue 220* (London: September 5, 1710).

[633] Marisa Linton, *The Politics of Virtue in Enlightenment France* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), p. 110.

[634] J.G.A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 42-50.

[635] David Morse, *The Age of Virtue: British Culture from the Restoration to Romanticism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), p. 2.

[636] Morse, p. 7.

connotations of virtuous kingship diminished gradually but steadily over the course of the eighteenth century, and the king's virtues came to be viewed in similar terms to the virtues of the everyday citizen.[637] Similar notions developed in Britain, where works like Bolingbroke's *Idea of a Patriot King* (1738) promoted the idea that a monarch should be a virtuous and independent ruler, who acted in the best interests of his people.[638] These ideal views of kingly virtue were employed in the writings of Rapin, Raynal and Millot about the reigns of past kings, and were used to examine the private life of Henry VIII.

The patriarchal and paternal role of the king became much more prominent in the eighteenth century. As warfare took place at a distance in this period, the king's role in local affairs became much more visible.[639] While for a long time there had been the association with the commandment to 'honour thy father' as a shorthand for obeying political authority, the notion of the king as father to his people was transformed in the eighteenth century.[640] The political meanings of fatherhood changed following the dilution of ideas of absolute monarchical rule and the position of a monarch as the divinely ordained father of his people.[641] The care of dependents was an important part of a patriarch's responsibilities in Britain. An honourable, respectable householder and ideal man was supposed to care for his family by ensuring their emotional, financial and physical welfare.[642] In France, as fatherhood became less authoritarian and more affectionate relations developed within the family, kingship became associated with a less patriarchal and more paternalistic ethos.[643] This chapter analyses how Rapin, Millot and Raynal explored this development in the more personal aspects of kingship, especially how being a father and husband affected a king's public role.

---

[637] Linton, *The Politics of Virtue*, pp. 148-149.
[638] Morse, p. 3.
[639] Jeffrey Merrick, 'Politics on Pedestals: Royal Monuments in Eighteenth-Century France', *French History*, 5:2 (1991), 234-264 (p. 238); Jeffrey Merrick, 'Patriarchalism and Constitutionalism in Eighteenth-Century Parliamentary Discourse', *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture*, 20 (1990), 317-330.
[640] Butler, pp. 135-136.
[641] Butler, pp. 135-136.
[642] Lisa Smith, 'The Relative Duties of a Man: Domestic Medicine in England and France, 1685-1740', *Journal of Family History,* 31 (2006), 237-256 (p. 249).
[643] Merrick, *Politics on Pedestals,* p. 238.

Eighteenth-century historians examined the personal life of Henry VIII, and how relationships within his household affected his public responsibilities as king. The concept of the king as a father to his nation was a dominant belief in the early modern period, and was used by kings to promote their royal power.[644] In the eighteenth century, the ideal father was increasingly portrayed as a man who was compassionate with his children, and whose relationship with his son came second to that with his wife.[645] As we saw in Chapter 2, chivalry was often associated with politeness and manners in the eighteenth century, and this was applied to men's relations with women and the family. Men were thus expected to treat women with higher regard.[646] Commentators earlier in the eighteenth century often viewed fatherhood as something that should strengthen a husband's ties of affection towards his spouse, which meant that fathers were held increasingly liable for adultery.[647] In historical accounts, the respectful treatment of wives formed part of the depiction of an honourable king, especially as during the eighteenth century honour represented an individual's character, and constructed how one considered the relationship between the personal and the public.[648] Honour encompassed both the respectful treatment of others as well as the importance of the duty of obligation.[649] French historians therefore admonished Henry VIII for his deficiency as a husband due to the way he behaved towards his numerous wives.

Similarly, a husband was expected to control his passions if he was to live up to contemporary standards of virtue. Robert Jones argues that 'anything less than stoic

---

[644] Jennifer Germann, 'Fecund Fathers and Missing Mothers: Louis XV, Marie Leszczinska, and The Politics of Royal Parentage in the 1720s', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 36 (2007), 105-126 (p. 108).

[645] Philip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society: 1660-1800* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), pp. 97-99.

[646] Michèle Cohen, '"Manners" Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750-1830', *Journal of British Studies*, 44:2 (2005), 312-329 (p. 319).

[647] David M. Turner, *Fashioning Adultery: Gender, Sex and Civility in England 1660-1740* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 59.

[648] Faramerz Dabhoiwala, 'The Construction of Honour, Reputation and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6 (1996), 201-213 (p. 201).

[649] *OED Online*, 'honour, n.', (Oxford University Press, 2018) < http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/88228?rskey=MDk9Zv&result=2&isAdvanced=false#eid> [Accessed 14 April 2018].

resolve' was viewed 'as degenerate and unmanly'.[650] The way in which historians judged Henry VIII's actions, motivated primarily by unrestrained passion, exemplifies the argument that equanimity was crucial to ideal masculinity. In addition to this notion of self-control, it was argued that a man's lack of sexual restraint could affect the health of his wife as well as the fertility of the household. In eighteenth-century medical literature writers regularly held men responsible for introducing illnesses, such as gonorrhoea (which was then considered a primary cause of sterility) into their marriages.[651] If a man did not contain his desires and exercise self-control, he put the future of his family at risk, and eighteenth-century historians used Henry VIII as the archetype to demonstrate the issues with this unvirtuous behaviour.

Scholarly debates about the nature of eighteenth-century family and gender roles were amplified by the publication of Lawrence Stone's *Family, Sex and Marriage* (1977), which argued that the patriarchal family was supplanted by a companionate one during this period. Stone argues that emotion and romantic love replaced order and hierarchy.[652] While Stone's arguments have been disputed, the emerging public role of sentiment and sociability did affect the way people viewed and discussed marriage, and historians reflected this change in the way they encouraged readers not to emulate Henry's poor treatment of his wives.[653] Patriarchy and affection, they suggested, were not incompatible. As Robert B. Shoemaker argues, 'patriarchal authority and love were not inconsistent with one another and were both common aspects of marriage'

---

[650] Robert W. Jones, *Gender and the Formation of Taste in Eighteenth-Century Britain: The Analysis of Beauty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 5.

[651] Lisa Smith, p. 248.

[652] Lawrence Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977).

[653] For historians who have disputed Stone's interpretation, see Susan Dwyer Amussen, 'Approaching a New English Social History, 1500-1850', *Historical Journal*, 38:3 (1995), 679-685; Elizabeth Kowaleski-Wallace ed., *Their Fathers' Daughters: Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth, and Patriarchal Complicity* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); Joanne Bailey, 'Family Relationships', in *A Cultural History of Childhood and Family in the Age of Enlightenment,* ed. by E. Foyster and J. Marten (Oxford; New York: Berg, 2010) pp. 15-31; Colin Heywood, *Growing up in France: From the Ancien Regime to the Third Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 143-155; Ralph A. Houlebrooke, *The English Family 1450-1700* (London and New York: Longman, 1984), pp. 96-125; Linda A. Pollack, *Forgotten Children: Parent-child Relations from 1500 to 1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 144-156; Keith Wrightson, *English Society 1580-1680* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1982), pp. 97-128.

throughout the eighteenth century.[654] This chapter will explore historical depictions of marriage, as historians argued for the necessity of both patriarchal authority and love. They contended that one could strengthen the other, both on a domestic and on a national scale, by inspecting the role of the king and his nation in parallel with the role of father and his household. Karen Harvey explores the changing nature of domestic patriarchy in the eighteenth century, arguing that in conjunction with the changing values of female domesticity, the nature of the 'home' was transformed.[655] Harvey employs the discourse of 'oeconomy', which was the belief that eighteenth-century ideal masculinity saw the linking together of the good governance of the household and the nation.[656] Changing views of eighteenth-century marriage and gender roles affected the way eighteenth-century historians evaluated the relationship between Henry VIII and his wives and children. By depicting all of Henry's marriages and relationships with his children as lacking in affection and love, historians presented Henry as a tyrannical father and flawed king. By making implicit connections between household and nation, historians demonstrated to their varied readers how behaviour within the domestic sphere affected one's public life outside of the household.

Current scholarship on the historical legacy of Henry VIII focuses on how literary texts influenced historical views. Thomas Betteridge and Thomas S. Freeman's collection on Henry VIII is useful for its examination of Henry's reputation in the period between his death and the present, while dealing with influences such as the outbreak of the English Civil War and the expansion of English print culture in the eighteenth century. Betteridge and Freeman argue that many of the traditional perceptions of Henry VIII emerged between his death and the Civil War, and endured throughout the eighteenth century and beyond. Henry's capricious behaviour, the beheadings of multiple wives and his tyrannical kingship were central, recurring features of these discourses. Many of these elements can be found in Shakespeare's play *Henry VIII*

---

[654] Robert B. Shoemaker, *Gender in English society, 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres?* (Harlow; London: Longman, 1998), p. 102.
[655] Karen Harvey, *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) pp. 1, 66.
[656] Harvey, pp. 1, 66.

176

(1613).[657] This play shaped ongoing discourses, making a particular contribution to the way in which historians focused on Henry's multiple marriages and the methods the king chose to end them. Eighteenth-century historical texts often presented Henry as despotic. Historians frequently used various forms of the term 'tyrannical' to describe Henry's actions and reign. Andrew Sarkie has drawn attention to other literary influences on historical perceptions of Henry, such as Gilbert Burnet's *History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (1679).[658] Sarkie argues that Burnet's history was one of the most influential accounts of Henry VIII in the eighteenth century and examines the reasons behind its influence. Sarkie notes that Burnet's Henry VIII was a monarch who was 'swayed by his advisors and favourites' and 'who was influenced by his women'.[659] The texts of Rapin, Raynal, Millot and Hume repeat these ideas, and historians used them to comment on issues of masculinity and kingship, as this chapter will explore. Historians discussed Henry's wives to argue that queens, mistresses, their families, and advisors all manipulated the king.

Previous scholarship has also emphasized the importance of the establishment of the Church of England in historical accounts of Henry VIII. Ronald Paulson's study of Henry VIII provides useful insights into how the Tudor king was depicted in popular historical texts and images during the eighteenth century. Paulson's examination of the works of Hogarth, Hume, Burnet and Swift argues for the historical significance of the establishment of the Anglican Church amongst above other aspects and consequences of Henry's reign.[660] Paulson's exploration of Henry's historical legacy in the eighteenth century helps us to understand the varied portrayals of Henry VIII in French and British historical texts. While Henry's creation of the Church of England was revered by British historians and redeemed the Tudor king as a historical figure, French historians placed greater emphasis on his failings in his role as father and husband.

---

[657] Thomas Betteridge and Thomas S. Freeman, 'Introduction: All is True – Henry VIII in and Out of History', in *Henry VIII and History,* ed. by Thomas Betteridge and Thomas S. Freeman (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), pp. 1-20 (pp. 4-9).
[658] Andrew Sarkie, 'Henry VIII in History: Gilbert Burnet's *History of the Reformation* (v.1), 1679', in Betteridge and Freeman, pp. 151-163.
[659] Sarkie, p. 162.
[660] Paulson, pp. 115-140.

This chapter contributes to my argument that the success of French historical works in Britain was due to their emphasis on the private lives and passions of rulers and their ability to make their subjects relevant to an expanding British readership. I argue that French historians followed the neoclassical ideal in their use of kings as moral exemplars, and portrayed an ideal king as one who did not let his personal emotions affect the wellbeing of his country. My research provides insights into the ideal qualities and behaviours of kings in their personal relationships, and how a king's roles as husband and father affected ideal kingship. Henry VIII was a useful historical figure for authors to discuss as he presented the opportunity to comment on the nature of fatherhood, marriage, and masculinity, as well as kingship. He also allowed historians to discuss the need for both private and public virtues, as Henry's actions as husband and father were perceived to influence his public role as king.

In both France and Britain, kings regularly had affairs outside of marriage. Henry VIII's sexuality had a great impact on his politics, with major consequences for his nation, especially due to his role in the creation of the Church of England. Rapin, Millot and Raynal believed that Henry was ruled by his passions, and his marital choices contributed to great religious upheaval when Henry broke with Rome and made himself head of the Church. French historians cast judgment on Henry's choices and exhibited how one's personal and domestic decisions affected the nation and the public good. They also characterized his wives according to eighteenth-century notions of virtue. The following five sections in this chapter will explore these depictions.

The first section will examine the portrayal of ideal eighteenth-century marriage in French historical accounts of Henry VIII and his marriages to Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn. Historians used the concepts of divorce, annulment and remarriage to assess the consequences of Henry's actions as both a husband and king. The second section analyses ideal masculinity through the way in which Henry's many vices were depicted. It will examine how historians argued that these vices affected his role as husband and undermined his ability to be an ideal king. The following section will examine portrayals of Henry as a father. It will explore depictions of the tensions

between Henry's paternal and patriarchal roles, while considering issues of inheritance and paternity. The fourth section will use accounts of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn to understand how eighteenth-century historians used the wives of Henry VIII to impart the archetype of the ideal woman. Historians used themes of motherhood, beauty and virtuous behaviour in their writings about Catherine and Anne to portray ideal eighteenth-century female qualities and behaviour. The final section will address the rejection of Henry VIII as an ideal king by eighteenth-century French historians, as they viewed the king's court as an extension of his household. They argued that Henry had failed this household, and drew attention to the negative influence of malignant advisors whilst also criticizing his vulnerability to suggestion and external influence. While the Church of England brought long-lasting stability to Britain, French authors were much less forgiving of Henry's despotic tendencies in comparison with their British counterparts. French authors communicated this disapproval through their portrayal of the famous Tudor king as a tyrannical, tempestuous and malleable ruler.

These five sections will demonstrate that, according to eighteenth-century historians, ideal kingship required a king to be able to separate his personal desires from the public good. By examining the relationship between a king and his wives and children, historians argued for the need of moral behaviour in all facets of life. To historians, morality required virtue to be present in both the public and domestic spheres.

Section 1: Marriage and its Creation and Dissolution

Changing notions of marriage, and the ways in which it began and ended, were prominent in eighteenth-century historical accounts. Henry VIII's first marriage to Catherine of Aragon and its dissolution allowed historians to comment on the changing nature of marriage and divorce in the eighteenth century. The creation of the Church of England also influenced the way French and British historians discussed

Henry's motives and behaviour in his marriages. The belief in the divine influence of God was employed by some historians to support Henry's role in creating the new Church, and to excuse Henry's dishonourable behaviour. British historians demonstrated the importance of a suitable spouse for a successful marriage when discussing Catherine of Aragon. Historians emphasized her age and health to suggest that she was neither a suitable queen nor wife. Henry's annulment of his first marriage allowed French historians to discuss the nature of annulment, and the consequences it caused for both household and country. Through accounts of Henry's marriages to Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn, eighteenth-century historians were able to convey the important role of morality and honour in the creation of marriage, and its end.

Views about divorce were changing during the eighteenth century. In France, *philosophes* advocated for changes in perceptions of marriage and for changes in the law. The *philosophes* thought that a more flexible approach to the dissolution of marriage would be useful, so that divorce would provide a check on paternal power, and this check would ultimately lead to an increase in good public morals and an improved society. The *philosophes* often referred to the permissibility of divorce in Ancient Rome.[661] French historians, however, were unable to defend this new notion of divorce in their texts as Henry's reasons for divorce were not deemed honourable. They felt that Henry's personal desires did not warrant the dissolution of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon, nor did the divorce check his paternal power or increase public morals. While British historians, namely Hume, saw the establishment of the Church of England as a positive outcome that warranted the dissolution of the marriage, French authors focused more on Henry's infatuation with Anne Boleyn as the factor that contributed most to England's break with Rome. French historians focused on the dishonour with which Henry pursued and ended his marriages. Rapin, Millot and Raynal suggested that the divorce was essentially a direct result of Henry's uncontrolled desire for a woman who was not his wife, and not a desire to improve the welfare of his nation.

---

[661] James F. Traer, *Marriage and the Family in Eighteenth-Century France* (Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 49-55, 337.

By the eighteenth century, several works had been published in England that defended Henry's actions in the creation of the Church of England, and Henry's involvement greatly influenced British historical accounts. These works were less influential in France, and account for the disparities in the motives provided by French and British historians for Henry VIII's break with the Catholic Church. In Britain, the prevailing historical view of Henry VIII in the eighteenth century was based on Holinshed's Elizabethan *Chronicles* (1577), *The Life and Reign of Henry VIII* (1649) by Edward Herbert the Lord of Cherbury, Gilbert Burnet's *History of the Reformation* (1679), and David Hume's *History of the Tudors* (1759).[662] Ronald Paulson argues that all of these historians agree that generally Henry 'was a cruel, capricious, and despotic king' but that his actions were defensible because of the resulting 'triumph of England's Protestantism'.[663] Given the popular support of Protestantism and its role in British national identity in the eighteenth century, this view is not surprising. British historians' forgiveness of Henry demonstrates the importance of the creation of the Church of England to the eighteenth-century Briton. French historians, on the other hand, did not find redemption for Henry in his creation of the Church. Burnet was especially influential during this period, and he argued that Henry's disposition was a necessary quality that ultimately helped to establish Protestantism. In his preface, Burnet stated this very argument to introduce his work, writing that it was 'a signal providence of God, in raising a king of his temper, for clearing the way to that blessed work that followed; and that could hardly have been done but by a man of his humour'.[664] The eighteenth-century British public believed that Henry VIII was not exemplary in his personal behaviour, due to his unpredictable constitution. His 'humour', as described by Burnet, was 'unconstant' and 'swayed' by 'passions', and yet it was excusable and even forgivable as it was part of a divine plan to introduce Protestantism to England.[665] This interpretation also implied that eighteenth-century readers were aware that Henry VIII was not a typical neoclassical exemplary figure, despite positive overall assessments of his reign by British historians.

---

[662] Paulson, p. 128; Sarkie, p. 151.
[663] Paulson, p. 128.
[664] Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, 2 vols (London, T.H. for Richard Chiswell, 1715), I, p. VI.
[665] Burnet, I, p. V.

British views of Henry VIII are exemplified by the historical account of Hume, who vindicated Henry's behaviour in his argument that England was unhappy under the rule of Catholicism. Hume argued that the creation of the Church of England had been necessary, and portrayed the Catholic Church as an unfair institution that did not prioritize England's welfare.[666] Hume argued that during Henry's reign many held 'a disgust against the restraints of the old religion', and 'an indignation against the tyranny and interested spirit of the ecclesiastics'.[667] Hume made it clear to the reader that a break with Rome and the creation of the Church of England was imperative for the welfare of the nation. While Burnet interpreted the creation of the Church of England to be a result of divine intervention, Hume analysed its creation to align with the Scottish Enlightenment view of 'stadial history'.[668] To the historian, the break with Rome was a necessary step for the advancement of England as a nation.

French historians, by contrast, discussed the creation of the Church of England to explore the nature of annulment and the dishonourable consequences which resulted from the end of marriage. The annulment of Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine of Aragon was viewed by French historians as the king's genuine motive for his decision to break with Rome. French historians felt that his decision to pursue this annulment indicated a lack of honour and therefore virtue. Annulment posed a threat to the nation that corresponded with the threat that it posed to the domestic family, namely that it disrupted and invited danger to the household. For Henry, this household was the nation of England. Both French and British historians conveyed to readers that Henry's personal family matters, the microcosm, inevitably affected his greater kingdom, the macrocosm, in the creation of the Church of England. British historians believed that his turbulent character was secondary to his role in freeing Britain from the Catholic Church. French historians, however, focused on the negative aspects of Henry's character and the potential dangers his actions brought upon his household and country.

---

[666] David Hume, *The History of England*, 2nd edn, 8 vols (London: A. Millar, 1763), IV pp. 136-140.
[667] Hume, IV, p. 138.
[668] Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 132-133.

Raynal and Millot argued that the break with Rome risked the safety of the nation as it created enemies of their previous political allies who remained Catholic. They argued that Henry's actions as king were influenced by the lack of virtue in his personal life, and deemed the king dishonourable for risking the safety of his people. This view meant that Henry's actions as father and husband, and their effect on his decisions as a king, were not redeemable. Raynal was concerned about the effects of the break with Rome on the lives of everyday people in England. He argued that Henry had 'laid the foundation of that famous divorce which ruined the Roman Catholic religion in England, and of a nation of Martyrs made it the Country of Heretics'.[669] Raynal thus argued that Henry jeopardized his nation in order to marry Anne Boleyn. With the reference to 'martyrs' he highlighted the nation's previously strong Catholic faith. Employing the term 'heretics' emphasized the magnitude of Henry's actions, as it suggested that he jeopardized the very souls of his people. In his desire for a new wife, Henry thus endangered the household that was his kingdom. Millot made a similar argument when he wrote that 'the Kingdom of England, the most devoted to the Holy See; and the most lavish to it in its favours, became its irreconcilable enemy'.[670] Millot argued that Henry created political enemies in England's break with Rome. England, which before had benefited from alliances with a number of Catholic polities, had now turned these Catholic nations into political enemies. Millot underscored the importance of the previous alliance in the use of the terms 'lavish' and 'favours'. He then employed the term 'irreconcilable' to emphasize the magnitude of Henry's actions. To Millot and Raynal, the break with Rome and annulment endangered the entire country, just as an annulment or divorce jeopardized the family and household.

Rapin, like Raynal and Millot, argued that the Church of England was created not because of Henry's desire to reform England's faith, but in order to end his marriage. Rapin considered Henry's motivations for the break with Rome. He queried whether

---

[669] Abbé Raynal, *The History of the Parliament of England,* trans. by [Anon] (London: T. Osbourne, 1751), p. 154.
[670] Abbé Millot, *Elements of the History of England*, trans. by Mr Kenrick, 2 vols (Dublin: James Williams, 1771), I, p. 329.

Henry's motives were due to matters of faith, or Henry's personal desire to divorce Catherine, writing:

> Hence therefore it may be inferred, that the King's proceedings in the late parliament, and the steps he made afterwards, flowed not so much from his real opinion, that the Papal Authority was all usurpation, as from his seeing there was no other way to get out of the plunge he was in.[671]

Rapin judged that Henry had created a considerable predicament for himself, and as a result the king had no choice but to pursue the matter of annulment until it was resolved. The historian used the term 'plunge' to insinuate that Henry was at fault for his quandary. He argued that the Church of England was created merely because, as he had put it, Henry had 'no other way' available to him. He implied that the Church of England was not created because of Henry's belief in the Protestant faith, but because of his desire to rid himself of Catherine of Aragon. A dozen pages later, Rapin detailed the motives for Henry's divorce and pondered whether he 'was fully convinced that the marriage was contrary to the Law of God', before informing the reader that no one would ever know what Henry truly believed. However, Rapin then conjectured that it may in fact have been 'only a pretence to get rid of Catherine, and to marry Anne Boleyn'.[672] Rapin's use of 'pretence' reflects his estimation of Henry's actions. In his pursuit of impartiality, the historian included three pieces of evidence to support his opinion. First, that Henry had been married eighteen years before he decided his marriage was unlawful. Second, that his love affair with Anne Boleyn made Henry 'press the affair of the divorce with the greatest earnestness'. Third, that Cardinal Wolsey had inspired the king to seek the divorce, 'to be revenged of the Emperor and the Queen'.[673] To Rapin, these motives did not warrant the dissolution of a marriage, either in the sixteenth or the eighteenth century. Each of the three points related to Henry's personal life, but affected his public decisions and role as king. Rapin concluded his thoughts on the matter by telling his readers that 'very few of the parties concerned acted from any other than political views, without much regard to the

---

[671] Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, *The History of England*, trans. by Nicolas Tindal, 15 vols (London: James and John Knapton, 1725-1731), VII, p. 452.
[672] Rapin, VII, p. 463.
[673] Rapin, VII, p. 463.

precepts of religion'.[674] Unlike Hume, Rapin focused on whether Henry truly believed in the Protestant cause, or whether he simply wanted a new wife. By emphasizing Henry's personal desires, the French historian implied that Henry's motives and actions were dishonourable, and argued that the king should not be forgiven simply because he created the Church of England.

However, Rapin, a Huguenot, felt that the establishment of the Church of England was ultimately in the nation's best interest, and emphasized divine influence in the Church's creation. Woolf argues that the role of divine intervention in historical accounts, in which 'the course of history was predetermined' by God, had diminished by the mid-seventeenth century. In the older tradition, it was believed that the unfolding of history was foreknown by God and part of his divine will.[675] After the Civil War and Interregnum, the past was employed by historians to explain disasters in a way that cast blame on their opponents.[676] Uncharacteristically, Rapin argued that the formation of the Church was all in the plan of God, 'who rules and directs all actions of men' and 'the end he designed' was 'the Reformation of the Church of England'.[677] Rapin's Huguenot faith was reflected in this argument, because for the historian, the Church of England was one of the important cornerstones of the modern Britain he so admired. Rapin's history, written in the early eighteenth century, made few references to the role of God. Rapin's use of divine intervention is similar to Gilbert Burnet's approach. Both writers employed this explanation to defend the importance of the creation of the Church of England in Britain's development. Unlike Burnet and Hume, however, Rapin allowed himself to be avidly critical of Henry's personal conduct.

Rapin also suggested that England's break with Rome was the fault of Pope Clement VII, as well as the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V (1500-1558), nephew of Catherine of Aragon. Rapin believed the pope felt threatened by the emperor, and as a

---

[674] Rapin, VII, p. 468
[675] D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and "The light of truth" from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto; London: University of Toronto Press, 1990), p. 8.
[676] Woolf, *The Idea of History,* pp. 4-8, 247; Royce Macgillivray, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague: Nijhof, 1974), p. 228.
[677] Rapin, VII, p. 468

result affected the pope's decision to grant a dispensation. As Rapin wrote, the emperor, 'from motives of honour', did not want to see his aunt usurped and 'had not the emperor been concerned in the Affair, it would have been the easiest thing in the world to find an expedient to content the king, without detriment to the Papal Authority'.[678] Rapin understood Charles V's motives and did not wholly condemn the actions of the emperor. Rapin called attention to the Pope's actions instead, and came to the blunt conclusion that 'the affair was wholly and solely retarded on the Emperor's account' but that Clement VII ultimately failed in the 'duty of a Pope'.[679] Thus, regardless of Henry's capricious emotions and actions, Rapin felt that Clement VII had also contributed to the break with Rome, even if Henry's desire for Anne made him pursue the cause so vehemently. For Rapin, therefore, the Church of England was not created solely due to the failure of Henry's management of his personal desires.

While French historians discussed Henry's dishonourable behaviour in the dissolution of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon, Hume argued for the importance of honourable conduct in the creation of this marriage. At the same time, Hume used Henry's first wife to discuss the choosing of a suitable spouse. In his *History*, Hume argued that Henry had always been concerned about the consequences of marrying his brother's widow and therefore was acting honourably from the very beginning of the union. Hume addressed this issue in the first paragraph of Chapter XXX in order to emphasise Henry's early misgivings. Hume explained that when Henry VII was on his deathbed he warned his son 'not to finish an alliance' that was 'so unusual and exposed to such insuperable objections'.[680] By including Henry's father's doubts about the marriage, Hume added further weight to his argument that Catherine of Aragon was an unsuitable wife and queen from the very beginning of their marriage. Furthermore, Hume blamed the Privy Council for convincing an unwilling Henry to marry Catherine after Henry VII had died. Hume also noted that marrying a brother's widow was forbidden in the sixteenth century and that Henry had to get a papal dispensation in order to marry Catherine. By accentuating Henry's original misgivings about the

---

[678] Rapin, VII, pp. 466, 451-452.
[679] Rapin, VII, pp. 452, 465.
[680] Hume, IV, p. 83.

marriage, Hume thus also suggested that the pope failed in his duty by giving permission to the union, and that Henry's eventual break with Rome arose from this error. By placing blame on the Catholic Church for allowing the marriage to take place, Hume vindicated Henry VIII for marrying Catherine even though the king was aware that it may have been illegal. Hume argued that Catherine of Aragon was an unsuitable wife in the first place and that the unsuitability of the marriage ultimately contributed to its demise.

The end to Henry's second marriage was also criticized by French historians, who used Anne's gruesome death to condemn Henry's actions and character. Historians were able to discuss a husband's responsibility to his wife when they criticized Henry's treatment of Anne, right before her execution, as unnecessary and cruel. Lisa Smith argues that for the middling and upper sorts in the eighteenth century being a patriarch 'was as much about responsibility to and care of one's dependents as it was about maintaining hierarchy and power'.[681] Smith's emphasis on the importance of caring for dependents resonates with the increased importance that was placed on love and affection within marriage in this period. While Henry's actions could be interpreted as those of a patriarch who was trying to maintain his hierarchy and power, historians focused instead on his failure to protect his wives and children, and how he often ignored their care in order to pursue his personal desires. They argued that Henry failed to take care of his dependent, his wife and queen. Rapin wrote that Anne gave a false confession stating that she had married Lord Percy, now the Earl of Northumberland, because 'it was believed that this confession was drawn from her, by her being given to understand that the King would at no other rate be prevailed upon to mitigate that cruel part of her sentence of being burnt, into the milder part of having her head cut off'.[682] This analogy made Henry look especially cruel and dishonourable as it implied that he gained Anne's confession only though the threat of a more horrible and painful death. Rather than looking after her emotional and physical welfare, as the ideal patriarchal figure should, Henry instead abused his role and forced his wife to make false

[681] Lisa Smith, p. 249.
[682] Rapin, VII, p. 525.

confessions. The historian also highlighted that Anne's choices were limited: death by burning or death by beheading, and these options emphasized the brutality with which Henry treated his wife. Rapin also wrote of Henry's cruelty towards Anne in his annulment of their marriage. Rapin argued that it did not make sense to have the marriage annulled before her execution, since she could not be condemned as adulterous if her marriage to the king was considered 'only as a concubinage'. This inconsistency was only allowed because 'Henry had got such an absolute sway over his subjects, that his will was the sole measure of justice and law. Nay, he so little regarded the publick [sic] and his own reputation, that he married Jane Seymour the next day after Anne Boleyn's death, which argued so strong a passion, that it served greatly to justify the deceased Queen'.[683] Rapin argued that Henry ignored his duties as king as he disregarded 'the public' in addition to 'his own reputation'. Rapin thus implied that Henry's actions were both dishonourable behaviour by a monarch and disliked by his people. Rapin emphasized Henry's failures as monarch by referring to his inability to control himself, as he had 'so strong a passion'. Historians thus argued that Henry's multiple marriages caused instability which endangered the nation, and which the king ignored in order to satisfy his personal desires.

Millot also criticized Henry's behaviour at the end of his marriage to Anne Boleyn, and suggested that Henry's swift remarriage after Anne's execution was dishonourable. This conduct exhibited flawed kingship, as it clearly meant that the monarch was unable to control his passions and wait an appropriate amount of time before taking a new wife. Millot wrote that 'Henry himself, according to Mr. Hume, made a very strong apology for her, by marrying Jane Seymour the very day after her execution. His furious passion got the better of all regard to decency'.[684] With this description, the historian argued that Henry's behaviour was excessive, as his 'passion' was described as 'furious'. This quotation also provides more evidence of Hume's influence on Millot's historical narrative. Moreover, like Rapin's depiction of the risk to Henry's reputation, Millot's history described a king who ignored social norms and

---

[683] Rapin, VII, pp. 525-526.
[684] Millot, I, p. 339.

'decency'. For these historians the king therefore lacked the contemporary ideal qualities of politeness and honour.[685] Millot took this idea further, stating that Henry 'scrupled to take a concubine to his bed, and did not hesitate to sacrifice his queen upon the scaffold, that he might espouse his mistress'.[686] Millot argued that Henry was willing to 'sacrifice' his lawful wife, and described Jane Seymour (1508-1537) as Henry's 'mistress'. At the same time, by using the word 'sacrifice', Millot held the king accountable for the death of his spouse. Again, it was clear to Millot that Henry's personal desires took precedence over what was best for him as a king, and therefore this conduct was unscrupulous. Historians emphasized Henry's poor kingship in his willingness to set aside his queen and regard for the nation in order to satisfy his personal desires.

Hume suggested that Henry's immoderate temper led to the demise of his second marriage and the king's behaviour allowed the historian to remind readers of the importance of the contemporary virtue of stoicism.[687] In chapter XXXI, Hume titled Anne's fall as the 'Disgrace of Queen Anne'. When he wrote that she lost her life due to 'the rage of that furious monarch' he appeared to pity her.[688] Hume suggested that Anne's 'disgrace' was Henry's fault rather than her own and highlighted Henry's harsh treatment of his queen. He employed the terms 'rage' and 'furious' to underscore Henry's excessive temper. Hume highlighted Henry's culpability in Anne's downfall by writing that the king had 'persevered constantly in his love to this lady' during the full six years it took to divorce Catherine, and 'the more obstacles he met with to the gratification of his passion, the more determined zeal did he exert in pursuing his passion'.[689] The use of the term 'zeal', often used to describe religious fanaticism, implied that Henry's behaviour was excessive. Hume used the term 'gratification' to suggest that Henry was unable to see beyond fulfilling his personal desires, and did not pay attention to their impact on his household and nation. Hume also highlighted

---

[685] Ryu Susato, 'The Idea of Chivalry in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Case of David Hume', *Hume Studies*, 33:1 (2007) 155-178 (p. 157).
[686] Millot, I, p. 339.
[687] Jones, p. 5.
[688] Hume, IV, p. 166.
[689] Hume, IV, p. 166.

189

Henry's fickle behaviour, as he noted that once Henry had married Anne, it did not take long for her to bore him. Even Hume, who venerated Henry as the king who created the Church of England, depicted a monarch who was clearly led by his passions.

Rapin argued that Henry's actions towards his wives at the end of his marriages were unvirtuous. To defend his argument, Rapin cited several historians in order to conclude that Anne was innocent and therefore Henry did not have the right to end his marriage. In proving that Anne was blameless, historians were able to cast judgment on Henry's actions as king. Anne's innocence also emphasized that Henry had failed in his role as a husband. Historians implied indirectly that Anne's violent end suggested that Henry failed to protect his wife, an important responsibility of the eighteenth-century patriarch.[690] Rapin argued that only one source gave direct evidence of the possibility of Anne's infidelity. This source was the writings of Nicholas Sanders (1530-1581), a sixteenth-century Catholic polemicist. Rapin stated that the only evidence given for Anne's adultery was a moment when the Queen dropped her handkerchief, when 'one of her gallants took it up and wiped his face with it'. In the footnote to this statement, Rapin added that he had examined the work of Bishop Gilbert Burnet. Rapin asserted that Burnet was a trustworthy source, writing that the Bishop had taken 'more than ordinary Pains to learn all he could concerning this affair' since Burnet had cited the account of Spelman, a judge at the time of Anne's execution.[691] Rapin ultimately concluded 'that it seems there was no legal evidence against the Queen' and Henry was her 'adversary' and 'a husband who was king, and jealous even to madness'.[692] Once again Rapin emphasized how Henry's behaviour and jealousy made him a deficient king who was easily swayed by his passions. Rapin cited different sources to underscore Anne's innocence and emphasize Henry's flawed character.

In their accounts of Henry VIII, historians emphasized how the dissolution of a marriage damaged the household. They argued that, as Henry was the father of his

---

[690] Lisa Smith, p. 249.
[691] Rapin, VII, p. 518. Rapin used Burnet throughout his account of the reign of Henry VIII (as had David Hume). Rapin also relied particularly on Tudor chroniclers Edward Hall, Herbert of Cherbury, Polydore Vergil and George Buchanan for his chapters on Henry VIII.
[692] Rapin, VII, pp. 518, 520.

nation, the creation of the Church of England greatly affected his kingly household: his country. There are substantial differences between French and British interpretations of the creation of the Church of England and the dissolution of Henry's first marriage to Catherine of Aragon. British historians forgave Henry's actions towards Catherine and blamed the papacy because they valued the creation of the Church of England. French historians instead argued that its creation jeopardized the nation, and honour played an important role in this narrative.

Section 2: Masculine Qualities of the King and Husband

Historical accounts in both France and Britain used Henry VIII and his behaviour as husband and father to explore the changing constructions of masculinity in the eighteenth century. As Henry VIII had several unsuccessful marriages and was infamous for his mistreatment of his wives, his behaviour as a husband contradicted contemporary notions of polite and masculine sensibility, and historians emphasized this contradiction in their accounts. The impact of a husband's violence, fickleness and inability to achieve self-control were used by historians to show how a man's actions within the domestic sphere affected his public presence. These vices thus allowed historians to promote the need for virtue in all facets of a man's life. Historians emphasized the need for ideal eighteenth-century men to have self-control and to meet their responsibilities honourably, while underscoring the ways in which excessive passions were seen as incompatible with kingship.

Henry VIII's multiple marriages and ill-treatment of his wives indicated that he was not an ideal husband and historians used eighteenth-century notions of masculinity to critique his behaviour. Shoemaker argues that in eighteenth-century Britain, an adult man was increasingly expected to 'possess a capacity for feeling and softness, to be a companionable and faithful husband', and to contribute to the management of the

191

household.[693] The way in which eighteenth-century historians were critical of Henry's behaviour towards his numerous wives demonstrates that the idea of a companionable and faithful husband was increasingly prevalent in eighteenth-century texts. In the seventeenth century, Henry VIII was portrayed as strong patriarchal figure, but eighteenth-century historians instead highlighted his failings as a father and husband. In the eighteenth century, the ideal man was a respectful and devoted husband.[694] Honour was thus a key characteristic of a virtuous husband, and necessary for a successful marriage. The ideal devoted husband was also expected to be faithful to his wife. Eighteenth-century historians argued that Henry VIII did not live up to these ideals in any of his six marriages.

Violent behaviour was incompatible with the ideal of being a good companion. In the early modern period it had been considered acceptable for a husband to physically discipline his wife, within reason.[695] This view shifted in the eighteenth century. Elizabeth Foyster argues that a husband's undue violence toward his wife was thought to reduce his masculinity and was already deemed dishonourable by the late seventeenth century.[696] This shift corresponds with the rise of reason as a virtue, and with attempts to promote self-control in all facets of life. Foyster's argument also explains why eighteenth-century historians were so critical of Henry's behaviour towards his wives, as his lack of control and excess in the trial and beheading of his wives was considered to be undue violence towards a spouse. Historians judged and critiqued Henry's behaviour as husband and king, and used the king's failure to protect his wives and his inability to participate in a companionable and affectionate marriage to comment on how not to achieve the ideal marital relationship. Historians thus stressed Henry's unsuitable nature as a husband in order to convey that immoral conduct could damage matrimony.

The concept of an affectionate marriage became much more widespread in the

---

[693] Shoemaker, p. 39.
[694] Hannah Smith, 'Politics, Patriotism, and Gender: The Standing Army Debate on the English Stage, circa 1689-1720', *The Journal of British Studies*, 50 (2011), 48-75 (pp. 54-55).
[695] Shoemaker, p. 104.
[696] Elizabeth Foyster, 'Male Honour, Social Control and Wife Beating in Late Stuart England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6 (1996), 215-24.

eighteenth century and historians judged Henry VIII against these changing notions. In France, *savants* represented their marriages as affectionate and advocated for the intellectual benefits of marriage in their work. *Philosophes* such as Antoine Lavoisier (1743-1794) and Claude Audrien Helvétius (1715-1771) depended on wives as intellectual as well as domestic companions, and affectionate marriage came to be viewed as more productive.[697] Conduct books published in early eighteenth-century Britain also encouraged friendship and affection between husbands and wives. These books often argued that although it was the wife's duty to submit to her husband, the husband's duty was to love his wife. By the end of the period, conduct books encouraged husbands and wives to endeavour to live together peacefully and in love, and to aim to please each other.[698] In his prescriptive text, *The Relative Duties of Parents and Children, Husbands and Wives, Masters and Servants* (1705), William Fleetwood argued that husbands and wives should be 'friends and companions in all their fortunes', and asked husbands not 'to use, neither in word or deed, any ungentleness or rigour towards' their spouses.[699] Almost a century later, John Ovington's conduct book told husbands and wives that they 'each must endeavour in all things to please the other, that they may live in love and peace'.[700] These authors, whose work spanned the eighteenth century, emphasized the importance of affection and companionship in marriage.

Historians noted the absence of affection and companionship in Henry's marriages, and instead highlighted the king's vices, including impatience, the excessive pursuit of sexual desire, and a heated temper, to argue for the need for equanimity in the eighteenth-century model man and king. The control of sexual desires was important for ideal rulers as it demonstrated public evidence of their self-regulation. As Marisa Linton argues, in anti-monarchical propaganda of the period, while Louis XV's wife

---

[697] Meghan K. Roberts, 'Philosophes Mariés and Epouses Philosophiques: Men of Letters and Marriage in Eighteenth-Century France', *French Historical Studies*, 35:3 (2012), 510-539 (pp. 511-12).
[698] Shoemaker, p. 102.
[699] William Fleetwood, *The Relative Duties of Parents and Children, Husbands and Wives, Masters and Servants* (London: C. Harper, 1705), pp. 107, 333-336.
[700] John Ovington, *The Duties, Advantages, Pleasures and Sorrows, of the Marriage State* (London: T. Page, 1803), pp. 8-9.

'epitomized queenly virtue', his mistresses 'stood for vice'.[701] The king's sexual promiscuity attracted attention, but did not garner outright condemnation. Instead, originally in court and *parlementaires* circles and subsequently in the clandestine press, a discourse circulated that the king was allowing his mistresses to dictate political policy. Thus the king's personal vices became a part of public politics, and this failure was the core of the perception of a corrupt monarchical government.[702] If a king were publicly promiscuous, it was associated with tyranny and excess, as it exemplified the rule of passion over reason.[703] Henry's private vices affected the public when his personal sexual desires shaped his decisions as king. Monarchs who had mistresses were not unusual in eighteenth-century France or Britain; however, mistresses were nonetheless disliked when they were perceived to affect kingship. For example, the French were frustrated with the disruptive role of Louis XV's mistresses, and the circumstances contributed to Louis XV's known repute for decadence, rather than virtue.[704] When mistresses procured political favour for family and friends, or influenced a king's judgment on foreign or religious matters, it implied that the king's private life was affecting his public duties.

Historians argued that Henry's personal desires instigated the annulment with Catherine of Aragon and his inability to attain self-control was particularly significant. In the eighteenth century, the control of passions, and the exercise of reason, became more prominent in ideas of masculinity.[705] Millot argued that the king did not conform to this ideal, as 'the passions of Henry were to produce cruel and fatal scenes'. The language which Millot used made it evident that Henry's lack of levelheadedness would result in an unfortunate outcome.[706] Millot's account was sympathetic to Catherine. The historian defended her suitability as a spouse while he employed her as a contrast to the

---

[701] Marisa Linton, 'Virtue Rewarded? Women and the Politics of Virtue in Eighteenth-Century France. Part I', *History of European Ideas,* 26 (2000), 35-49 (p. 38).
[702] Linton, *The Politics of Virtue*, p. 130.
[703] Kevin Sharpe, 'Virtues, Passions and Politics in Early Modern England', *History of Political Thought*, 32:5 (2011), 773-798 (pp. 793-794).
[704] Linton, *The Politics of Virtue*, p. 130.
[705] Susan Khin Zaw, '"Appealing to the Head and Heart": Wollstonecraft on Burke on Taste, Morals and Human Nature', in *Femininity and Masculinity in Eighteenth-Century Art and Culture*, ed. by Gill Perry and Michael Rossington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), pp. 123-141 (p. 135).
[706] Millot, I, p. 326.

wrathful Henry. Millot described Catherine as having 'gentle and amiable virtues' and claimed that she had lost Henry's affections because the king was 'governed by the love of pleasure'.[707] Millot criticized Henry for his lack of self-control, and suggested that the king was focused on gratification rather than rather than the honour he should maintain as a king and husband. This judgment was repeated in Millot's account of the divorce, when the historian wrote that: 'humanity and justice were on the side of the queen; but the king was in love, and violent'.[708] The historian maintained that Catherine of Aragon had 'humanity' and 'justice' and highlighted how Henry's violence was excessive. Millot clearly believed that Henry's treatment of his wife was unwarranted, and that the king's unrestrained behaviour was neither masculine nor kingly.

Raynal also presented Henry's behaviour towards his wives to advocate for the need for self-control. According to Raynal, Henry 'bore with impatience the yoke which joined him to his brother's widow. This tye, which was at first odious to him, became in time insupportable'.[709] Raynal underscored Henry's impatience with his wife to highlight to readers Henry's inability to exercise the virtue of self-control. Terms such as 'odious', 'insupportable' and 'impatience' suggested that Henry was unable to regulate his emotions. For Raynal, Henry was unable to comport himself properly as king, let alone as a husband and head of a household. When Raynal told his readers that 'Interests of State had long prevailed' but then 'inclination insensibly got the ascendant', he insinuated that Henry was fulfilling his personal desires by annulling the marriage, rather than prioritizing matters of state.[710] The use of the term 'insensibly' was a direct accusation of the king's failure to see reason and emphasized the importance of the virtue of equanimity to Raynal's readers.

Historians argued that Henry's inconsistency in all aspects of his life, and not just with his wives, showed his lack of self-control and dishonourable conduct. In order to have household order, a man had to have control of his dependents, and this was only

---

[707] Millot, I, p. 321.
[708] Millot, I, p. 326.
[709] Raynal, p. 153.
[710] Raynal, p. 153.

possible if he had control of himself.[711] Historians argued that Henry's fickleness with

his wives, advisors and allies jeopardized his public and political responsibilities as

king. Raynal emphasized Henry's 'inconstancy' both with his wives and with his

alliances with Charles V and Francis I, as this behaviour could have endangered the

safety of his kingdom. Raynal criticized Henry for being 'inconstant in his friendships,

his ministers'.[712] Raynal's concluding summary of Henry VIII informed the reader that

Henry was a king who 'was never constant but in his rage. By his own

acknowledgement, he spared no woman in his passion, nor any man in his anger'.[713]

Raynal argued that Henry failed to exercise self-control in all facets of his life and

character. With this narrative, he described a king who was unpredictable and fickle,

whose only consistent emotions were 'passion' and 'anger', and who failed to achieve

equanimity, thus underlining Henry's unsuitability as monarch by expounding the

effects of his private vices on his public role.

Historians observed that Henry's inconsistency in matters of religion also made

others suffer. Following the annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon, his faith

wavered between Catholicism and Protestantism until his death. Historians commented

on Henry's inconsistency to remind readers that the virtuous man was supposed to have

independent views that were incorruptible.[714] Henry's volatility instead demonstrated a

weakness in character, and suggested that his opinions were easily malleable. Raynal

accused the king of being inconstant in his opinions of faith, where 'he wrote against

Luther, and acted against the Pope; he merited the title of Defender of the Faith, and that

of Persecutor of the Church […] his life was a series of contradictions'.[715] Similarly,

Millot reminded his readers of Henry's lack of restraint when he persecuted his people

for their religious faith. When Henry was married to Catherine Howard (1523-1542), her

uncle, the Duke of Norfolk, and Bishop Gardiner came into favour because of her

marriage, and sought to bring back Catholicism. When Henry instituted 'the statute of

---

[711] Karen Harvey, 'The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800', *Journal of British Studies*, 44:2 (2005), 296-311 (p. 298).
[712] Raynal, p. 157.
[713] Raynal, p. 157.
[714] Linton, 'Virtue Rewarded?', p. 36.
[715] Raynal, p. 157.

the six articles', Millot argued that it 'was rigorously executed' and that 'many protestants acquired the glory of martyrdom' as a result.[716] Passed by Parliament in June 1539, this statute hardened existing heresy laws and affirmed that traditional Catholic doctrine was the basis of faith for the English Church. This act was met with a great deal of resistance, and was eventually repealed by Henry's son, Edward VI.[717] Millot wrote that the act was 'rigorously executed' to imply that it was pursued with excessive vigour, and that Henry's people, who he had encouraged to become protestant, were suddenly vulnerable to the return of Catholic doctrine. Millot further emphasized Henry's fickleness and its consequences for his people by arguing that Henry's persecution of the reformers 'was no less rigid against those Catholics who refused to take the oath of his supremacy'. As a result of this excessive behaviour, 'some symptoms of discontent now appeared against the despotic cruelty of the English Monarch'.[718] Millot labelled Henry as a despotic king because of his inconsistent behaviour towards matters of faith. He made his disdain clear when he used the term 'cruelty'. Millot argued that this excessive behaviour turned Henry's own people against him, as he persecuted both Protestants and Catholics alike. The instability in Henry's reign, especially with regard to matters of religion, provided readers with examples of the damaging consequences of Henry's inconsistent nature.

Historians presented Henry's nature as erratic because his passions for Anne Boleyn eventually waned, as they had for Catherine of Aragon. Rather than being a sign of Henry's masculine virility, historians instead viewed his actions towards his wives as fickle and uncontrolled. The ideal marriage in the eighteenth century was one of mutual affection, where both spouses aimed to please one another.[719] Yet Henry's waning affection for his wives and his pursuit of his own selfish desires went against this notion. Historians argued that this fickleness of Henry's resulted in Anne's execution, just as it was responsible for ending his first marriage. According to Millot, the love that Henry had, which was once 'violent' for over six years, quickly dissipated 'when it had no

---

[716] Millot, I, pp. 349-350.
[717] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), p. 30.
[718] Millot, I, pp. 349-350.
[719] Shoemaker, p. 104.

longer any obstacles to contend with'.[720] This conclusion made Henry's divorce from Catherine appear to be all the more self-serving, rather than something that was accomplished for the good of his kingdom. Millot argued that Henry was 'incapable of moderating his desires[;] he sacrificed his wife to his mistress'.[721] To argue that the king was 'incapable' allowed the historian to argue that Henry was unable to regulate his passions and achieve the desired self-control that a husband and father should. Henry thus served as a lesson to readers on poor masculine conduct because of this inconsistent and uncontrollable behaviour, which affected his household and public duties as king. For Millot, Henry VIII's fickle behaviour towards his wives was the example of how not to comport oneself as the ideal patriarchal head of the household.

Unlike French historians, however, Hume argued that Henry's conduct was not dishonourable, because – unlike other kings – Henry actually married the women with whom he had affairs. Hume defended Henry's multiple wives as they helped him to avoid having countless mistresses, as 'unlike to most monarchs, who judge lightly of the crime of gallantry, and who deem the young damsels of their court rather honoured than disgraced by their passion, he seldom thought of any other attachment than that of marriage'.[722] Hume thus excused Henry's behaviour towards his numerous wives by arguing that the monarch had more respect for women than many of his kingly peers. This interpretation corresponds with Hume's perceptions of Henry as England's first modern king, whose actions, whilst not perfect, led to a stronger nation.[723] As we have seen, Hume felt that the creation of the Church of England was a necessary and crucial step in Britain's history, so he presented Henry's motives for his multiple marriages as honourable in order to justify the king's actions.

Henry's tempestuous rule was considered to be tyrannical by some eighteenth-century historians. As we have seen, ideas of divine right and absolute monarchical

---

[720] Millot, I, p. 337.
[721] Millot, I, p. 337.
[722] Hume, IV, p. 168.
[723] Nicholas T. Phillipson, *David Hume: The Philosopher as Historian* (London: Penguin, 2011), p. 145.

power began to change from the mid-seventeenth century.[724] While James I and Charles I both promoted the notion that they derived their authority from God, this idea waned following the Civil War, regicide and Interregnum. The notion re-emerged during the later Stuart period then declined again following the Glorious Revolution.[725] All the same, neither Hume nor Millot believed that this tyranny defined Henry's reign. Millot appreciated some qualities of the Tudor king, even if his lack of personal constraint and discipline affected his marriages. According to Millot, 'every thing gave way to the absolute authority of Henry. His desires were as much respected, as his resentments were dangerous; and even his tyranny was sometimes forgot, in consideration of the openness and generosity of his temper'.[726] The historian employed the descriptions of 'openness' and 'generosity' to compensate for his use of the terms 'resentments', 'dangerous' and 'tyranny'. Millot suggested that Henry's positive and negative characteristics formed some kind of balance, and that he was an effective, if tyrannical, ruler. Millot's respect for Henry could also be attributed to his firm belief in the necessity of obedience to the monarchy, and his belief that 'no government is perfect, or free from every inconvenience'.[727] Here Millot's perspective differed from that of other authors.

Raynal, by contrast, felt that Henry's tyrannical behaviour was more problematic. He reproached Henry by providing a quotation of a 'celebrated Englishman' who said that 'if all the portraits of a merciless Prince that are in the world, were lost, they might be painted a second time exactly after nature, by drawing the life of Henry VIII'.[728] The Englishman in question was Sir Walter Raleigh, a landed gentleman who rose rapidly in the favour of Queen Elizabeth I, was knighted in 1585 and was instrumental in the English colonisation of North America. Raynal cited this well-known figure to strengthen his argument about Henry's harsh temper. In describing

---

[724] Laura Janara, 'John Locke's Kindred Politics: Phantom Fatherhood, Vicious Brothers and Friendly Equal Brethren', *History of Political Thought*, 33:3 (2012), 455-489 (p. 455).
[725] Paul Langford, *The Eighteenth Century: 1688-1815* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 47.
[726] Millot, I, p. 335.
[727] Millot, I, p. xvii.
[728] Raynal, p. 158.

199

Henry as the most 'merciless Prince' history has ever encountered, Raynal was able to call attention to, and criticize, Henry's tyrannical nature.

Hume commented on Henry's tyrannical rule of his court in his final character portrait of the king. In eighteenth-century Britain, Henry VIII was perceived to be a figure of concentrated and absolute power. This legacy was due to the infamous beheadings as well as the writings of earlier historians including Thomas Cromwell and his propagandist.[729] Unlike the French authors, Hume offered a concluding summary that allocated no space to the complicated relationship Henry had with his queens and which focused more on his actions as king.[730] But Hume's overall view of Henry's virtue was similar to that of the French writers. Hume emphasized how Henry had a 'tyrannical disposition, soured by ill health' at the end of his reign.[731] While criticizing Henry, Hume provided an excuse for the king's behaviour and suggests that he could have been a worthy king were it not for his unfortunate ill health. A few pages later, Hume stressed that 'the absolute, uncontrolled authority which he maintained at home, and the regard which he acquired among foreign nations, are circumstances which entitle him to the appellation of a *great* prince; while his tyranny, and cruelty, seem to exclude him from the character or a *good* one'.[732] Hume recognized Henry's shortcomings as king but forgave his tyranny due to the monarch's creation of the Church of England. Leo Braudy argues that Hume considered that history was the 'slowly building structure of institution and laws'.[733] Braudy's argument also shares similarities with O'Brien's views about Hume as a writer of stadial history.[734] Hume's emphasis on the role of Henry VIII in the creation of the Church of England, and the historian's amelioration and vindication of the king's personal shortcomings, confirms O'Brien's and Braudy's argument that Hume wrote in a stadial manner. Hume found the structure of institutions and laws to be the most important part of the development, and

---

[729] Paulson, p. 115.
[730] Hume, IV, pp. 286-300.
[731] Hume, IV, p. 282.
[732] Hume, IV, p. 287.
[733] Leo Braudy, *Narrative Form in History and Fiction: Hume, Fielding and Gibbon* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), p. 66.
[734] O'Brien, pp. 132-133.

progression, of history. For the historian, the founding of the Church of England was instrumental to this advancement.

As previous historians have argued, ideals of marriage in the eighteenth century placed more weight on affection and did not accommodate violence. These notions were perpetuated by French and British historical texts. With the belief that the king had a patriarchal and paternal responsibility for his country, historians used the relationship between Henry VIII and his six wives to argue that an agreeable marriage benefitted both the family and the household. Historians used Henry to convey the ideal of a responsible and companionable partnership to their readers. Historians argued that Henry's inconsistency and lack of self-control in his relationships with family and advisors were neither kingly nor masculine behaviours. Historical accounts emphasized Henry's inconsistent behaviour as a husband to highlight the relationship between the personal and the political, and to underscore the ways in which unregulated passions were seen as incompatible with kingship.

Section 3: Ideals of Fatherhood

The relationship between father and child was scrutinised by eighteenth-century historians in their accounts of the tumultuous relationship between Henry VIII and his two daughters, Elizabeth and Mary, to comment on contemporary ideals of fatherhood and patriarchy in the eighteenth century. The king as a ruler of the nation was like a father running his household, and as Karen Harvey argues, 'the house – and all that it contained and symbolized – provided the grounding for these men's self-identities'.[735] Historians engaged with this concept and Henry's relationship with his daughters to criticize the king for failing to engage with, and protect, his dependents. They argued that his behaviour as father was indivisible from his behaviour as king. Historians also used Mary's youth in juxtaposition with Henry's dishonourable behaviour as her father

---

[735] Harvey, *The Little Republic*, p. 22.

to emphasize his failures as a paternal figure. While historians were sympathetic to the troubles caused by the absence of a male heir, they did not condone Henry's behaviour, especially when Anne Boleyn suffered a miscarriage. Instead, Henry was depicted by historians as inconsistent and callous. This section will explore how historians considered, and commented on, contemporary issues of paternity, patriarchy and legitimacy.

The notion that that king was the father to his nation was prevalent in early modern Europe. The idea had a particular resonance in France, especially prior to the reign of Louis XV, as it promoted royal power.[736] Sarah Hanley argues that the positions of father and king reinforced one another prior to the eighteenth century, and ensured that women and men remained subordinate in their roles as wives, sisters, brothers and children. With this sovereign and patriarchal power, the king was the head of state as well as the head of the household.[737] The king's monarchical power was an extension of his patriarchal role, and eighteenth-century historians therefore employed this concept to cast judgment on Henry's behaviour during his reign. Yves Castan presents the concept in reverse, noting that the father was like an absolute monarch because he controlled the current and eventual distribution of a family's wealth.[738] This idea featured in eighteenth-century French historical accounts when authors critiqued Henry's constantly changing laws and legislature which changed the order of succession and redefined the legitimacy of his children. Historians criticized this behaviour because it created uncertainty about the future of the realm and fuelled divisions and discord during Elizabeth's reign, because the constantly changing laws during Mary and Elizabeth's childhoods allowed their opponents to question their legitimacy and offer alternative figures to rule in their stead. Lady Jane Grey was made queen for nine days before Mary came to the throne, and Elizabeth always had to contend with the claim to the throne of Mary Queen of Scots. This legacy prompted historical evaluation of Henry's role as

---

[736] Germann, p. 108.

[737] Sarah Hanley, 'Engendering the State: Family Formation and State Building in Early Modern France', *French Historical Studies*, 16:1 (1989), 4-27; Sarah Hanley, 'The Monarchic State in Early Modern France: Marital Regime Government and Male Right', in *Politics, Ideology, and Law in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Adrianna E. Bakos (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1995), pp. 107-26.

[738] Yves Canstan, 'Pères et fils en languedoc a l'époque classique', *Dix-Septieme Siecle*, 102/103 (1974), 31-43.

father and king. Historians traced the influence between his patriarchal and paternal roles. Henry's relationship with his children was presented both as a metaphor for, and an actual reflection of, his role as father of the nation.

Historians judged Henry VIII as a patriarchal figure against eighteenth-century notions of politeness and manners. Assessments of patriarchy were entwined with ideas of household management that had earlier origins. A man's conduct was reflected in the household he kept. A responsible and virtuous man kept a successful and happy household, while a man of less virtuous qualities had a disorderly household.[739] A man's ability to govern his household reflected his ability to undertake civic duties. Household management was associated with self-management and both were considered to be especially important for married men. Therefore, if a man was unsuccessful at self-management, he could endanger the health and welfare of his whole household. People believed that a man could only keep order in his household if he were able to keep order in himself.[740] Ultimately, the model man did whatever was necessary to support and protect his family.[741] In Henry's case, the monarch's marriages, annulments and execution of his wives endangered the future prospects of his children. Henry's erratic relationship with his two daughters was discussed by historians to argue that Henry was unable to keep order within himself, and therefore with the nation.

Expressions of affection between father and child became more widely articulated in the eighteenth century. Henry's behaviour as a father was interpreted as dishonourable, and not to be emulated. In eighteenth-century France, royal children became viewed less in terms of their value for political alliances. Jeffrey Merrick argues that, while the king and his officials stressed the monarch's role as a father to his people, *parlementaires* also liked to remind the king that his children had a claim on his affection, as well as meriting protection and support. Consequently, if the king's role as monarch should be like a father's to his children, then it was believed that he should act

---

[739] Lisa Smith, pp. 247-248.
[740] Lisa Smith, pp. 247-248.
[741] Lisa Smith, p. 249.

paternally, rather than as a master does to his slave.[742] *Parlementaires* used the language of paternalism to stress that the king had responsibilities as an affectionate father, who should connect his people together as a family.[743] This view corresponds with a growing belief in the importance of affection within the family in eighteenth-century Britain. Thus when French historians presented the king as father to his nation, their account resonated with British readers.

Historians presented the young princess Mary as a contrast to Henry. Mary was portrayed as a daughter who desperately wanted to please her father, while Henry's paternal failure was evidenced by his characterization as uninterested and unaffectionate. Millot described Mary as:

> about twenty years of age, and being desirous to regain the good graces of her father, was constrained, for this purpose, to acknowledge his supremacy, and to renounce the Pope. It was not without the utmost reluctance that she consented to these conditions; but she was reduced to the alternative of adopting the theological sentiments of the king, or of exposing herself to his hatred.[744]

The princess was depicted as deeply afraid of her father while also seeking his favour. Millot mentioned her age in order to highlight her vulnerability and Henry's dishonour in overpowering her in this state. Because Mary eventually gave in to his demands she fulfilled her duty as his child. Henry, in contrast, appeared even more unkind for making such demands of his daughter in the first place. Millot portrayed Mary as a young woman who was helpless given her father's behaviour and her obligations as his ward. Similarly, Rapin indicated that Henry had manipulated Mary, by using his daughter's hope of returning into his good graces to bend her to his will.[745] Rapin noted that Mary sought to improve relations with her father after the violent death of her stepmother Anne. Mary's actions confirmed that Henry's behaviour towards his wives and children had repercussions for the whole household. Although Mary became a deeply disliked queen and acquired an infamous historical reputation, Henry's failings as a father were

---

[742] Jeffrey Merrick, 'Fathers and Kings: Patriarchalism and Absolutism in Eighteenth-Century French Politics', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, 308 (1993), 281-303 (pp. 282, 284, 287).
[743] Merrick, *Fathers and Kings*, pp. 284.
[744] Millot, I, p. 339.
[745] Rapin, VII, p. 526.

more significant in her youth and she was at that point presented as a sympathetic figure. Millot and Rapin also offered an indirect explanation of why Mary later on became a queen of questionable virtue. The historians sought to provoke readers to ask themselves if Henry's failure in his patriarchal and paternal roles caused Mary's bloody reign.

Henry VIII's multiple marriages were also seized upon by historians to discuss how the absence of a male heir could be problematic. In the early modern period, kings hoped that their wives would give birth to at least one healthy son. High death rates made second and third sons valuable insurance against an heir's premature death.[746] Historians believed that the problem of male issue played a part in Henry's multiple marriages. British historians like Hume cited the troubles that a lack of male heir could cause in order to defend Henry's actions. According to Hume, a 'male issue' was extremely important to Henry to ensure England's security once Henry VIII died.[747] A monarch needed to provide a strong and secure line of succession for his country. To Hume, Catherine of Aragon was an impediment to this outcome.

French historians instead questioned the sincerity of Henry's desire for a male heir to judge his decision to end his first marriage to Catherine. For Rapin, Henry's divorce from Catherine of Aragon was partly because Henry 'pretended that although he should be regardless of his salvation, or able to overcome his scruples, the good of his people required that he should labour beforehand to prevent an inconvenience that was easy to be foreseen. He had but one daughter, and in all likelihood should never have any more children'.[748] Rapin argued that Henry used 'the good of the people' as an excuse and used terms such as 'inconvenience' to argue that Henry's feelings about the absence of a male heir were insincere. Rapin called attention to the fact that Henry argued that he was 'required' to obtain a male heir to suggest that Henry felt insecure about his position, as had other monarchs in the past. However, these monarchs had not created a new church with themselves at the head in order to solve this problem. In the description of Henry's desire for a son as 'pretended', Rapin argued that Henry may not

---

[746] Patrick Allitt, 'Romancing the Throne', *National Interest,* 114 (2011), 29-39 (p. 29).
[747] Hume, IV, pp. 84-85.
[748] Rapin, VII, pp. 359-360.

have been as concerned about a male issue as other historians had posited. For Rapin, although a succession crisis may have been a real fear, Henry's personal desire for Anne, rather than for a male heir, was the motive for the annulment of his marriage. Millot showed similar misgivings, writing that 'this misfortune affected [Henry] the more, as the cause of being childless is the threatening in the Mosaical law against the person who shall espouse his brother's widow […] The more he was inclined to a divorce, he was the more solicitous to convince himself of the illegitimacy of his marriage'.[749] Millot, like Rapin, used the phrase 'convince himself' to undermine the argument that Henry's plight in his marriage with Catherine was truly sincere. He also implied that Henry grew more committed to the notion that his marriage was illegitimate as his desire to end the marriage grew.

Accounts of Henry VIII's marriage and children also gave historians the opportunity to discuss issues of inheritance and paternity, as illegitimate children were viewed as a danger to the household. For a king, an illegitimate child endangered his household and nation by creating problems for the line of succession. In the eighteenth century, many believed that all illegitimate children were damaging to the health of the nation, as they disrupted families and placed financial strain on communities.[750] Historians thus endeavoured to counter any rumours that Elizabeth was conceived illegitimately before her parents married. Rapin addressed this question explicitly, writing that Anne Boleyn 'proved not with child till after her marriage, whether the King espoused her in November last year, or in the January following'.[751] Rapin referred to specific months to make it clear to readers that the marriage and pregnancy occurred in the correct order, and to address rumours that the dates of both were precariously and suspiciously close. Rapin argued for the legitimacy of Elizabeth, which resonated well with readers as she was a revered figure even in the eighteenth century.[752] To Millot, the

[749] Millot, I, p. 321.
[750] Lisa Forman Cody, *Birthing the Nation: Sex, Science, and the Conception of Eighteenth-Century Britons* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 283-284.
[751] Rapin, VII, p. 462.
[752] Jennifer Clement, 'Elizabeth I, Patriotism, and the Imagined Nation in Three Eighteenth-Century Plays', *Intellectual History Review*, 22:3 (2012), 391-410 (p. 392); J. Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 38.

birth of Elizabeth 'was a fresh source of satisfaction to Henry'.[753] The historian focused on Henry's original inclination to be proud of and happy at Elizabeth's birth, highlighting that the king was genuinely pleased with Elizabeth's birth and viewed her as his lawful heir. But his reaction also pointed to his fickleness as he declared Elizabeth illegitimate a few years later. Affirmations that Elizabeth was conceived after Anne and Henry were married sought to leave no doubt that Elizabeth was a legitimate queen, to ensure that Elizabeth's historical legacy remained intact, and to pander to popular views of the time.

Hume considered Henry's reaction to Anne's later miscarriage to be dishonourable. Hume claimed that Henry was furious that Anne had given birth to a dead son. The king was depicted as cruel whereas Anne played an 'innocent' part in the 'misfortune'.[754] In the early modern period, and into the eighteenth century, some prescriptive texts argued that 'women of delicate form, and too great sensibility, [were] the most likely to miscarry'.[755] Even though Anne's constitution may have contributed to the miscarriage, following this view, Henry was to blame as it was his duty to protect his 'delicate' wife. Jennifer Evans and Sara Read have argued that pregnancy was both a public and private concern as it had 'implications beyond the woman's body in terms of the family' and the household. They argue that miscarriages were viewed in similar ways to live births.[756] Henry's behaviour thus warranted criticism due to his anger towards a woman who had just lost a child. According to Evans and Read's argument, if a miscarriage affected not only the wife, but the husband and household, then this tempestuous behaviour of Henry's was explained by his desire to secure a son for the legacy of his household. However, Henry's anger towards Anne for her miscarriage might have jeopardized future pregnancies because of the distress he caused her and the pressure he imposed on her.

---

[753] Millot, I, p. 328.

[754] Hume, IV, p. 166.

[755] Hugh Smith, *Letters to Married Women* (London: G. Kearsly, 1774), pp. 3-40; Daniel Turner, *The Force of the Mother's Imagination Upon her Foetus in Utero* (London: J. Walthoe, R. Wilkin, J. and J. Bonwicke, 1729); A. Blondel, *The Force of the Mother's Imagination Over the Foetus* (London: J. Brotherton, 1729).

[756] Jennifer Evans and Sara Read, '"Before midnight she had miscarried" Women, Men, and Miscarriage in Early Modern England', *Journal of Family History*, 40:1 (2015), 3-23 (p. 6).

Hume argued in his text that when Anne had given birth to 'a dead son', Henry's reaction was dishonourable and unmanly. Hume criticized Henry's tempestuous response in his desperation for a male heir: 'his temper, equally violent and superstitious, was disposed to make the innocent mother answerable for this misfortune'.[757] Hume ensured that Anne was seen by his readers as the blameless party by his use of terms like 'innocent' and 'misfortune', which communicated that she had done nothing wrong. The use of the words 'violent' and 'superstitious' to describe Henry's reaction emphasized his dishonourable conduct and the way in which it propagated the problem. Hume argued that a woman's tragic miscarriage was used by her husband and her enemies to convince themselves of Anne's unsuitability for the throne, because she did not provide a male heir.

The issue of paternity featured earlier in Hume's *History* when he raised doubts surrounding the legitimacy of Mary, a question which French historians ignored. Hume argued that Henry's initial doubts about his marriage to Catherine of Aragon materialized when rumours arose that other monarchs questioned the legitimacy of his daughter Mary:

> The states of Castile had opposed the emperor Charles' espousals with Mary,
> Henry's daughter; and, among other objections, had insisted on the illegitimate birth
> of the young princess. And when the negotiations were afterwards opened with
> France, and mention was made of betrothing her to Francis or the duke of Orléans,
> the bishop of Tarbe, the French ambassador, revived the same objection.[758]

Hume emphasized the problems of legitimacy to excuse Henry's divorce from Catherine. If other monarchs were suspicious, and Henry was unable to secure a marriage for his daughter, then issues of legitimacy could have political consequences for the king. Hume did not include any personal descriptions of Mary as a child, and he used her instead as means to explain Henry's behaviour in his divorce from Catherine. This exclusion allowed Hume to ignore Henry's failings in his paternal role, and in

---

[757] Hume, IV, p. 166.
[758] Hume, IV, p. 84.

Hume's view Henry's behaviour towards his children was a direct result of the necessity to secure the legacy of his kingdom.

Historians explored Henry's multiple Acts of Succession to argue that Henry's fickle nature had a negative impact upon his kingship. During Henry's reign, three acts, issued in 1533, 1536 and 1543, changed the legitimacy of his two daughters and altered the order of succession. The Acts of Succession affected Mary and Elizabeth as individuals and also had great potential to create confusion and political strife. The ever-changing legitimacy of Henry's children demonstrated Henry's erratic emotions, which affected perceptions of his ability to rule and make effective decisions as king. Rapin used Henry's issue of inheritance to determine that Henry failed to manage his household successfully. According to Rapin, Henry wanted Mary to sign certain articles that included an admittance to the 'unlawfulness of her Mother's marriage'. Ultimately Mary had to sign these articles, since Henry was 'inflexible' on the matter.[759] To force a daughter to admit to her own illegitimacy implied a lack of compassion in Henry, and provided further evidence of his paternal inadequacies. Subsequently the 1536 Act of Succession declared any issue of his first two marriages, namely Mary and Elizabeth, illegitimate. Rapin argued that it gave Henry the 'power to settle the order of his successors. By that it was in the King's power to re-place Mary and Elizabeth in such order as he should please, or to exclude them altogether'. The Act passed, according to Rapin, because of the 'absolute sway' Henry possessed, which meant that 'the Parliament approved of all his actions, and granted him even more than he desired'.[760] Here Rapin portrayed Henry as despotic, able to manipulate parliament not merely to do his bidding but 'even more'. Henry's demands not only had a negative impact on his daughters, but the manipulation of parliament had consequences for the nation due to the potential for future civil war. Historians thus highlighted how Henry simultaneously failed both his daughters and his people, and thereby emphasized that his role as a father was inseparable from his role as king.

---

[759] Rapin, VII, p. 526.
[760] Rapin, VII, p. 527.

Like Rapin, Millot used succession issues to tease out the paternal and patriarchal responsibilities of kings and fathers. Henry's method of dealing with rights of succession went against eighteenth-century ideals of fatherhood in which a father's duty was to protect and care for his offspring. [761] Millot sought to inspire his readers to pity Elizabeth when he described the new succession act that was announced after Anne's execution, in which Henry's 'marriage with Queen Anne was declared null and illegal, and thus the princess Elizabeth, as well as Mary, became a bastard; although it was destined that they should both of them mount the throne of England'.[762] In this passage, Millot emphasized two points to readers: that a child had lost her mother because of her father, and that this father was failing in his duty to protect his offspring. By calling attention to Mary's predicament as well as Anne's, Millot argued that Henry failed both of his daughters in his paternal and patriarchal roles.

Millot also maintained that the governance of the kingdom was affected by Henry's problems with his children and wives. Millot argued that Henry's difficulties with the questions of succession meant that he continued to rule ineffectively and 'the new parliament which was now called, was no less obsequious and submissive than the former. The conduct of the King was extolled by it with the most shameful exaggeration'.[763] Millot was frustrated with Henry's demands that had:

> allowed him the liberty of devolving the succession of the crown to whom he
> pleases; and whoever refused to answer upon oath to any article of this
> settlement, was to be considered as guilty of treason. It seemed to encourage him
> to exertions of tyranny.[764]

In this passage Millot argued that the succession had not been dealt with lawfully, because parliament had instead met Henry's despotic demands and allowed him to pursue his personal desires, or what 'he pleases'. For the historian to imply that Henry had to threaten people with treason suggests to readers that some did not agree with Henry's actions. Historians thus argued that Henry threatened both of his households:

---

[761] Lisa Smith, p. 249.
[762] Millot, I, p. 339.
[763] Millot, I, p. 339.
[764] Millot, I, pp. 339-340.

his family and his nation. Henry's despotic tendencies and desires affected his public duties, and resulted in a king who ruled with 'tyranny'.

Millot also discussed the recurrence of inheritance difficulties when Henry declared that Edward was the immediate heir to the throne in 1544. The historian argued that the:

> two houses restored Mary and Elizabeth to their right of succession; and what is singular, the king, notwithstanding this act, was so capricious, that he would not reverse the Statute which pronounced these princesses illegitimate, and made the parliament invest him with a power of still excluding them.[765]

The phrase 'their right succession' reflected Millot's belief that both Mary and Elizabeth had the right to succeed Henry as monarch. Millot thus argued that Henry was cruel as well as wrong about their legitimacy. The term 'capricious' indicated a perception that the act was an abuse of power on Henry's part. That Henry 'made' parliament give him the control to exclude his daughters also allowed the historian to imply that parliament did not agree with the king's actions.

The early modern view of the king as father to his nation was used by eighteenth-century historians to discuss new contemporary notions of paternal and patriarchal roles. They used the responsibility of a father for his children and household to warn readers against fickle behaviour. Henry's multiple acts of succession allowed historians to emphasize Henry's erratic nature, while also discussing the issues of legitimacy and the danger they brought to the household. For French historians, Henry's poor treatment of his children was mirrored in the substandard way he treated his parliament and country. If the ruler's relationship with a nation was analogous to a father's with a household, then historians suggested that Henry's patriarchal and paternal behaviour put both his nation and household at risk. Historians implied to readers that Henry's actions as a father were inseparable from his behaviour as a king, arguing that the actions within a man's private life always affected his public and political responsibilities.

---

[765] Millot, I, p. 356.

Section 4: Ideal Women

Eighteenth-century historians used their accounts of Henry VIII and his wives to show that they were interested in exploring ideas of femininity as well as masculinity. During the eighteenth century, history as a reading practice became one of the foundations of female education.[766] Historians wrote prescriptive texts for female readers that were similar to conduct books. Both genres provided instruction on the importance of the female qualities of modesty, chastity, piety, beauty, youth and motherhood.[767] Historians emphasized the importance of youth and beauty in a wife through their assessments of the historical figures of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn. Historians focused in particular on the reputation and downfall of Anne Boleyn to comment on both the virtuous and unvirtuous qualities of the ideal eighteenth-century woman. As historians compared queens according to their perceived virtues, especially with regard to their sexual behaviour, the queen judged most harshly was Catherine Howard. Historians also explored ideas of femininity by using Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn to convey to readers that model behaviour in motherhood was a fundamental part of ideal female identity in the eighteenth century.

Historians drew links between the importance of fertility and the suitability of a spouse in their accounts of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn. In the eighteenth century, youth and beauty were important for prospective wives, as they suggested that a wife should be able to bear her husband children, ideally including a male heir. Beauty was sometimes deemed to be an expression of a woman's inner virtue, which might also be exhibited in a public role.[768] Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn were treated very differently by historians, who focused on their age and beauty to make implicit comments about their fertility. For example, Raynal described Catherine as a 'peevish

---

[766] D.R. Woolf, 'A Feminine Past? Gender, Genre, and Historical Knowledge in England, 1500-1800', *The American Historical Review,* 102:3 (1997), 645-679 (pp. 659-670).
[767] Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus, 'Introduction', in *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities*, ed. by Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus (London and New York: Longman, 1997), pp. 1-28 (pp. 1-2).
[768] Jones, pp. 1, 7.

old woman' who could hardly compete with the young Anne Boleyn.[769] Raynal expressed a similar opinion in another text he wrote on Henry VIII's divorce, titled *Histoire du divorce de Henri VIII roi d'Angleterre, et de Catherine d'Arragon*. Written in 1763, fifteen years after his *History of the Parliament of England*, it was never translated into English and it contained a similar, if more descriptive, narrative. In *Histoire du divorce*, Raynal concluded that Catherine did not have many talents, and even fewer pretentions, where 'she had neither grace, nor dignity; no desire to please'.[770] Raynal offered a list of criticisms to emphasize that Catherine had no redeeming virtues as a wife. Her lack of 'grace' and 'dignity' implied she had not attempted to make herself amiable to her husband. Her lack of interest in her husband's happiness confirmed her unsuitability as a wife.[771] Raynal's description of Catherine, which saw her wanting in ideal feminine qualities of youth and charm, and therefore implicitly fertility, allowed the historian to impart to readers the necessary qualities of the ideal wife.

Hume also offered an explanation for Catherine of Aragon's spousal inadequacies. Like Raynal, he emphasized the importance of youth and chastity in a new wife. From the beginning of his account, Hume asserted that Catherine was not a suitable match for the king, writing:

> The queen was older than the King by no less than six years; and the decay of her beauty, together with particular infirmities and diseases, had contributed, notwithstanding her blameless character and deportment, to render her person unacceptable to him.[772]

Hume emphasized her age, 'decay' and ill health. Catherine's inability to produce a male heir, and the fact that several of her children had died in early infancy, except for a daughter, added to this 'misfortune', which essentially was a 'curse' which resulted

---

[769] Raynal, p. 153.
[770] Abbé Raynal, *Histoire du divorce de Henri VIII roi d'Angleterre, et de Catherine d'Arragon* (Amsterdam, 1763), pp. 13-14.
[771] Shoemaker, p. 104.
[772] Hume, IV, p. 84.

from Henry's decision to marry the widow of his brother.[773] Catherine's infertility and age suggested that the marriage was doomed from the very beginning.

Hume's depiction of Catherine was in deliberate contrast to his portrayal of Anne Boleyn, to demonstrate that the latter was a more suitable spouse. Hume portrayed Anne as ideal because she was young, intelligent, beautiful and modest. Hume introduced Anne to his readers as a 'young lady, whose grandeur and misfortunes have rendered her so celebrated', and 'whose accomplishments even in her tender years were always much admired'.[774] Hume thus argued that Anne's positive qualities began when she was much younger in order to suggest that her virtues were genuine, because their presence from a young age meant that they were ingrained in her natural character. The emphasis on her young 'accomplishments' linked Anne to the ideal feminine quality of youth. The historian argued that when Henry eventually fell in love with Anne, 'finding the accomplishments of her mind nowise inferior to her exterior graces', he started to contemplate making her his queen, and 'was more confirmed in this resolution, when he found that her virtue and modesty prevented all hopes of gratifying his passion after any other manner'.[775] While Hume had previously acknowledged that Catherine of Aragon had good inner qualities, with her 'blameless character', he argued that Anne's virtues were also manifested externally with her 'exterior graces'.[776] Anne was therefore exemplary, inside and out. This description corresponds with the eighteenth-century belief that outer beauty reflected a woman's inner virtue.[777] Moreover, the historian complimented Anne using eighteenth-century ideas of feminine virtue by presenting her as a woman who was intelligent as well as wise, and whose beauty did not affect her humility. Hume also emphasized her virtue in her ability to resist Henry's advances, as many other women had failed to do. Her honourable chastity was thus portrayed as a facet of her modesty, both in her general character and in her steadfast refusal to bed the king. The suitability of Anne to be a wife was thus made clear to Hume's readers and

---

[773] Hume, IV, p. 84.
[774] Hume, IV, pp. 86-87.
[775] Hume, IV, p. 87.
[776] Hume, IV, pp. 84, 87.
[777] Jones, pp. 1, 7.

underscored the ideal qualities and behaviour eighteenth-century women should bring to their marriage.

Historians also focused on Anne's reputation to impart the importance of piety to female readers as she had a strong Protestant faith. In the eighteenth century, devotion to religion was an important virtuous quality, and piety was one of the most frequently listed virtues in female conduct books.[778] Religious belief was connected to virtue and eighteenth-century historians like Millot and Rapin criticized earlier authors when they felt their religious background – whether Catholic or Protestant – had affected their interpretations of Anne. Millot stated that 'this unfortunate queen is described as a monster by the catholic historians; while those of the protestant persuasion have extolled her as virtuous, and irreproachable; as if her good or bad conduct was a proof of the merit or demerit of the one or the other of these religions'.[779] Rapin also believed that Anne's reputation had been tarnished by those who were against the Church of England and the Reformation. As he wrote:

> The enemies to her daughter Elizabeth and the Reformation, have blackened her reputation as much as possible, fancying by that to give a mortal wound to the Protestant religion. For a contrary reason, the Protestants have omitted nothing that could help to give of her a quite different idea. But both have gone upon a false principle, since the goodness of a religion depends not upon the life and conversation of the Professors.[780]

Rapin and Millot believed that previous historians of both Catholic and Protestant faith were equally guilty of shaping their texts according to their faiths. By highlighting these religious prejudices, Rapin was able to address any concerns of his readers about the effects of his own faith. With this point he was able to assure his audience that he was aware of, and did not partake in, religious partialities in the writing of history. Both Millot and Rapin were very much aware of the religious bias of many of their sources, and they criticized other historians for their prejudices. Rapin was open about his misgivings, and he eventually argued that 'people are innocent or guilty according to the

---

[778] Shoemaker, p. 23.
[779] Millot, I, p. 339.
[780] Rapin, VII, p. 524.

party they are of'.[781] While Rapin and Millot came from opposing religious backgrounds, they agreed that the depictions of ideal women by earlier historians reflected the historians' religious beliefs. Millot's and Rapin's accounts, written over forty years apart, exhibit similar frustrations with religious preconceptions, and this similarity demonstrates the ongoing effect of these influences on the way people viewed their past.

Despite previous religious prejudices, historians also used Anne to warn their readers that her disadvantageous quality of 'gaiety' made her vulnerable. This warning suggested that Anne lacked humility and modesty. In the eighteenth century, prescriptive texts portrayed the ideal woman as pious, chaste, and modest.[782] In discussing Anne's downfall, Hume stated that she appeared to him to be 'entirely innocent, and even virtuous, in her conduct' but unfortunately for her she had a 'certain gaiety, if not levity, of character' that 'made her less circumspect than her situation required'.[783] Hume also believed this vice was made worse because she was a beautiful woman who liked to influence those around her, and was sometimes a little too familiar and comfortable with friends. But to Hume these were innocent actions, as she was 'more vain than haughty' and she did not realise how this behaviour could be used against her.[784] While Hume admitted that Anne was vain, his description of her unawareness of others using her gaiety against her implied a youthful naiveté on her part. This depiction of Anne's innocence added further weight to Hume's argument that she was an example of feminine virtue, especially when compared with the older, ailing Catherine of Aragon. At the same time, the details of Hume's account communicated to readers that the ideals of beauty and youth should be accompanied by modesty and humility.

The importance of modesty was also highlighted by Rapin, who argued that Anne's deficiency in humility made her vulnerable to the criticisms of the court. Rapin

---

[781] Rapin, VII, p. 524.
[782] Barker and Chalus, pp. 1-2.
[783] Hume, IV, p. 166.
[784] Hume, IV, p. 167.

admitted that 'it cannot be denied that by some familiarities little becoming a queen, she gave too great an advantage over her'. Although a young and beautiful woman, she was unfortunately 'not displeased to see the effect of her beauty upon all sorts of people, imagining that the love she inspired them with very much heightened her merit'. Rapin felt that the virtue of modesty was still relevant to eighteenth-century women, as he argued that even in his time 'we see too many ladies liable to this infirmity'.[785] Anne's confidence in her beauty was unappealing to eighteenth-century historians, who argued that the pride she took in her beauty made her vulnerable to those who wished to turn others against her. Rapin thus argued that Anne's vanity was a vice that contributed to her downfall.

Historians also felt that Anne's 'French manners' made her disagreeable to those around her at court, as they argued that the fear of the other can cause prejudice. Anne's French background was not portrayed negatively by historians, but it was offered as an explanation for why some had disliked her. Hume argued that that her education and upbringing in France 'rendered her the more prone to these freedoms'.[786] Similar assertions can be found in Millot's history. Millot quoted from Hume's work several times in his text, and we see the latter's influence in Millot's account of Anne's upbringing. Anne:

> had been educated at the court of France; and there she acquired those gay and easy manners, which, though perfectly consistent with honour, have yet too much the appearance of gallantry. Her vanity was not insensible to the homage that was paid to her beauty; and the freedom of her carriage corresponded little with the strict ceremonial which was practiced in the English court.[787]

The problem with Anne's Frenchness was the lack of modesty and moderate behaviour that should be present in the ideal English woman. Not only did Anne's French manners mark her out as different from other women in the court, her lack of circumspection in choosing to retain these manners made her vulnerable to criticism. Millot also commented on her vanity to highlight the importance of modesty to readers. Raynal

---

[785] Rapin, VII, p. 524.
[786] Hume, IV, p. 166.
[787] Millot, I, pp. 337-338.

gave Anne many compliments that were similar to Hume's and Millot's, and also attributed her mannerisms and behaviours to her time spent in France.[788] Historians warned their readers that this vulnerability eventually led her enemies to turn others, and especially Henry, against her.

Historians compared Henry's six wives according to their virtues and flaws. Chastity was the most important quality of an ideal woman in the eighteenth century; sexual promiscuity was considered the most problematic form of behaviour.[789] As a result, Catherine Howard was used as the archetype of female vice by eighteenth-century historians. When Rapin described the accusations against Catherine Howard, and her sexual activity before her marriage, he wrote that 'the Queen at first denied all. But at a second examination she confessed, that before marriage she had prostituted herself to several men'.[790] Rapin's personal misgivings about Howard's vices were evident in the strong language he used to describe the king's fourth wife, and the historian employed a more forceful tone than he had used to discuss Anne Boleyn. When he reached the topic of Catherine's execution, Rapin confirmed that he had been suspicious of her impropriety and informed his reader that the queen admitted to the 'miscarriages of her former life before she was married' but denied 'that she had ever defiled the king's bed'.[791] The historian's emphasis on the queen's sexual activity before marriage highlighted the consequences of such unvirtuous conduct for a woman. Rumours of Catherine Howard's immorality were used by historians to judge the queen more harshly, and they portrayed the consequences of this vice to set an example for readers.

Other historians addressed the need for morality in the ideal eighteenth-century woman. Catherine Howard's behaviour was described particularly salaciously by Millot, who argued that the king 'was boasting that he had found a woman worthy of being the

---

[788] Raynal, *Histoire du divorce*, pp. 26-27.
[789] Shoemaker, pp. 37, 97.
[790] Rapin, VII, p. 618.
[791] Rapin, VII, p. 620.

partner of his bed'.[792] Millot presented Catherine Howard as a woman with depraved qualities, 'whose vices soon after conducted her to the scaffold'.[793] This outcome was a clear lesson; Catherine's 'vices' led to her terrible demise. Even though Millot did not question the legitimacy of the claims against Catherine, and wrote instead that 'it was found, that she had been criminal before her marriage', he did not believe in the 'criminality' of her actions. He even criticized how her family 'were condemned for having concealed her dishonour from the king'. Millot wrote that the king 'fought for proofs of her guilt', and was full of 'fury and madness'.[794] For Millot, Henry's character was far worse than Catherine Howard's vices. Therefore, while Catherine was used to illustrate detrimental qualities in a woman, historians nonetheless did not consider her vices as warranting her execution. Historians thus assessed Catherine Howard's sexual promiscuity in order to caution readers as to how a woman could come to such a dire situation whilst also using her ill-treatment as judgment upon the king.

Historians also perceived positive feminine qualities in Henry's wives. They used Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn to depict model behaviour in motherhood, underscoring its importance in the ideal woman. During the eighteenth century, motherhood was closely linked to a woman's sexual and social identity.[795] Discourses of motherhood intersected with ideals of domesticity. Anne and Catherine were depicted as ideal mothers because of their willingness to sacrifice themselves for their children. During the eighteenth century, women were often encouraged to lose their agency and individual desires, and instead to serve the family and state as mothers.[796] Historical accounts of the queens' sacrifice to protect their children resonated with these beliefs, especially because they depicted women who had submitted to their husbands' will.[797] Historians argued that Catherine eventually agreed to a divorce to protect Mary, and Anne accepted her fate to protect Elizabeth, in order to ensure their children did not face

---

[792] Millot, I, p. 350.
[793] Millot, I, p. 349.
[794] Millot, I, p. 350.
[795] Ruth Perry, 'Colonizing the Breast: Sexuality and Maternity in Eighteenth-Century England', *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 2:2 (1991), 204-234 (p. 207).
[796] Perry, p. 209.
[797] Tori Bowers, *The Politics of Motherhood: British Writing and Culture, 1680-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 196.

the consequences of Henry's tumultuous temper. The behaviour of the two queens contrasted with Henry's fickle paternal affection for his two daughters. According to Rapin, Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn both conceded defeat in order to protect their children. Rapin felt that 'it is very probable that [Catherine of Aragon] acted with sincerity […] she looked upon herself as the King's lawful wife, and in that belief she did not think herself obliged to resign her right to another', but unfortunately 'she could not own her marriage null, without greatly injuring her daughter the Princess Mary'.[798] Eighteenth-century historians believed that Catherine of Aragon did not want to stay married to the king because of any selfish reasons or desire for power. Instead, it was because she truly believed that she was his lawful wife, wanted to fulfil her role as the ideal mother, and sought to protect the legacy and inheritance of her child.

Rapin's account of Anne's trial and execution also promoted ideals of motherhood. Rapin believed that Anne 'suffered Death with great constancy'. Anne did not confirm or deny any of the crimes of which she was accused, because it was:

> commonly thought that the apprehensions she was under of drawing the King's anger on her daughter Elizabeth, prevented her from insisting upon her own innocence. As she knew the King's temper perfectly well, and as she could not vindicate herself without charging him with injustice, she was afraid Elizabeth would become the sacrifice of the King her Father's resentment.[799]

In denying herself the right to defend her innocence, Anne was an ideal mother because she sacrificed her own life in order to protect her child. To Rapin, Anne exhibited the eighteenth-century ideal of restraint. Her ability to control her emotions even in death illustrated her equanimity as well as her selflessness. Historians used this trope to highlight Henry's lack of paternal care and the abuse of his paternal role in expecting Anne to submit to his will. Rapin employed the terms 'anger' and 'temper' to emphasize Henry's inability to control his emotions, and how this behaviour affected his role as a father. He then lauded Anne's ideal motherhood in her 'sacrifice', in order to juxtapose Anne's ideal motherhood against Henry's paternal failures. Similar depictions are found

---

[798] Rapin, VII, p. 466.
[799] Rapin, VII, pp. 522-523.

in Hume's *History,* where Anne was depicted as a woman bravely facing her death on the scaffold in order to protect her child. As Hume wrote:

> she probably reflected, that the obstinacy of queen Catherine, and her opposition to the king's will, had much alienated him from the lady Mary; and her maternal concern, therefore, for Elizabeth, prevailed in these last moments over that indignation, which the unjust sentence, by which she suffered, naturally excited in her.[800]

Hume attempted to recreate Anne's state of mind for his readers, conveying a sense of interiority when he suggested the topics on which 'she probably reflected'. This statement allowed Hume to create an intimate perspective which may have been particularly appreciated by his female audience. Hume reminded his readers of Henry's previous dishonourable conduct towards Mary, and how this behaviour was now aimed towards Anne and Elizabeth. This emphasis heightened Anne's virtuous behaviour as a mother. The allusion to a sacrifice on Anne's part echoed Rapin's account, as Hume emphasized Anne's 'maternal concern' and how she 'suffered' to protect her child, highlighting the sacrifices which ideal mothers made for their children. Hume employed the terms 'unjust' and 'indignation' to underline that Anne's execution was a terrible act, and he used Anne's motherhood to further argue that Henry's paternal and patriarchal deficiencies made him a poor monarch.

Both French and British historians used the wives of Henry VIII to impart lessons to female readers. The sacrifices which Anne and Catherine made to protect their children thereby highlighted Henry's failures in his fatherly duties, while emphasizing the role of the ideal mother to female readers. In the eighteenth century, the protection of one's wife and children was supposed to be a natural masculine impulse.[801] Henry was therefore an unsuitable paternal figure because he punished his own daughters for the actions of their mothers.

---

[800] Hume, IV, p. 175.
[801] Joan B. Landes, 'Republican Citizens and Heterosocial Desire: Concepts of Masculinity in Revolutionary France', in *Masculinities in Politics and War*, ed. by Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 96-115.

Section 5: The King's Court and Household

Eighteenth-century historians used historical accounts of Henry VIII and his wives to communicate that an ideal king should not let his private life influence his public role. Historians viewed the king's court as an extension of his household, and drew attention to the negative influence of malignant advisors. Historians argued that factions within the court sought to exploit the king's personal vices in order to direct his public role to their will. In this portrayal, Henry was manipulated by his court, rather than doing what was best for it. As the head of this household, it was his responsibility to lead and provide guidance, rather than allowing himself to be influenced by factions. Historians also intimated that the court manipulated Henry during the trial and execution of Anne Boleyn, to argue that his failure to control his household led to his failure to protect his wife and queen. Historians implied that Henry's unrestrained personal passions caused damage to his family and household.

Historians argued that a king's vulnerability to malignant advisers jeopardized his household, as it suggested that he was not in control. As we saw in Chapter 2, factions were a problem in both Britain and France in the eighteenth century. If a king was susceptible to factional influence it suggested that he lacked independence and self-control, which were essential qualities in the ideal eighteenth-century man.[802] Historians explained how factions exploited aspects of Henry's private life to influence his public politics. Factions within the court used Henry's fading love for Anne for their own political ends, rather than to promote the nation's best interest. Historians criticized Henry, like Charles I and Louis XIII and XIV as discussed in Chapter 2, for his vulnerability to court influences. As Rapin wrote:

> The flatteries of his subjects, and the extravagant praises continually bestowed
> on him by the sovereigns who stood in need of him, had possessed him with

---

[802] Carter, p. 74.

such a conceit of his own merit, that he imagined his actions ought to have been made the standard of good sense, reason and justice.[803]

Rapin argued that Henry's unchecked passions were used to the advantage of those around him, and that he was easily swayed by sycophancy. The historian thus suggested to his readers that Henry's weak moral character, in addition to his love for Anne, led to the divorce and break with Rome. Henry was presented as arrogant, and the false flatteries he received disconnected him from the realities of his duties as king. Rapin communicated similar notions in his account of Henry's marriage to Catherine Howard. This queen was 'so devoted to the Duke [of Norfolk] her uncle, and to the Bishop of Winchester, that she was entirely guided by their counsels'. Since Catherine Howard initially had 'great ascendent [sic] over the King', Rapin believed the two men could have succeeded in manipulating Henry against the Reformation, were it not for her downfall.[804] In mentioning Catherine Howard's devotion, Rapin suggests that Norfolk and Winchester had manipulated her, and that Henry had failed to protect his wife, as well as himself, against malevolent advisors. By drawing attention to the possibility that the creation of the Church of England could have been impeded or prevented, Rapin argued that Henry's malleability to those around him also placed his nation at risk.

Warnings against the influence of malicious advisors, and the resulting endangerment of household and nation, were also found in historical accounts of Anne Boleyn's downfall. For Rapin, advisors within the court who were uncomfortable with the development of the Church of England turned the king against Anne. When Anne Boleyn's sister-in law told Henry about Anne and her husband's supposed incestuous relations, 'the king, prejudiced by his passion for Jane Seymour, was overjoyed to find in the pretended unfaithfulness of the Queen, a means to help him to the possession of the person he loved'.[805] Rapin also suggested that people within Henry's court desired a new queen who could facilitate a return to Rome, and used Henry's emotions to further these ambitions. This manipulation was a clear example of how Henry's passions affected his abilities as king. Historians included this account as it demonstrated how

---

[803] Rapin, VII, p. 358.
[804] Rapin, VII, p. 604.
[805] Rapin, VII, p. 516.

223

easily Henry was manipulated. Rapin argued that advisors used this opportunity to accuse Anne of other unfaithful deeds, writing that: 'these enemies were the same as those of the Reformation. They imagined she had put the King upon all his proceedings against the Pope, on purpose to favour the new Religion'.[806] Rapin made it clear to his audience that Henry's emotions directed his actions and that his advisors knew how to use this vulnerability to attain their own ends. Historians argued that, ultimately, Henry allowed his personal desires to be used by those around him. This vulnerability did not correspond with ideas of virtuous kingship.

Historians saw Anne's trial and execution as a great failure of kingship and as an example of how Henry was manipulated by his court, household, and emotions. Henry believed, without evidence, that Anne had had multiple affairs and historians argued that these assumptions caused jealousy in Henry and allowed him to be manipulated. Millot accused Anne's enemies of taking advantage of her precarious situation when Henry's infatuation with her suddenly subsided. Millot believed that Anne was innocent, but unfortunately Henry 'allowed himself to be persuaded of the infidelity of his queen'.[807] In the use of the term 'allowed', Millot stressed Henry's weakness in his kingly role. Millot also employed the term 'queen' rather than 'wife', or even 'mistress', in this sentence to highlight Henry's failures in his role as king. Millot pitied Anne, who accepted everything graciously, despite her 'repeated protestations of her innocence'.[808] Anne's behaviour only further emphasized the contrast to Henry's tempestuous conduct that was judged by the historian as ill befitting of a king.

Historians deemed that Henry's uncontrolled emotions ultimately resulted in Anne's death. They argued that, rather than set the example to his court, Henry allowed a select few from his court to lead him astray from ideal kingship. As the head of his household, court and nation, Henry had a responsibility to lead, but instead he was susceptible to malignant influence. To Rapin, this susceptibility prevented the queen from receiving a fair trial. He wrote that: 'it is very probable that the King believed the

---

[806] Rapin, VII, p. 516.
[807] Millot, I, p. 338.
[808] Millot, I, p. 338.

Queen guilty, and that, prejudiced as he was, signs and tokens were to him substantial proofs. But can the same thing be said of the peers who condemned her?'.[809] Rapin argued that Henry should have been able to rise above his emotions of jealousy and 'prejudice', and lead his people and court by example. Instead, it was the court who manipulated the king, as Rapin expressed in his reference to 'signs and tokens' which should not have been 'substantial proofs'. At the same time, Rapin argued that the court was unjust and unvirtuous but ultimately the fault lay with the king, who should have been impervious to its influence. The historian accused Henry of being 'inspired with a jealousy which threw him into a sort of fury', thus arguing that Anne was sentenced to death because of Henry's uncontrolled temper. Rapin even named this temper 'the most impetuous and most impatient that ever was'.[810] Thus, historians criticized Henry for his inability to control himself, emphasizing the point by exclaiming that no other historical figure was as 'impetuous' and 'impatient'. For Rapin, Henry's anger meant that even if some advisors felt that Anne was innocent, 'the dread they were under of turning against themselves the King's fury, if they complied not with his humour, made them consider marks and signs as real proofs'.[811] Henry's reign of terror thus influenced the court. Rapin employed the terms 'real proofs', as he had earlier with 'substantial proofs', to contend that there was no evidence of Anne's guilt. Historians used this example to argue that a king's court was an extension of his household. When his private actions were directly affected by the court, they influenced his public role as head of the nation.

French historians focused on how Henry's malleability and pursuit of personal desires had negative consequences for the English monarchy. While Henry VIII would always be remembered for his creation of the Church of England, French historians chose also to remember him for his despotic nature, his capricious temper and the way in which his advisors and enemies within his court, and metaphorical household, used these vices to manipulate the king to do their bidding. The ability to manipulate Henry affected his role as king, father, and husband, because the execution of his wives and constantly changing orders of succession affected both his household and nation.

---

[809] Rapin, VII, p. 521.
[810] Rapin, VII, p. 517.
[811] Rapin, VII, p. 522.

Henry's behaviour therefore further emphasized the important link between the household and nation to eighteenth-century readers. To French historians, Henry's inability to control himself and his household meant he was not a king whose character readers should emulate.

Conclusion

Many of the historians discussed in this chapter proposed a connection between private behaviour and public affairs. As their accounts of Henry VIII demonstrate, the king's behaviour within the domestic sphere affected his public life beyond the household. They illustrated how the flaws in this domestic sphere produced a king who fell short of contemporary ideals of masculinity and kinship. In France, the king's vices, which were supposed to be private, became part of public politics, and when the king did not exhibit virtue in both his private and public life, it strengthened perceptions that the monarchical government was corrupt.[812] Historians nonetheless referred to British virtues alongside French political influences in their depictions of English kings. Through this way of writing they were able to use Henry as a prescriptive historical figure. Henry's errors and faults humanized him and made him a useful figure for instruction, as well as making him a figure that the contemporary reading public could understand and connect to.[813] When Henry's vices affected the public, as with his desire for a new wife, or his decision to change the order of succession, they allowed historians to demonstrate that personal desires had a direct effect on public life. Historians argued that Henry's ill-treatment of his wives affected his reign, and they focused on his dishonourable behaviour to convey to readers the necessity of virtue in all aspects of one's life. Historians were ultimately arguing for the need for both private and public virtues, as Henry's actions as husband and father considerably influenced his role as king.

---

[812] Linton, *The Politics of Virtue*, p. 130.
[813] Hargraves, p. 25; Mark Salber Phillips, *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain, 1740-1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 14-18, 29-30.

Eighteenth-century historical texts reflected changing views about marriage and parenthood in this period. As king, Henry was the leader of a nation like a father is the head of a household. Historians used his role to assert the need for both private and public virtue in the ideal eighteenth-century man. An English king held three identities as a father in historical texts: he was a father to his children, a father to his household in the form of the court, and – perhaps most importantly to readers – a father to his nation. The king as the metaphorical father thus played an important role in historical accounts of Henry's reign.

The multiple marriages of Henry VIII and their unhappy demises were used by historians to convey royal vices that did not correspond with eighteenth-century notions of ideal kingship. These various marriages, which involved multiple factions within England as well as foreign powers, could have instigated great instability and even warfare. Henry failed to take adequate care of his dependents and household. Instead, historians argued, Henry turned against his queens in order to satisfy his personal desires, jeopardizing the entire nation.

Henry's uncontrolled passions affected his decisions, according to Rapin, Raynal and Millot. Historians portrayed Henry as a king with a weak moral character, as it did not align with eighteenth-century notions of proper male comportment and virtue. By the mid-eighteenth century, the ideal man had become a combination of moral masculine, social and political conduct, in which integrity was a fundamental quality. The virtuous man was independent as well as incorruptible, both in his private and public life. He should be able to master his emotions whenever necessary. He was an exemplary husband, father and son, and always took his familial obligations with the utmost seriousness.[814] Henry's untempered passions, evidenced by his six marriages and by the way he pursued and ended them, was used by historians to warn against the vices of uncontrolled constitutions. Henry's ill-treatment of his wives affected his decisions as king and historians focused on this problem to impart the necessity of virtue in all aspects of one's life.

---

[814] Linton, 'Virtue Rewarded?', p. 36.

Henry's inability to control his emotions and desires became a central instructional theme within historical accounts of his reign. French historians believed that Henry was a man led by his emotions, who lacked the restraint, gentility and control of the eighteenth-century virtuous man. They argued that Henry allowed his mistresses to become his wives, and his tyrannical behaviour ran unchecked. They depicted a king who allowed himself to be manipulated by those around him, due to his strong emotional reactions in addition to his weakness for flattery. Henry's inability to control his moods allowed historians to argue against tyrannical kingship, as his advisors, friends and family were depicted as fearful of his violent, and at times fickle, temper. The capricious nature of the king allowed historians to imply that virtuous behaviour within the household was also for the good of the nation, as one inherently affected the other.

French and British historians were not in complete agreement on the unsuitability of Catherine of Aragon's marriage to Henry. However, they used her marriage to Henry to provide an example of the need for the regulation of passions on behalf of the husband. Some historians believed that Catherine was an unsuitable spouse, yet they nonetheless argued that Henry should have been able to ignore his wish to wed another woman and control his personal desires. Accounts of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn allowed historians to comment on ideal qualities for eighteenth century women, such as youth, beauty, modesty and fertility. Historians depicted Catherine as unattractive in comparison with Anne Boleyn, in order to emphasize how Henry's personal desires and passions affected his decision to break with Rome. Both marriages were used to demonstrate the ill effects of malignant advisors on ideal kingship.

Historians explored new ideals of the affectionate father in their discussion of Henry's VIII's three children, as they portrayed the king as a questionable patriarchal figure. Both Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn were worried about their fate and its effect on their children, and historians used this concern to promote sympathy for the

queens when faced with Henry's tumultuous behaviour. Through the analysis of Henry VIII as a husband and father, French historians did not believe that Henry was a prudent ruler. Instead they argued that Henry was a king who ignored reason and the greater good, and based important national decisions on his personal desires. Children were utilised by historians to address legitimacy and succession issues. Historians argued that Henry's multiple acts of legislation about the legitimacy of his children put both his household and nation in a precarious situation. These concerns had a particular resonance given that the right of succession was an issue of national concern in 1688 and into the early eighteenth century.

The French historical emphasis on Henry VIII's vices demonstrates how notions of ideal kingship changed in the eighteenth century, and how the significance of the king's private life increased dramatically in comparison with histories written in the seventeenth century. As the notion of the divine right of kings became less prominent in the eighteenth century, these historical texts reveal how all aspects of a monarch's life were increasingly becoming part of their public role. As the patriarchal father turned into a more affectionate and paternal figure, historians reflected new ideals of politeness, sensibility and marital affection in their texts. While French and British historians placed different emphases on the vices of Henry VIII and the danger or instability which they caused, their interest in and sense of what constituted an ideal man, father and husband confirms the existence of shared historiographical practices.

Chapter 4: Queens and Gender in Eighteenth-Century Historical Writing

This chapter argues that eighteenth-century historians offered moral instruction to their readers on feminine virtue, patriarchy and the role of the monarch, through their accounts of sixteenth-century queens. These accounts discussed the lives, and in some cases, reigns of Lady Jane Grey (1537-1554), Mary I (1516-1558), and Elizabeth I (1533-1558) to convey eighteenth-century ideals. Eighteenth-century historians writing in both Britain and France sought to articulate their views of ideal behaviour for eighteenth-century women and the ideal conduct of the monarch. Queens played a prominent role in sixteenth-century Europe, and their diverse roles offered historians varied examples. Historians employed Lady Jane Grey as the ideal feminine exemplar, and used ideal female qualities such as beauty and youth, to criticize the unpopular Mary Tudor. Elizabeth was held in high regard by eighteenth-century historians, and her depiction as a monarch with masculine qualities meant that historians were able to circumvent the prescriptive gendered role of the usual female historical figure.

Queens were prominent in the public mindset throughout the eighteenth century and thus played an important role in contemporary historical texts. William III became the Protestant alternative to James II during the Glorious Revolution of 1688, primarily due to his marriage to Mary II and her claim to the throne. Mary was not regarded as a ruling queen by her people as she held no substantial regal power, yet her inheritance of the throne still held symbolic authority. Upon the death of William III in 1702, Queen Anne – the first queen regnant since Elizabeth I – reigned until 1714. Importantly, Anne's husband remained the Prince of Denmark, allowing Anne to reign over England with autonomy. Moreover, the threat of a Catholic monarch and the Jacobite uprisings drove negative depictions of Catholicism in historical texts. As Rachel Weil has argued, the reigns of Mary and Anne witnessed a passionate debate about the position of women

in society and the significance of women in political life.[815] Weil has shown that the reigns of these queens, especially that of Anne, raised apprehensions about the role of the household patriarch, because a man was no longer in place as father of the kingdom.[816] These apprehensions shaped portrayals of sixteenth-century queens, as historians employed these figures to promote certain feminine ideals and to discuss the ideal public role of British queens.

In early modern France and England, men and woman were perceived as natural opposites, and men were considered to be superior to women.[817] For example, Montesquieu believed that men were inherently physically stronger than women, while women had a less instinctive intellectual capacity.[818] He believed that climate had an effect on the biological development of women, and that hot climates made women naturally subservient to men.[819] These perceptions of bodily difference placed men over women as both rational and spiritual beings, and these ideas underpinned social hierarchy and social order.[820] British eighteenth-century prescriptive texts also argued that women and men were different by nature. These dissimilarities were said to shape their characters and they thus defined the specific activities and roles in society that were best suited to each sex.[821] From these accounts an image of the eighteenth-century woman emerged who was pious, modest, chaste and passive, and who was associated with the domestic sphere.[822] People believed that the masculine mind symbolized the changeable and unpredictable, while the feminine mind was associated with the

---

[815] Rachel Weil, *Political Passions: Gender, the Family and Political Argument in England 1680-1714* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999); Matthew McCormack, 'The New Militia: War, Politics and Gender in 1750s Britain', *Gender & History*, 19:3 (2007), 483-500 (p. 490).
[816] Weil, p. 490.
[817] Anne McLaren, 'Gender, Religion, and Early Modern Nationalism: Elizabeth I, Mary Queen of Scots, and the Genesis of English Anti-Catholicism', *The American Historical Review*, 107:3 (2002), 739-767 (p. 742).
[818] Chris Nyland, 'Adam Smith, Stage Theory, and the Status of Women', *History of Political Economy*, 25:4 (1993), 617-640 (p. 619).
[819] Nyland, p. 638.
[820] McLaren, p. 742.
[821] Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus, 'Introduction', *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities*, ed. by Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus (London and New York: Longman, 1997), pp. 1-28 (pp. 1-2).
[822] Barker and Chalus, pp. 1-2.

imaginative.[823] These beliefs influenced the ways in which historians addressed the role of women in the natural patriarchal order and how they conveyed ideas of feminine virtue and queenly behaviour.

History as a reading practice became one of the foundations of female education by the later eighteenth century.[824] J.B. Black has noted that David Hume was like Voltaire in that he believed history was crucial as an instrument of education, and that virtue played an important role within these texts.[825] This chapter will therefore explore how eighteenth-century historians used their texts to instruct female readers in both France and Britain in what they considered to be feminine virtue. During this period, history was viewed as an account of male activities, which could only be written by men, but nonetheless histories were increasingly recommended and marketed to female readers.[826] Women were an important part of the reading public in this period.[827] When recording their reading activities, most women included history, which also comprised of history in the form of letters, memoirs and biographies.[828] Women were encouraged to read some of the same historical works as men, but were not encouraged to write about them as men were.[829]

When works of history were compared with novels, history was typically heralded as more useful for its educative qualities and engaging instruction on morality. By comparison, novels were often considered to be an insubstantial form of reading that

---

[823] J.G.A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 99.

[824] D.R. Woolf, 'A Feminine Past? Gender, Genre, and Historical Knowledge in England, 1500-1800'*, The American Historical Review,* 102:3 (1997), 645-679 (pp. 659-660); Mark Salber Phillips, *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain, 1740-1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 110-114.

[825] J.B. Black, *The Art of History: A Study of Four Great Historians of the Eighteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1926), p. 85.

[826] For women's agency in the writing of history during this period, and their role in the debates over and conversations about the genres of history, see Devoney Looser, *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820* (Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).

[827] J.G.A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion Volume 2: Narratives of Civil Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 168.

[828] Jacqueline Pearson, *Women's Reading in Britain, 1750-1835: A Dangerous Recreation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 49-50.

[829] Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, p. 181.

resulted in an unproductive use of time.[830] The competition between the novel and history began in the first half of the eighteenth century, when women were encouraged to recognize the superiority of history in comparison with the romance and the novel, as history formed a part of both leisure and educative reading practices.[831] Writers of fiction throughout the eighteenth century adopted the narrative realism and title of history, yet still included the novel's sentimental and ornamental style.[832] Robert Mayer argues that 'matters of fact were by definition worthwhile but always because they had the potential of providing men and women with a basis for acting efficaciously in the world'.[833] As history was known for its educative purposes, it appears that writers of fictions hoped to mimic history's success for its promotion of gender ideals and instructions on morality. The sentimental aspect of the historical teaching of virtue was normally associated with female readership and genres outside of history, and these alternate genres included fiction.[834] Marc Salber Phillips argues that 'female readers were conventionally regarded as forming the audience not for history but fiction', yet sentimental fiction was denounced by contemporary moralists as particularly unsuitable for female readers.[835] Sentimentalism, as defined by John Mullan, was a language of feeling that reflected on social bonds and communicated passions.[836] It was the fear of this intimate and emotional writing that led moralists to encourage eighteenth-century women to read history. Historians such as Rapin, Raynal and Millot acknowledged their female readership, and used their accounts to warn their readers about the dangers of excessive sentiment.

Writers such as James Fordyce, a Scottish Presbyterian minister, composed conduct books in which they argued for the usefulness of history as an educational tool,

---

[830] Clare Barlow, 'Virtue, Patriotism and Female Scholarship in Bluestocking Portraiture', in *Bluestockings Displayed: Portraiture, Performance and Patronage, 1730-1830,* ed. by Elizabeth Eger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 60-80 (p. 66).
[831] D.R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 322-323.
[832] Woolf, 'A Feminine Past', p. 664.
[833] Robert Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel: Matters of Fact from Bacon to Defoe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 116, 123.
[834] Phillips, p. 104.
[835] Phillips, p. 107.
[836] John Mullan, *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 1.

especially in terms of eighteenth-century notions of virtue by which women were expected to abide. In his *Sermons to Young Women*, originally published in 1766, Fordyce informed women that:

> First, I would observe that history, in which I include Biography, and Memoirs, ought to employ a considerable share of your leisure. Those pictures which it exhibits, of the passions operating in real life and genuine characters; of virtues to be imitated, and of vices to be shunned; of the effects of both on society and individuals; of the mutability of human affairs; of the conduct of divine providence; of the great consequences that often arise from little events; of the weakness of power, and the wandering of prudence […] the pictures, I say, which History exhibits all of these, have been ever reckoned by the best judges among the richest sources of instruction and entertainment.

For Fordyce, history helped women to contemplate 'the majesty and happiness of Virtue in the best examples, together with the meanness and misery of Vice in the worst'.[837] J. Burton's *Lectures On Female Education and Manners* (1794) also noted the importance of examples of virtue in historical texts, writing that 'the characters of Virtue, of Vice and of Folly, have been so strongly marked by the Historian or Moralist, that you will be less liable to deception, when you see the living Portraits'.[838] The reading of history during this period promoted cultural constructions of gender and as a result historians used gendered virtues to describe female historical figures.[839] Conduct books underscored the value of history in teaching women proper behaviour.

An essay in Hume's *Study of History* which was published in 1741, but withdrawn in 1760, recommended the reading of history to his 'female readers', noting that it was:

> an occupation, of all other, the best suited to their sex and education, much more instructive than their ordinary books of amusement, and much more entertaining than those serious compositions.

---

[837] James Fordyce, *Sermons to Young Women*, 12th edn, 2 vols (New York: I. Riley, 1809), II, pp. 6-7.

[838] J. Burton, *Lectures on Female Education and Manners* (Dublin: J. Milliken, 1794), pp. 157-158.

[839] Pearson, p. 50; Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), p. 9.

Yet the historian did not only promote the study of history to women. Hume also wanted to demonstrate 'how well suited' the study of history could be for everyone and argued that 'the advantages to be found in history seem to be of three kinds, as it amuses the fancy, as it improves understanding, and it strengthens virtue'.[840] Pocock argues that Hume wrote about women's role in the reading and sharing of history, as he felt that women were contributing to the overall formation of the polity due to the convergence of the public and private spheres.[841] As there were anxieties about women and their growing public role in the eighteenth century, Hume's acknowledgement of his female readership allowed him to communicate his historical philosophy directly to this emerging audience. While Hume followed the eighteenth-century approach whereby a historical character exhibited virtue or vice to readers, he also incorporated a sentimental approach which he thought his female audience would appreciate.[842] Mullan found that Hume surrounded himself with female admirers, and corresponded regularly with women about his works. Mullan argues that Hume viewed correspondence as especially valuable, because it offered 'the possibility of a type of communication which could be both rigorously correct and perfectly responsive'.[843] If Hume was in regular correspondence with female readers throughout the seven years during which he wrote his *History of England*, women may have influenced the way in which he wrote. Hume's consciousness of his female audience certainly accounts for his use of idealised feminine qualities and behaviour in his depictions of sixteenth-century queens.

Later in the century, Hester Chapone (1727-1801), a key member of the Bluestocking group, advocated for the necessity of women reading history in her *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind* (1773). This work featured an extensive letter, entitled 'On the Manner and Course of Reading History'. The letter was a guide on how a woman should read history, and included a certain chronological order and specific periods, and some examples of authors that were deemed suitable for women. Chapone

---

[840] David Hume, *On The Study of History* (1743), cited in Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, p. 180.
[841] Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, p. 180.
[842] Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 61; J.C. Hilson, 'Hume: The Historian as Man of Feeling', in *Augustan Worlds: Essays in Honour of R.A. Humphreys*, ed. by J.C. Hilson, M.M.B. Jones and J.R. Watson (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1978), pp. 205-222 (p. 209).
[843] Mullan, pp. 4-5.

wrote that her female reader should begin with the ancients, before moving on to more modern history. She encouraged her reader to learn about the nations that surrounded her, as 'you cannot learn the history of Great Britain, without becoming in some decree acquainted with almost every neighbouring nation, and without finding your curiosity excited to know more of those, with whom we are most connected'.[844] In studying the history of Britain, she recommended beginning with the invasion of Julius Caesar. Chapone advised her reader to 'set out with Rapin, and proceed with him to William the Conqueror. From this era there are other histories of England more entertaining than his, tho' [sic], I believe, none esteemed more authentic'.[845] Chapone's recommendation of Rapin reflected his appeal to female readers. Millot's and Raynal's texts also included similar accounts of sixteenth-century queenship and it is likely that these were also attractive to female readers. Eighteenth-century women thus saw their new position as avid readers of history affect the way in which the genre was written and shared. The manner in which historical accounts depicted contemporary constructions of feminine virtue in sixteenth-century queens, especially Lady Jane Grey, demonstrates the widespread use of historical works as educational texts for women.

The three successive queens of sixteenth-century Britain allowed eighteenth-century historians to explore ideas of femininity while providing instruction for modern monarchs and queens. Lady Jane Grey was the first sixteenth-century Tudor queen, between 10 July 1553 and 19 July 1553. Unlike other monarchs, Lady Jane Grey never received a dedicated chapter in major eighteenth-century historical works and her status as a legitimate queen has been questioned because she was uncrowned, and held the throne for only nine days. She had no chance to implement policies and had little effect on the rest of the kingdom or foreign politics. Perhaps for these reasons, she was used in historical works to promote notions of feminine virtue rather than political ideals. Her short reign set the stage for the two queens that followed her. The life of the young queen was contrasted with the reign of Mary I. Accounts of Grey were frequently used by historians to commence their account of Mary's reign; only rarely was her life

---

[844] Hester Chapone, *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind,* 2 vols (London: H. Hughs for J. Walter, 1773), II, pp. 196-197.
[845] Chapone, II, pp. 218-219.

discussed at the end of the reign of Edward VI. Following Grey's brief rule, Mary Tudor reigned from July 1553 until her death on 17 November 1558. Mary was the only child of Henry VIII by his first wife Catherine of Aragon. Her younger half-brother Edward VI succeeded their father in 1547. When Edward became mortally ill in 1553, Mary's Catholicism provoked an attempt to remove her from the line of succession. On the young king's death their first cousin once removed, Lady Jane Grey, was proclaimed queen. Mary assembled a force in East Anglia and deposed Jane, who was eventually beheaded. If the disputed reigns of Jane and the Empress Matilda are excluded, Mary was the first queen regnant of England. In 1554, Mary married Philip II (1527-1598). Four years later, Elizabeth succeeded her half-sister to the throne and ruled for 44 years until her death on 24 March 1603. The childless Elizabeth was the last monarch of the Tudor line.

The history of sixteenth-century queens has long been a popular academic pursuit, whereas the examination of their historical legacies post-reign has only been a focus of scholarship in recent years. Thomas S. Freeman and Susan Doran's study of historical perceptions of Mary I explores the anti-Catholic rhetoric closely associated with a poor opinion of Mary. Doran and Freeman argue that that these views 'owe a great deal to Elizabethan historiography' as Mary's short Catholic reign was followed by a Protestant reign that lasted over four decades.[846] Freeman argues that by the eighteenth century, fifteenth-century texts demonizing Mary's religious persecutions grew more prevalent.[847] Freeman's argument illuminates why portraits of Mary as a cruel and murderous queen permeated eighteenth-century French and British historical accounts in art because of the influence of these widely accepted perceptions. In a separate study focused on Elizabeth I, Doran and Freeman challenged the view that Elizabeth was unambiguously celebrated in the literature and portraiture of the early modern era.[848] They explained how the most familiar myths surrounding Elizabeth developed from the concerns of her contemporaries and continued into the centuries that

---

[846] Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman, 'Introduction', in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 1-17 (p. 9).
[847] Thomas S. Freeman, 'Inventing Bloody Mary: Perceptions of Mary Tudor from the Restoration to the Twentieth Century', in Doran and Freeman, *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, pp. 78-100 (p. 85).
[848] Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman eds, *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2003).

followed. These myths include that of Elizabeth's reputation as a queen who ruled with a masculine manner.[849] The myths that Doran and Freeman emphasize in the legacies of Mary and Elizabeth are found in the histories of Rapin, Millot, Raynal and Hume. The presence of these common conceptions of Tudor queens in historical works suggests that eighteenth-century historians helped to propagate the myths of Elizabeth and Mary that we see today, whilst also conveying eighteenth-century apprehensions about women, domesticity, and their growing public presence.

Lady Jane Grey was a well-known historical figure in the nineteenth century, yet little has been written about her historical legacy in the eighteenth century. Jean Marsden's study of Hanoverian plays about Grey provides useful insights into the perceptions of Grey that emerged during this period. Marsden argues that the early eighteenth century witnessed contentious moments in English political and cultural life, and these events included the threat of Jacobite rebellion and the Hanoverian succession. As a result, she argues, there was a brief but intense obsession with Lady Jane Grey that swept the British nation.[850] A view of an innocent, martyred and virtuous Grey resonated through eighteenth-century historical texts in the rest of the century due to this obsession.

In this chapter I argue that the representation of female historical figures played an important role in communicating feminine virtue and dominant cultural constructions of gender to male and female readers. The way in which French and British historians presented sixteenth-century queens contributed to the success of their works of history in eighteenth-century Britain because in this period history was promoted especially to women for its important lessons and prescriptive notions of virtue.

The first section of the chapter will examine how eighteenth-century historians used accounts of sixteenth-century queens to explore the desirable qualities and

---

[849] Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman, 'Introduction', in Doran and Freeman, *The Myth of Elizabeth*, pp. 1-23 (p. 18).
[850] Jean I. Marsden, 'Sex, Politics, and She-Tragedy: Reconfiguring Lady Jane Grey', *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 42:3 (2002), 501-522.

behaviour for eighteenth-century women. Lady Jane Grey was presented by historians as an example of feminine virtue, and writers highlighted her youth, beauty, intelligence and modesty to argue that she should be emulated. Grey served as a contrast to the unpopular Mary Tudor, who was depicted as an aging and melancholic queen to convey ideal feminine qualities for both queens and female readers.

The following section will argue that eighteenth-century historians used the short rule of Lady Jane Grey to comment on ideals of patriarchy in the eighteenth century. Both French and British historians maintained that Grey was used as a pawn in a plot, and that she was manipulated by the court, her parents, husband and father-in-law. Historians depicted the Duke of Northumberland (1504-1553) as a power-hungry figure who controlled Grey and manipulated King Edward VI (1537-1553), in order to warn against the misuse of patriarchal power. Elizabeth I, on the other hand, avoided the eighteenth-century connotations of weakness associated with femininity as she presented herself with masculine qualities. Historians were thus able to portray her reign as successful without undermining the patriarchal order that was deemed natural.

The third section explores how eighteenth-century historians treated queens differently from kings. Mary and Elizabeth were depicted as competitors over suitors to highlight the difference in their feminine virtues, and this rivalry was a trope that historians did not use in their depictions of kings. Historians discussed the suitability of potential spouses, as there were concerns that a husband, and especially a foreign one, could jeopardize the queen's commitment to her country. Historians engaged with the different qualities of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor to convey that Elizabeth was ultimately the ideal monarch, while her sister Mary was the example of the type of monarchical rule to avoid. They also commented on the demise of Mary Stuart's (1542-1547) first marriage to emphasize the need for self-control, as an unsuccessful union brought uncertainty and turmoil to a nation.

The final section of this chapter will examine how historians used queens to educate readers about the ideal monarch, be they male or female. Eighteenth-century

historians presented the behaviour of the queen Mary Tudor and regnant queen Catherine de' Medici (1519-1589) as cautionary tales in order to advocate for religious toleration. Historians then presented Elizabeth I as the model monarch due to her ability to overcome, and learn from, many obstacles. Sixteenth-century queens allowed eighteenth-century historians to advocate that a monarch should reign with the nation's best interests at heart, rather than their personal desires.

Section 1: Ideals of Femininity

Eighteenth-century historians used their historical accounts of queens to explore and promote desirable qualities for eighteenth-century women. Lady Jane Grey, queen for only nine days, has been treated as an exemplar of feminine virtue since the end of her reign. Grey was used as a model of the kind, virtuous, demure ideal woman of the eighteenth century. She embodied the gender ideals of both France and England, and her reign was so short that it did not cause any problematic issues of representation of a female in power. Historians used Lady Jane Grey and Mary Tudor to convey ideals of youth and beauty to eighteenth-century women. Historians highlighted the contrast between them. The ways in which both women were depicted reveals the trepidation with which eighteenth-century society viewed female aging. This section will explore how eighteenth-century historians communicated eighteenth-century constructions of feminine virtue to their female readers.

Early in the eighteenth century, a considerable amount of national turmoil led to a resurgence in Lady Jane Grey's popularity. Queen Anne died in 1714, and the Hanoverian succession that followed saw significant political and religious upheaval. Combined with the 1715 Jacobite rebellion, the prospect of Catholic absolutism was a potent political scare tactic which was seized upon by Whig writers.[851] The devout but steadfast Lady Jane Grey became an idealized figure representing the British national

---

[851] Marsden, pp. 503-504.

character, who reminded readers of the potential evils of Catholic rule.[852] This depiction of Grey as an ideal and virtuous queen continued throughout the eighteenth century.

Lady Jane Grey had been regarded as an exemplar of feminine virtue since the sixteenth century. Carole Levin argues that in the early modern period, Grey epitomised archetypal feminine behaviour because she was 'beautiful, modest, deferential, quiet, and passive'.[853] Given that these qualities were valued highly in the eighteenth century, it is unsurprising that Grey was described in these terms in eighteenth-century historical texts. Grey became synonymous with the contemporary constructions of ideal feminine behaviour because female virtue was of increasing importance in the eighteenth century. In Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755), the term 'virtuous' was an adjective that when 'applied to women', meant 'chaste'. For Johnson the definition of 'chaste' meant 'pure of all commerce of sexes' as well as 'pure; uncorrupt [sic], free from obscenity'.[854] As we shall see, Grey's portrayal was inspired by the second part of this definition.

Grey was used as an exemplary figure by historians because she was intelligent, educated and in possession of ideal feminine qualities. Rapin, for instance, described Grey as 'an accomplished Lady both in body and mind'.[855] Grey was exemplary because her beauty matched her intelligence. Millot drew attention to her scholarly pursuits to highlight her incorruptibility, writing:

> To the natural virtues and charms of her sex, she joined such knowledge and
> such talents as might have done honour to ours. The solidity of her
> understanding led her to the pursuit of literature. The study of the learned

---

[852] Marsden, p. 501.

[853] Carole Levin, 'Lady Jane Grey: Protestant Queen and Martyr', in *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. by Margaret Patterson Hannay (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1985), pp. 92-106 (p. 92).

[854] Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 2 vols (London: J. and P. Knapton and A. Millar, 1755), II.

[855] Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, *The History of England*, trans. by Nicolas Tindal, 15 vols (London: James and John Knapton, 1725-1731), VIII, p. 106.

languages was at once her employment and her delight; and she preferred the lessons of Plato to the amusements of the court.[856]

The historian used Grey's love of learning to argue that she was an ideal woman who sought to improve herself even beyond 'the natural virtues and charms of her sex'. In stating that she took pleasure in her education, Millot stressed the importance of the virtue of self-improvement for women. Moreover, Millot stated that she had 'talents as might have done honour to ours [men's]', suggesting that she was able to adopt ideal male qualities in a non-threatening way, due to her ability to retain her reassuringly 'natural' and 'charm[ing]' femininity. He argued that Grey also exhibited ideal behaviour as she wanted to rely on more than her natural feminine charms. To Millot, Grey was a demure and intelligent woman who was different from frivolous female courtiers. Had she remained queen, she would have been 'indeed, worthy of it', due to her chastity, intelligence and femininity.[857]

Hume similarly argued that Grey was an exemplary figure due to her multiple talents and positive characteristics. Hume used her ideal qualities to defend her incorruptibility. To Hume, she was innocent of the plot to put her on the throne as she 'was a lady of the most amiable person, the most engaging disposition, the most accomplished parts'.[858] Hume also noted that Grey had been educated alongside King Edward from a young age, to affirm her unusual intelligence.[859] As Grey had 'her heart, full of this passion for literature and arts', Hume felt that she was exemplary as she 'had never opened [her]self to the flattering allurements of ambition'.[860] Hence Grey remained the ideal woman in eighteenth-century historical texts because she was pure of heart in her desire to better herself, and for her modesty in her desire to pursue her studies. This behaviour was in contrast to that of the usual women at court whose behaviour was deemed as rather vain. In this description Hume establishes a balance: Grey desired to improve herself, but managed to avoid the transgressive over-reaching

---

[856] Abbé Millot, *Elements of the History of England*, trans. by Mr Kenrick, 2 vols (Dublin: James Williams, 1771), II, p. 2.
[857] Millot, II, p. 2.
[858] David Hume, *The History of England*, 2nd edn, 8 vols (London: A. Millar, 1763), IV, p. 395.
[859] Hume, IV, p. 395.
[860] Hume, IV, p. 396.

implied in the term 'ambition'. Her eschewal of ambition meant that she was portrayed as incorruptible; her 'chaste' behaviour, as defined by Samuel Johnson, made her an exemplary figure for female readers.

Historians likewise called attention to Grey's equanimity, portraying her as a young woman who faced her execution with a courage that demonstrated her control over her passions. As discussed in previous chapters, equanimity was an eighteenth-century virtue for both men and women.[861] Rapin described Grey as a young woman who was almost pleased at her execution because she had never sought power in the first place: 'as for Jane she saw herself stript [sic] of her dignity which she had held but nine days, with more joy than she had taken it up'.[862] Rapin used Grey's appearance of humility and lack of ambition to portray a woman who faced her execution with dignity rather than great emotional turmoil. Raynal portrayed a similar calmness, arguing that the young queen had 'died more gloriously on the scaffold, than Mary lived on the throne'.[863] By contrasting Grey to the queen who followed her, Raynal lauded her bravery, using Grey's mastery of her emotions to criticize Mary's reign. Similarly, Millot focused on Grey's execution and her idealistic equanimity to highlight the virtue of her entire character. Grey faced her death with courage as 'she received without emotion the long-expected news that she must prepare for death'. When it was time for her execution, Millot argued that she comported herself with 'magnanimity' and 'steadiness'.[864] Grey was therefore commendable for her equanimity, as when facing her death, an event that many confronted with great fear, her calmness and acceptance demonstrated her model character. These accounts of Grey's death suggested a form of martyrdom, in which the queen represented a pinnacle of the ideals of female modesty and self-effacement. Grey's death was depicted by historians as preferable to the kind of public power that she would have had to wield as queen. With this martyrdom,

---

[861] Susan Khin Zaw, '"Appealing to the Head and Heart": Wollstonecraft on Burke on Taste, Morals and Human Nature', in *Femininity and Masculinity in Eighteenth-Century Art and Culture*, ed. by Gill Perry and Michael Rossington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), pp. 123-141 (p. 135).
[862] Rapin, VIII, p. 129.
[863] Abbé Raynal, *The History of the Parliament of England*, trans. by [Anon] (London: T. Osbourne, 1751), p. 159.
[864] Millot, II, pp. 8-9.

historians were able to address the anxieties about the increasingly public role of women in the eighteenth century.

According to historians, Lady Jane Grey was emblematic of the ideal feminine qualities of beauty and youth. In the eighteenth century, youth and age were perceived as distinct. Age was the negative binary of youth, and was often associated with a state of decay.[865] In *The Present State of Matrimony: or, The Real Causes of Conjugal Infidelity and Unhappy Marriages* (1739), George Booth produced a list of well-worn binary oppositions in which health, innocence and beauty were associated with youth, while rottenness, debauchery, deformity and disease were associated with age:

> In short, we see beauty coupled to deformity, youth to age, innocency [sic] to debauchery, health to diseases and rottenness; that we may as well join fire and water, war and peace, and all the contraries in nature.[866]

Using these contradictions, Grey was emblematic of the ideal eighteenth-century woman, while Mary embodied the negative perceptions of feminine aging in historical texts of the period. Indeed, historians frequently underscored Mary's lack of positive feminine qualities by focusing on her age. While Jane was 16 or 17 when she was made queen, Mary was crowned at 37. To highlight Grey's youth, Millot wrote that Grey 'died in the bloom of life, a woman whose beauty, spirit, sense and virtue, did honour to her country, and whose happiness, had she been left to the indulgence of her own studious inclinations, would have been more to be envied than a princes'.[867] Millot lamented Grey's death as a great loss of potential life, and listed her great qualities of 'beauty, spirit, sense and virtue' one after the other to underscore her embodiment of the ideal of female youth. Millot thus argued that these qualities made Grey a faultless figure who could have been envied by all, even royalty, had she not lost her life.

By contrast, Millot informed his readers that Mary was 'naturally solemn, melancholy and opinionated' and that she had a 'gloomy jealousy' towards her sister

---

[865] Helen Yallop, *Age and Identity in Eighteenth-Century England* (Abington: Routledge, 2015), p. 34.
[866] George Booth, *The Present State of Matrimony: or, The Real Causes of Conjugal Infidelity and Unhappy Marriages* (London: John Hawkins, 1739), p. 32.
[867] Millot, II, p. 9.

Elizabeth.[868] In effect, Mary was the opposite of Grey. Rapin described Mary in similar terms, noting that she had 'a temper fierce and vindictive', and a 'natural cruelty'.[869] These qualities were at odds with ideals of femininity. In labelling Mary as 'solemn', 'vindictive' and inclined to 'melancholy', Rapin and Millot implied that the queen's cantankerous disposition was the result of her advanced age, especially when compared with their depictions of Grey or Elizabeth. The historians portrayed Mary as an aging woman whose character should not be emulated. This characterization also asserted that Mary's emotional instability, exacerbated by her old age, led to the religious persecutions and other failures of her reign.

In the eighteenth century, female aging was associated with the loss of youth, rather than the arrival of infirmity. Many texts presented older women as old maids, casting them either as sexual predators or asexual drones.[870] Mary's portrayal corresponded with the latter stereotype. Abbé Raynal used Mary's husband, Philip II, to highlight Mary's old age, writing:

> When Philip married Mary, she was ugly, old, sickly, and peevish. The ambitious Spaniard sacrificed his dislike, to the desire of adding a rich Crown to the many vast Estates, which he was soon to inherit. The Queen's barrenness confounded his views, and put an end to the complaisance of a selfish husband, who, besides, had just taken possession of the immense spoils of Charles V.[871]

Raynal accentuated her old age and drew on negative connotations of older women to undermine Mary's queenship. He again used the term 'peevish', which he had previously employed to criticise Mary's mother, Catherine of Aragon.[872] With this description, he depicted Mary as unhealthy, unattractive and capricious to highlight her old age, as it was often believed in the eighteenth century that aging could be combated with social interaction and the right type of thinking.[873] In drawing attention to this ill-tempered behaviour and the queen's advanced age, Raynal suggested to readers that she

---

[868] Millot, II, p. 4.
[869] Rapin, VIII, p. 215.
[870] Susannah R. Ottaway, *The Decline of Life: Old Age in Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 41.
[871] Raynal, p. 160.
[872] Raynal, *History of the Parliament*, p. 153.
[873] Yallop, p. 2.

was unfit to rule. Furthermore, he noted Philip II's dislike of his aging wife to argue that Mary's traits did not represent feminine ideals. Both Raynal and Millot undermined the queen by drawing attention to her barrenness. Millot argued that that Mary had a 'mortification of being without children'.[874] By stating that Mary was embarrassed by her infertility, Millot insinuated that eighteenth-century women should dread barrenness, as it signified a loss of femininity and youth. Susan R. Ottaway argues that childbirth and childrearing were central to a woman's role in early modern society, and this ideal persisted in the eighteenth century.[875] Mary, in her inability to produce an heir, did not live up to ideal gender roles. Historians capitalized on her infertility and age in order to emphasize the ideal feminine qualities of beauty and youth to female readers.

Section 2: Patriarchy

In writing about sixteenth-century queens, historians were able to comment on ideals of patriarchy, and the place of women within it. Historians bolstered the natural patriarchal order by emphasizing Lady Jane Grey's feminine ideals and complimenting her grace and obedience. Depictions of Grey reinforced contemporary feminine archetypes, in order for historians to assuage the anxiety provoked by the notion of women in possession of public power. These accounts may have been in response to a broader context of anxiety about the increasingly visible public role of women at the beginning of the eighteenth century.[876] Historians argued that Grey, as a woman, had no control due to her role within the patriarchy. By contrast, Elizabeth I, the renowned queen who reigned for over 44 years, was treated completely differently by eighteenth-century historians. They were able to evade the common gender and patriarchal concerns that they had addressed with other sixteenth-century queens because Elizabeth was positioned outside of the normal patriarchal hierarchy both because she was a monarch, and because she was considered to possess a number of masculine virtues. Clarissa

---

[874] Millot, II, p. 21.
[875] Ottaway, p. 41.
[876] Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History*, p. 99.

Campbell Orr argues that royal women represented an extreme case of 'relational women, whose importance is determined by being the daughter, wife or mother of a royal man'.[877] I would argue that eighteenth-century historians treated queens in this manner, especially Lady Jane Grey. Elizabeth, initially viewed as the daughter of Henry VIII, came to be viewed as her own person only because of the masculine characteristics that were attributed to her.

Prescriptive texts of the period argued for the naturally superior role of men in the patriarchal order. Some eighteenth-century writers positioned men as the superior sex not only because of their physical and mental strengths, but also because of their role as protectors and governors of women, as the feminine sex was viewed as delicate and requiring protection.[878] Lord Kames, in his 1776 publication of *On the Progress of the Female Sex,* expressed that 'The man, as a protector, is directed by nature to govern' while the woman 'delicate and timid, requires protection' and 'conscious of inferiority, is disposed to obedience'.[879] The voicing of these ideals in texts ensured that literate women knew the roles that were expected of them in the household and society. These perceptions of men and women were also expressed in the chivalric code, and the delicacy and fragility of women was often used to support the chivalric notion of masculinity, as this belief held men to be the stronger and more heroic sex.[880] Grey, in eighteenth-century historical texts, often embodied this delicacy and fragility, and was viewed as both the victim and upholder of the ideal patriarchal order.

Historians used accounts of Lady Jane Grey to depict the young woman as a victim of patriarchal authority. The dignity with which she faced her accession to, and descent from, the throne idealized this behaviour, and made her into an exemplar of feminine virtue. According to eighteenth-century historians, Grey ultimately had no say

---

[877] Clarissa Campbell Orr, 'Introduction: Court Studies, Gender and Women's History 1660-1837', in *Queenship in Britain 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics*, ed. by Clarissa Campbell Orr (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 1-52 (p. 1).
[878] Michèle Cohen, '"Manners" Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750-1830', *Journal of British Studies*, 44:2 (2005), 312-329 (p. 329).
[879] Henry Home, Lord Kames, *On the Progress of the Female Sex, in Six Sketches on the History of Man* (Philadelphia: R. Bell and R. Aitken, 1776), p. 195.
[880] Cohen, p. 329.

in the matter of her queenship, and in her docility towards her superiors she was depicted as following the ideal eighteenth-century notions of patriarchal order. She was innocent because she was used by political factions, all the members of which were male, within the court. Historians emphasized this martyrdom with the portrayal of a reluctant Grey who did not want to take the throne. Grey's lack of desire for power underlined her status as a victim. In describing Grey's accession to the throne, Rapin wrote that the Duke of Northumberland reported to the council 'that so far was Jane from aspiring to the Crown, that they had been forced to offer a sort of violence to her to persuade her to accept it'.[881] Even when Grey had initially heard of the plot, she was immediately distressed and proclaimed Mary's and Elizabeth's right to the throne before her. Rapin wrote that 'she was unwilling to aspire to the throne before her turn'.[882] In the depiction of Grey's reluctance to assume power, her portrayal as a victim is highlighted by the idea that she believed firmly that the crown did not belong to her. Grey was thus viewed as an innocent victim of a plot, cementing her status as a female martyr and confirming women's place in the ideal patriarchal order, even if this order had been exploited by her superiors.

Historians reimagined Grey's behaviour in accordance with eighteenth-century patriarchal rules, and they called attention to the importance of her obedience. Historians highlighted how Grey had obeyed her parents to argue for her innocence. Grey's father was depicted as a supporter of the Duke of Northumberland, which suggested to readers that Grey had no choice in the matter as she would have had to submit both to the will of her father, and father-in-law. Historians called attention to the patriarchal authority of Grey's father. As Raynal notes, 'the obstinacy of her parents triumphed at length over her resistance. She paid with her life a forced royalty of nine days'.[883] This passage highlights Grey's reluctance as well as the determination of her father and father-in-law to put their daughter on the throne despite her own misgivings. At the same time, Raynal criticized the coercion of Grey's family, suggesting that they had taken their paternal influence too far. Rapin argued that when Edward died, Grey 'knew not that his death

---

[881] Rapin, VIII, p. 117.
[882] Rapin, VIII, p. 117.
[883] Raynal, p. 159.

was to procure her the crown, she was extremely surprised at the news which the Duke her father and the Duke of Northumberland told her'.[884] By emphasizing Grey's 'surprise', Rapin made clear to his readers that Grey was not an active member of the plot to take the throne. The standard view at the time was that the Duke of Northumberland was the main instigator of the plot.[885] Rapin thus included Grey's father and the Duke in the same sentence to portray a strong patriarchal front forcing Grey to do their bidding. In his history, David Hume used a similar method, but added the force of Grey's husband as well. Hume wrote that Grey was 'overcome at last with the entreaties, rather than reasons, of her father and father-in law, and above all her husband, she submitted to their will, and was prevailed on to relinquish her own judgement'.[886] Grey was portrayed as the reluctant victim of her father, husband and the Duke of Northumberland as she obeyed them in the end, even if she was unwilling. By depicting these men as a corrupting influence, Raynal, Rapin and Hume suggested that there should be limits to female compliance, accusing these men of exploiting the natural patriarchal order. Historians thus concluded that the corruption of this order was responsible for Grey's demise, as these men's machinations ultimately led to her death. Rather than protecting the vulnerable Grey, which – as Lord Kames had outlined is his text – was the duty of the eighteenth-century man, their forceful actions represented an abuse of power, and a failure to uphold their responsibilities to Grey.[887] Grey's reluctance was just as important, because although it challenged the patriarchal order, her unwillingness to supplant the rightful hereditary order to the crown also upheld her reputation for morality. It was significant that she did eventually submit, as it confirmed the natural order. Northumberland's failure to protect Grey was further emphasized when Rapin argued that the Duke was 'so far absolute in the Council, that not one of the Counsellors durst oppose his will' and everyone feared that with Edward's death 'in all likelihood the Duke would have more authority under Jane his daughter-in-law, than under Edward'.[888] In the depiction of the Duke as a villainous and ambitious figure,

---

[884] Rapin, VIII, p. 117.
[885] Paulina Kewes, 'The Exclusion Crisis of 1553 and the Elizabethan Succession', in Doran and Freeman, *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, pp. 49-61 (p. 50).
[886] Hume, IV, p. 396.
[887] Kames, p. 195.
[888] Rapin, VIII, p. 116.

supported by the Council, Grey was portrayed as an innocent pawn of scheming men and of a corrupted patriarchal authority.

The Duke of Northumberland was utilised by historians to warn readers of the danger of ambition, and its corruption of the ideal patriarchal role. Historians criticized the Duke because he manipulated Edward VI, as well as Grey. According to historians the Duke abused his patriarchal status in his role as the king's advisor, as Edward, although a child, was king. Historians argued that the Duke wanted more power for himself and thus demonstrated the vice of ambition. Rapin argued that the Duke of Northumberland was able to manipulate the king because Edward 'had a very great esteem and affection for Jane Grey'.[889] Rapin further dramatized this notion with a portrayal of the Duke of Northumberland manipulating Edward on his death bed: the duke, 'who hardly ever left him since his illness, took care to heighten his fears' about Mary, urging the young king to save 'the Reformation from the impending destruction'.[890] Here, Rapin gave direct evidence of the Duke's abuse of his role over Edward. Rapin highlighted the Duke of Northumberland's misuse of power, writing that 'every one knew the Duke of Northumberland held the council in subjection'.[891] With this statement, Rapin argued that the Duke was circumventing more than just his patriarchal responsibility. Millot shared these sentiments, and noted that the Duke was 'deservedly hated by the people' and 'ambitious to reign under the name of his daughter-in-law'.[892] The Duke oppressed Lady Jane Grey, the young King Edward, and the council. In emphasizing the Duke's corruption of power in his attempt to overextend his role as councillor to the king, historians stressed that he risked the entire safety of the kingdom as a result.

The treachery of the Duke of Northumberland was a principal argument in other historical accounts by French authors. The French historian Henri Griffet, a Jesuit writer, wrote *New lights thrown upon the history of Mary Queen of England, eldest*

---

[889] Rapin, VIII, p. 106.
[890] Rapin, V, pp. 105-106.
[891] Rapin, VIII, p. 114.
[892] Millot, II, p. 2.

daughter of Henry VIII. Addressed to David Hume. It was translated and published in Britain in 1771. His historical account of Mary I was written in response to David Hume's portrayal of the queen in his *History of England*, and Griffet argued that Hume omitted crucial information from key French sources, and as a result helped perpetuate the historical anti-Catholic view of Mary I. Griffet's work, however, like that of other French and British historians, also described the Duke of Northumberland as a cunning manipulator who was central to the plot to bring Lady Jane Grey to the throne. To Griffet, the Duke was a figure of 'unbounded ambition' and a 'bold and 'violent spirit'.[893] Griffet, like Hume, even reminded his readers of the possibility that Edward was poisoned, but without actually mentioning the Duke of Northumberland.[894] He did not need to name the Duke, as the historian placed him at the centre of Edward's influence and care, and hence the suspicion was suggested to readers with subtlety. Griffet argued that the Duke hid Edward's ill health from the rest of the court, writing that 'the nearer the prince approached his end, the more the Duke of Northumberland endeavoured to conceal his real condition' and 'all this time he was very assiduous in gaining the other lords of the Council over to his party, persuading them to approve his scheme of placing his daughter-in-law upon the throne'.[895] Griffet's implication that the Duke of Northumberland may have killed his ward to gain more power heightened the sense that Edward had been poisoned. Moreover, Griffet did not name Grey and instead used the term 'daughter-in-law' to accentuate the Duke's natural power over her because of his superior hierarchical position as her father-in-law. In order to defend Mary's right to the throne, and to ensure that she did not become the focal point of criticism, Griffet portrayed a manipulative and ambitious Duke of Northumberland to argue that he was overstepping his rights in naming Lady Jane Grey the next queen.

British writers also condemned the Duke of Northumberland for abusing his patriarchal authority. Hume, however, furthered his argument by maintaining that the people wanted Mary in power rather than the Duke. The Protestants 'dreaded the effect

---

[893] Henri Griffet, *New Lights Thrown Upon the History of Mary Queen of England, Eldest Daughter of Henry VIII. Addressed to David Hume*, trans. by [Anon] (London: J. Wilkie, 1771), p. 4.
[894] Griffet, p. 33.
[895] Griffet, p. 7.

of [Mary's] prejudices, the extreme hatred universally entertained against the Dudleys, who, men foresaw, would, under the name of Jane, be the real sovereigns, was more than sufficient to counterbalance, even with that party, the attachment to religion'.[896] Hume argued that it would not have been Grey, or her husband in power, but the Duke of Northumberland. Hume condemned the Duke's aspiration to rule when it was not his natural right. The Duke was thus employed as a figure of vice as he abused the patriarchal order in his goal to supplant the royal order of the kingdom. Historians criticized him because not only did he distort the natural patriarchal order, he also wanted to change the order of succession. In doing so the Duke hoped to rule the kingdom, in place of the monarch.

Kingship and gender were both sites of substantial anxiety in the sixteenth and the eighteenth centuries. To ensure the natural hierarchy and good order of the kingdom, it was believed that men had to preside over women, and kings over commoners.[897] Elizabeth, a successful queen, was depicted by eighteenth-century historians as having masculine qualities, and she was able to avoid her feminine role within the perceived natural patriarchal order. According to historians, Elizabeth was portrayed as the ideal queen because she thwarted concerns of her female sex and its involvement in her public role by embodying masculine qualities. The terms 'king' and 'prince' were used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to describe queens and were even utilised by queens themselves.[898] Cynthia Herrup has argued that in order to be a good ruler one had to have the necessary attributes associated with both the feminine and the masculine; monarchs 'had to be both unyielding and tender, both economical and bountiful with words and goods, and both courageous and peace loving'.[899] Elizabeth was praised by both French and British historians because she was able to achieve this balance.

Elizabeth's masculine virtues were thus used by eighteenth-century historians to explain her reputation as a successful queen. Susan Doran and Thomas Freeman argue

---

[896] Hume, IV, p. 394.
[897] Cynthia Herrup, 'The King's Two Genders', *The Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006), 493-510 (pp. 496-497).
[898] Herrup, p. 496.
[899] Herrup, p. 498.

that the depictions of Elizabeth's masculine character can be traced back to the publication of William Camden's *Annales* in the early seventeenth century.[900] The text remained popular, and was used as source material by eighteenth-century historians, including Rapin. The influence of Camden's work thus led to the depiction of Elizabeth as an exceptionally successful monarch in the eighteenth century: as a woman who possessed both male and female characteristics, she was able to avoid the feminine timidity associated with Grey and the wanton cruelty that Mary was depicted as possessing.

Eighteenth-century historians propagated the Camden image of the masculine Elizabeth, and emphasized her quality of physical strength. Camden influenced Raynal, as we see when the historian informed his readers that Elizabeth was of uncommon character for her sex. As a Queen 'she united the little vanities of a woman to the great sentiments of a hero, the foibles of the Sex to the labour of the other, many of the failing of a private person to all qualities of a perfect Sovereign'.[901] Raynal portrayed both her gender and her person as weaknesses to be overcome. According to Raynal, Elizabeth was able to succeed because she was 'always decent, judicious, and useful. To these great talents Elizabeth added an appearance of the solid and shining virtues which are the ornament and support of a throne'.[902] Raynal's description of a 'solid' Elizabeth gave the image of physical strength, one that was able to withstand the weight of the responsibilities of her throne. Raynal commended her ability to govern successfully throughout her reign, and used terms such as 'sound' and 'solid' to articulate her masculine strength, while the description of her virtues as an 'ornament' maintained her femininity. The range of her virtues thus encapsulated the ideal duality of the masculine and the feminine in the ideal queen.

Other historians emphasized Elizabeth's masculine qualities to argue for her sound judgment as queen. Elizabeth's mannish characteristics were highlighted at the very start of Catharine Macaulay's (1731-1791) *History of England* (1763-1783). The

---

[900] Doran and Freeman, *The Myth of Elizabeth*, p. 18.
[901] Raynal, p. 165.
[902] Raynal, p. 164.

first woman to write history in the grand manner, Macaulay began with the reign of James I, but not before praising the reign of Elizabeth. To Macaulay, Elizabeth had 'qualities that would do honour to a masculine mind'.[903] The female historian attributed the peaceful succession of James to Elizabeth's good judgment. In her argument for the usefulness of this ostensibly masculine quality, Macaulay attributed England's successful legacy to the reign of Elizabeth.[904] Rapin similarly argued that Elizabeth was one of England's most successful monarchs, and as queen she 'had a great deal of Wit' while she was also 'naturally of a sound and solid judgment' which was 'visible by her whole management from one end of her reign to the other'.[905] Rapin called attention to the queen's intelligence, and he gave her masculine qualities when he described her judgment as 'solid': a term that, as I have observed, was later employed by Raynal. Elizabeth's masculine methods thus led to her acceptance as a strong female figure. A monarch was not simply a woman, and in Elizabeth's case historians were able to successfully circumvent many contemporary, and sixteenth-century, notions of femininity and patriarchy in their descriptions of her. Grey, on the other hand, was viewed as an obedient figure and an exemplary representation of female virtue, whilst simultaneously depicted as a victim of the patriarchy. While historians demonstrated that patriarchal power could be abused, ultimately they upheld the patriarchal order in their discussions of Lady Jane Grey and Elizabeth I.

Section 3: Ideals of Queens

As I have begun to suggest, eighteenth-century historical depictions of queens were inspired by contemporary cultural ideals of women. In this section, I explore how historians wrote their accounts of queens in a different way from their accounts of kings due to contemporary gender norms. Historians focused on the suitability of spouses, as

---

[903] Catharine Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James I to that of the Brunswick Line* (London: J. Nourse, R. and J. Dodsley, and W. Johnston, 1763-1783), I, pp. 1-2.
[904] For more on Catharine Macaulay, see Looser, pp. 119-151.
[905] Rapin, IX, p. 220.

there were concerns that a husband, especially a foreign one, could jeopardize the queen's commitment to her country. In contrast to their accounts of kings, historians commented on the supposed romantic rivalry of Mary and Elizabeth in order to communicate Mary's unsuitability to the throne to readers. Moreover, accounts of Mary Stuart articulated the importance for a queen to exercise self-control within a marriage. Historians warned their readers of the turmoil a nation could face in the wake of the chaotic demise of a monarchical marriage.

Ideals of queenship were inspired by eighteenth-century feminine virtues, as they described the model queen as youthful and beautiful. In order to highlight Elizabeth's reign as a model which contrasted with Mary's rule, the two sisters were depicted as competitors over suitors. Historians recounted a rivalry between Elizabeth and Mary over Edward Courtenay, 1st Earl of Devon (1527-1556). Rapin made the rivalry clear to his readers, by including a heading in the margin which stated: 'the queen jealous of her sister Elizabeth'. The paratext referred to Mary's motion to declare an Act that once again stated that Elizabeth was illegitimate. Rapin argued that Mary re-instated this Act because of their previous romantic rivalry over Courtenay, stating that it was 'even pretented [sic] that another secret cause alienated her sister from her, and that was her love for the Earl of Devonshire, whom she had thoughts of marrying'.[906] Rapin depicted Mary as jealous, a move that suggested Elizabeth was to be envied, while highlighting Mary's abuse of her role as queen because she used her monarchical power to thwart a romantic rival. The private passions of queens were therefore presented as having political and public consequences.

Historians thus discussed the romantic rivalry to underscore the unsuitability of Mary to the throne. Using this method, Rapin depicted the Earl as a courtier who enthusiastically pursued Mary's younger sister, stating that the Earl 'applied himself, with little discretion perhaps, to pay his respects to Elizabeth'.[907] To insinuate that the Earl would rather marry Elizabeth suggested to readers that Mary was an unattractive

---

[906] Rapin, VIII, p. 145.
[907] Rapin, VIII, p. 145.

prospect compared with her younger, Protestant sister. Similarly, Millot wrote that Mary was envious of Elizabeth's 'superior qualities' which earned her 'the regard of the nation', as well as 'the affections of Courtney, earl of Devonshire, […] on whom Mary had matrimonial views, which that nobleman rejected'.[908] In placing Elizabeth as the superior romantic rival, the historian implicated Mary as the inferior queen. Millot's equating of romantic rivalry with the love of a monarch's subjects demonstrates how queens were treated romantically differently from kings in historical accounts. Rapin and Millot, however, did not use this method of describing romantic rivalry between a monarch and future monarch in their portrayal of kings.

Griffet, the French historian who wrote a history hoping to vindicate Mary I in response to British accounts, criticized previous historians' use of the supposed romantic rivalry between Mary and Elizabeth to insinuate that Mary was the inferior of the two sisters. Griffet argued that these historians portrayed Mary as petty and jealous, unfairly denigrating her as a queen who acted spitefully towards her sister simply because she was a romantic rival. Griffet argued that Mary's displeasure with her sister over Courtenay was 'a faithful image of what is often found in the human heart, and such as happens every day in persons of less illustrious rank'.[909] For Griffet, Mary behaved like any other human, so it was unfair of historians to demonize her for being jealous of her younger, more beautiful sister, when this was only natural. Griffet, citing the notes of the French ambassador M. De Noailles (1519-1585), wrote that Mary 'had a bad opinion of this nobleman, having learned that he was guilty of much folly and indiscretion, a great frequenter of common and infamous women, and followed other companies'.[910] He argued that the queen was not in Courtenay's favour, as he had little experience and capacity for the management of affairs. Moreover Griffet argued that Courtenay did not pursue Elizabeth until he knew Mary was no longer interested.[911] In making this statement, Griffet disputed the romantic rivalry between Mary and Elizabeth to which previous historians had called attention. He then argued that Mary was not jealous of her

---

[908] Millot, II, p. 8.
[909] Griffet, p. 49.
[910] Griffet, p. 52.
[911] Griffet, p. 54.

sister for superficial reasons: 'it was not therefore the rival of her beauty, but rather the rival of her power, that Mary persecuted in the person of Elizabeth'.[912] Griffet asserted with this description that Mary simply defended her throne against a monarchical rival, and was not merely jealous of her sister for petty reasons such as a dispute over a potential suitor. As Griffet's account supported Mary I, it demonstrates how other historians discussed aspects of Mary's sex to undermine the historical portrayal of her rule.

Writing about sixteenth-century queens provided historians with an opportunity to argue that the ideal queen should marry an appropriate partner. They presented Philip as ill-suited to his role while refusing to condemn Elizabeth for never marrying. Historians argued that the queen had to choose a husband who would have England's own best interests at heart. Historians thus addressed the nation's concern with Philip II due to his interests in his own country and empire. The English common law doctrine of *jure uxoris*, which was the ideal that property and titles belonging to a woman became her husband's upon marriage, led to a fear that Philip would disregard England's needs and favour his home country. Consequently, eighteenth-century historians portrayed the marriage of Philip and Mary in a negative manner. When it was announced that Mary's future male or female child would inherit Philip's throne should his first son die, Millot stated that the entire nation was displeased; they were concerned the Kingdom would become 'a province of Spain'.[913] Millot argued that the people had been opposed to the marriage from the beginning, as they 'were afraid that England would be swallowed up in the monarchy of Spain'.[914] In this condemnation of a foreign spouse who had great power, the historian warned readers that an unsuitable husband could jeopardize the safety, and future of their country. Moreover, it was a warning about all foreign spouses of monarchs, as historians suggested that they did not always have Britain's best interests in mind.

---

[912] Griffet, p. 66.
[913] Millot, II, p. 7.
[914] Millot, II, p. 10.

Millot argued against unsuitable foreign marriages by portraying a meddling foreign power. Millot's account accused Philip's father, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, of sending over four hundred thousand crowns to corrupt the members of parliament. The historian claimed the Emperor's actions were until that time supposedly unknown in England.[915] According to Millot, the marriage was:

> negotiated secretly; but the commons made it known to the nation. They could see nothing in this alliance but the danger of their liberties. They shook off their submission to the court, by remonstrating on this delicate subject, and were instantly dissolved.[916]

Millot portrayed a parliament that was fighting for the liberties of the English people, and this depiction therefore placed the queen in the role of the adversary. He underlined the problems of an unsuitable marriage by noting that Mary had to dissolve parliament in order to silence the protest of her people. In portraying the anxieties created by the marriage of Mary, Millot concluded that a monarch should marry a suitable spouse.

Raynal argued for the unsuitability of this marriage by portraying Philip as an extension of Mary's poor character and decision-making during her reign. The historian portrayed a disagreeable Philip and claimed that he only wished to marry Mary because of the power it granted him: 'The ambitious Spaniard sacrificed his dislike, to the desire of adding a rich Crown to the many vast Estates, which he was soon to inherit'.[917] Raynal depicted Philip as an ambitious and greedy monarch to encourage readers to conclude that the country was endangered by this marriage. Moreover, by claiming Philip was not interested in her character or her appearance, he called attention to issues with Mary's femininity. In depicting Philip in this manner, historians stressed that Mary had endangered her country by choosing a husband who had strong foreign ties.

For historians, it was better not to marry than to marry someone problematic. Philip II caused great problems for Mary, and historians emphasized her unsuitable marriage in their accounts. Elizabeth did not marry, and although some objected,

---

[915] Millot, II, p. 9.
[916] Millot, II, p. 6.
[917] Raynal, p. 160.

historians perceived her unmarried status as a better alternative to a problematic husband and ruler. Raynal, in his description of influential men in Elizabeth's court, argued that 'the Grandees all set up pretentions, either to govern the queen, or to marry her, or to destroy her'.[918] In putting the three options together, Raynal suggested that marriage was not a positive option in Elizabeth's situation, and thus offered an explanation for why she remained single. In doing so, Raynal argued that Elizabeth's unmarried status was for the good of the country.

Historians argued that self-control was necessary in a marriage of monarchs, because the dissolution of a marriage could cause great upheaval for the country. Historians addressed the problem of marital upheaval in their accounts of Henry VIII, and in their analysis of Mary Stuart. Historians argued that the Queen of Scots was unable to control herself or the ill will she had towards her husband, and that this behaviour eventually resulted in both their deaths. To prove this argument, Rapin cited the memoirs of Sir Robert Melville (1527-1621), the Scottish ambassador in England:

> This last says, the Queen could not bear the King in her Sight; she fled from his Company, and he, feeling himself forsaken by his Relations and Friends whom himself had abandoned, and having scarce any longer Access to the Queen, was always alone, and is a State worthy of Pity.[919]

Rapin demonstrated that Mary was unable to control her emotions since she could not 'bear' her husband. He portrayed her husband as a sad figure, employing the terms 'forsaken', 'abandoned' and 'alone' to present him as set aside by his wife. Rapin asked readers to view Philip with 'pity', perhaps hoping to produce feelings of compassion for a husband who had to face his wife's inability to control her passions.

Eighteenth-century historians thus argued that to maintain national stability queens should ignore their personal desires when in a marriage. Historians criticized Mary Queen of Scots for the supposed murder of her husband, and for marrying her husband's suspected murderer, the Earl of Bothwell (1534-1578), a few months later.

---

[918] Raynal, p. 162.
[919] Rapin, VIII, p. 328.

This murder created a great deal of political upheaval and unrest within Scotland and was deemed to be the disastrous result of a monarch unable to control her personal desires with repercussions which greatly affected her people. The act of murder was used by historians as the ultimate consequence of the failure to maintain self-restraint. For this reason, Mary Stuart was depicted by historians as a manipulative woman who orchestrated her second husband's death. Millot, who accused previous historians of casting undue aspersions against the Scottish queen, nevertheless argued that Mary Stuart's royal pardon of Bothwell for his kidnapping of her '*and for all other crimes*' was suspicious. Italicizing 'and for all other crimes', Millot emphasized this questionable behaviour, before arguing that 'this indulgence was a proof, at least, of her connivance'.[920] With this judgment, even if Mary was not guilty of the murder itself, it implied that she bore some responsibility for her husband's death. Furthermore, Millot argued that:

> This event disgraced her in the eyes of her subjects, and all of Europe […] Her connection with the man whom the public voice had pointed out as the murderer, her anxiousness to have him acquitted, a marriage so contrary to all decency, negotiated by means so odious, everything seemed to confirm, that Mary, the slave of her passion for Bothwell, was the partner of his crime.[921]

Millot highlighted the calamity Mary had caused, because due to her actions 'indignant Scots took up arms' against her.[922] In his overall depiction, Millot argued that Mary Stuart's inability to control her emotions condemned her in the eyes of her subjects, in addition to 'all of Europe'. The latter phrase called attention to the danger in which Mary placed her country. Moreover, Millot argued that Mary had ignored her people when they communicated their displeasure to her. The historian then accused the queen of being a 'slave' to her emotions, arguing for the imperative need for self-control in a monarch. In this respect, historians connected the personal behaviour of the monarch with the welfare of their country, reinforcing the strength of the connection between the queen's personal and public lives. As the monarch was the head of the nation, Millot suggested that the nation by extension had become a 'slave' to her 'passion'. This loss

---

[920] Millot, II, p. 38.
[921] Millot, II, p. 39.
[922] Millot, II, p. 39.

of autonomy had implications beyond Mary's romantic life. Millot's portrayal is indicative of the ways in which eighteenth-century historians described queens according to their relationships with their husbands and romantic suitors, and how they employed contemporary constructions of feminine virtue to convey ideals of queenship. Moreover, these historical accounts demonstrated how the emotions of an individual monarch might reverberate throughout the nation.

Section 4: Ideals of Monarchy

Historians used sixteenth-century queens to convey the opinion that the ideal monarch should always act in the nation's best interest. Using the religious persecutions of Mary Tudor and Catherine de' Medici, both British and French historians argued for the need for the monarch to set an example of religious toleration. They regarded the burning or killing of supposed heretics to be barbaric; they condemned the actions of Mary I and Catherine de' Medici, and portrayed them both as villainous characters whose monarchical behaviour was immoral and not to be emulated by future monarchs. Historians then presented Elizabeth as the ideal monarch to imitate, and demonstrated how her ability and determination to overcome many obstacles led to her success as a monarch.

Historians depicted the behaviour of Mary Tudor as a warning to readers, and used her as an example to advocate for a monarch's responsibility to promote religious toleration. Mary I was disliked in the eighteenth century. The myth of Bloody Mary which had emerged in the sixteenth century had intensified over time, and Mary came to be seen as the quintessence of the qualities that historians thought were most detrimental in a monarch.[923] The term 'Bloody Mary' has been found in print as early as 1658, in a poem by Nicholas Billingsley, a Presbyterian minister, and the epithet started to circulate at this time and grew in popularity during the reigns of Charles II and James

---

[923] Freeman, 'Inventing Bloody Mary', p. 78.

II.[924] The passing of the Act of Union in 1707 occurred in part due to the culmination of the Protestant endeavour to ensure that they were never persecuted and burned as heretics again.[925] In 1707, Parliament also passed the Act of Succession, which specified that from then on the monarch, whatever else he or she might be, had to be a Protestant. Then, the Jacobite invasion, and rumours of Jacobite invasions throughout the century, helped to brand an image of Mary's cruelty onto the British imagination.[926] Anti-Catholic sentiments were pronounced in Britain throughout the period, notably during the Gordon Riots in 1780, and a belief spread among the general public that Catholics were beholden to the pope ahead of their monarch.[927] Anti-Catholicism manifested itself in xenophobia, fear, political distrust and theological disagreement.[928] Modern scholars contend that Mary's main objective was the restoration of Catholicism in England, and the burnings were only a part of a number of measures which were undertaken to this end.[929] Historians nonetheless used these actions to analyse Mary's abilities and success as a queen, and to advocate for religious toleration as part of monarchical rule.

In the eighteenth century, sixteenth-century literary works still influenced the perceptions of Mary Tudor and her religious persecutions. John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* commonly, known as *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, contributed greatly to Mary's reputation as a gruesome queen. Originally published in 1563, later editions of Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* were far more forceful in their accusations against Mary.[930] One edition claimed that Mary 'joined a cruel and vindictive temper' to 'excessive bigotry' and outright named her the 'Bloody Queen'.[931] In 1732, the text became available in threepenny instalments, which could be ordered individually, and it became one of the

---

[924] Freeman, 'Inventing Bloody Mary', p. 81.

[925] Thomas S. Freeman, 'Burning Zeal: Mary Tudor and the Marian Persecution', in Doran and Freeman, *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, pp. 171-205 (p. 171).

[926] Jeremy Black, 'The Catholic Threat and the Press in 1720s and 1730s', *Journal of Religious History,* 12 (1983), 364-381 (p. 380).

[927] Colin Haydon*, Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-Century England, c. 1714-80: A Political and Social Study* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), pp. 2-4.

[928] Haydon*,* pp. 2-4.

[929] Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England Under Mary Tudor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), p. 102.

[930] Freeman, 'Inventing Bloody Mary', p. 85.

[931] John Foxe, *The Book of Martyrs, or the History of Paganism and Popery* (Coventry: T. Luckman, 1764), pp. 331, 333.

most common religious histories to be serialized.[932] Eirwen Nicholson argues that Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* 'was a victim of an eighteenth-century historiography of post-Revolution toleration, growing secularism and a torpid Anglicanism' and formed a part of England's antipathy towards the Catholic faith.[933] During the eighteenth century, large quantities of anti-Catholic material were printed. Jeremy Black, however, argues that anti-Catholic material 'confirmed, rather than created, prejudices'.[934] Mary's role in the *Book of Martyrs* strengthened these anti-Catholic prejudices, and contributed to the country's xenophobia towards the Catholic faith. The period's two most popular editions of Foxe's text served to only further demonize the Catholic queen. *The Book of Martyrs containing an account of the Sufferings and death of Protestants of the Reign of Queen Mary the First* was first printed in 1732, and reprinted in 1741, 1746, 1760, 1761, 1776 and 1784. In these versions, Mary's culpability for Protestant persecution was emphasized directly in the title, which associates her name with their 'suffering and death'. In 1782, *Fox's Original and Complete Book of Martyrs or, a universal history of Martyrdom* was expanded and reprinted in 1784, 1785, 1790, 1795, 1807 and 1810. As these texts and their ideas of Mary were prevalent throughout the century, they affected the ideas the authors portrayed, and what readers expected from a history.[935] The multiple editions of both works suggest that there was a strong interest in Marian persecutions in the eighteenth century, especially as they drew attention to Mary I directly in their titles. Most of the reprints and abridgements were printed in the second half of the eighteenth century and this interest indicates a fascination with religious persecutions against a backdrop of national anti-Catholicism. The public's obsession with the barbarity of the actions suggests that they sought religious toleration in an enlightened monarch, at least for those of the Protestant faith.

Foxe's summary of Mary I's reign was indicative of the historical sentiments about this queen:

---

[932] Woolf, *Reading History*, p. 279.
[933] Eirwen Nicholson, 'Eighteenth Century Foxe: Evidence for the Impact of the *Acts and Monuments* in the 'Long' Eighteenth Century', in *John Foxe and the English Reformation,* ed. by David Loades (Aldershot; Brookfield: Scolar Press, 1997), pp. 143-177 (p. 152).
[934] Jeremy Black, *Natural and Necessary Enemies: Anglo-French Relations in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Duckworth, 1986), p. 163.
[935] Freeman, 'Inventing Bloody Mary', p. 86.

> We shall never find any reign of any prince in this land or any other, which did ever show in it (for the proportion of time) so many great arguments of God's wrath and displeasure, as were to be seen in the reign of this queen Mary, whether we behold the shortness of her time, or the unfortunate event of all her purposes.[936]

Foxe highlighted the brevity of Mary's reign to underscore the futility of her rule. With this description he argued that she was unable to achieve any constructive objectives as monarch, and her only accomplishment was the persecution of her people. Eighteenth-century historians made these persecutions central to their depictions of Marian rule, indicating Foxe's influence. *Acts and Monuments* therefore greatly transformed how the Marian persecutions were perceived in the centuries that followed its initial publication. With its vivid anecdotes and graphic illustrations, Foxe's book meant that generations of readers knew about executions of Protestant martyrs in minute detail, without ever having been present.[937] Frances Yates argues that Foxe's work is a significant example 'of the power of propagandist history in establishing and maintaining a regime', and that it was used by Elizabeth to symbolically justify her rule.[938] The way in which eighteenth-century historians used Mary I as figure to explain the need for religious toleration, and the popularity of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs,* suggests that Yates' argument regarding Mary's use as a propagandist historical figure was indeed flourishing in the eighteenth century.

Eighteenth-century French and British historians thus portrayed Mary Tudor's persecution of the Protestants as excessive and a betrayal of her people. French historian and philosopher Voltaire labelled Mary's accession to the throne and the death of her brother as 'unhappy times', and commented that her ensuing reign 'a great deal more blood was spilt by executioners than by soldiers'.[939] Voltaire condemned Mary, and

---

[936] John Foxe, *The Actes and Monuments of these Latter and Perilous Days Touching Matters of the Church,* ed. by S.R. Cattley and G. Townsend, 8 vols (London: Burnside and Seely, 1839-1844), VIII, p. 625.

[937] Freeman, 'Burning Zeal', p. 173.

[938] Frances Yates, 'Foxe as Propagandist', in *Ideas and Ideals in the Northern Renaissance,* ed. by Francis Yates (Abington: Routledge 1984), pp. 28-39 (p. 28).

[939] Voltaire, *An Essay on Universal History, the Manners, and Spirit of Nations, from the Reign of Charlemagne to the Age of Lewis XIV*, trans. by Mr. Nugent, 3rd edn, 4 vols (Dublin: S. Cotter, 1759), III, p. 122.

argued that the Protestant religion was the key cause of death during her reign, as she executed so many of her people for their faith.[940] Voltaire's opinion of Mary was characteristic of the presentation of this queen in both French and British historical accounts. He argued that it was the monarch's responsibility to promote religious toleration.

In contrast to the pronounced focus on Marian persecutions, Elizabethan persecutions were mostly ignored in historical accounts. Political views of Elizabeth I influenced historians writing at this time and she was treated differently by historians for several reasons. In 1688, the Glorious Revolution saw Elizabeth revered as a historical figure, and she was compared to previous Stuart kings, in order for the new Hanoverian monarchs to be celebrated as Protestant rulers.[941] After the death of Queen Anne, and arrival of the new foreign King George I, people started to question what 'Britain' and 'Briton' really meant and they looked to historical figures for exemplars of British identity.[942] By the middle of the eighteenth century, Elizabeth had become the model of the ideal British monarch.[943] She appealed to the British because she had successfully thwarted an invasion from Catholic Spain, and had made the first steps towards the establishment of an empire. Elizabeth, moreover, became renowned for her love for her country and people. She was referred to as an ideal patriot ruler, who was more passionate about defending her people's liberties than conserving her own power.[944]

Historians therefore portrayed Elizabeth's persecutions as actions of necessity, in which people were executed for political, and not religious, reasons. Voltaire applauded Elizabeth's toleration, writing that 'no body was persecuted, nor even molested for his belief: but she put the laws strictly in execution against law-breakers, and those who

---

[940] Voltaire, III, pp. 122-124.
[941] B. Harris, *Politics and the Nation: Britain in the Mid-Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 64; C. Gerrard, *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole: Politics, Poetry, and National Myth, 1725-1742* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 192-194.
[942] Jennifer Clement, 'Elizabeth I, Patriotism, and the Imagined Nation in Three Eighteenth-Century Plays', *Intellectual History Review*, 22:3 (2012), 391-410 (p. 392).
[943] Clement, p. 392.
[944] Clement, p. 392; J. Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 38.

gave any disturbance to the state'.[945] Voltaire accused those who were executed of aspiring to give 'any disturbance to the state', and this account suggests that the Elizabethan persecutions were viewed by historians as politically motivated. Rapin shared this view. In his discussion of the Elizabethan persecutions, Rapin argued that 'the Reformation rose under Elizabeth in the same manner that the Roman Catholic Religion had done under Mary, with this only difference, that no person was put to death by Elizabeth purely for Religion'.[946] Rapin presented Elizabeth as a contrast to her sister, and used Elizabeth's reign to demonstrate the advantages of a monarch who promoted religious toleration. Mary's persecutions were interpreted as religious fanaticism, while Elizabeth's approach displayed her political ability. Historians argued that Elizabeth's executions, if done for political reasons, were necessary for the security of the crown. By depicting completely different purposes in the Marian and Elizabethan persecutions, historians maintained that religious toleration was a key responsibility of the ideal monarch.

Eighteenth-century historians argued that Mary put her faith before the security of her people, and depicted her as a queen who was consumed by her devotion to the Catholic religion. Rapin described Mary as 'extremely addicted' to the Catholic Church in addition to being absolutely 'devoted to the Pope'.[947] This description explained her motivations, and additionally the portrayal of an addiction to religion meant that Mary lacked self-control. Rapin further highlighted this lack of personal restraint when he informed his readers that 'as the new queen, [Mary] had nothing in her thoughts but the establishing of her religion'.[948] This phrase described a queen who was obsessive, and it served as an indication of her inability to control herself. Rapin hence employed Lady Jane Grey and Mary to show readers how faith should, and should not, be practised, writing that: 'Jane made open profession of the Protestant religion, and showed that she was entirely convinced of the Truth of its doctrines', while Mary 'on the contrary' was 'extremely addicted' to her faith. Grey was presented as an ideal figure of faith, whose

---

[945] Voltaire, III, p. 125.
[946] Rapin, VIII, p. 260.
[947] Rapin, VIII, p. 121.
[948] Rapin, VIII, p. 131.

devout behaviour was to be emulated by eighteenth-century readers. By contrast, Rapin criticized Mary's religious addiction and portrayed her as a dishonest monarch. He argued that the queen only 'pretended to keep to the religion established by Henry VIII, yet it was well known that she did it only to stop the mouths of those who governed during the King her Brother's Minority'.[949] Rapin used the term 'well known' to emphasize the deceit of Mary's actions, implying that everyone was aware of the fervent Catholic beliefs that she had tried to conceal. Rapin criticized the immorality of Mary's dishonesty, and the extreme fervency of her faith, rather than criticizing her Catholicism directly.

Mary Tudor's revocation of her promise of religious toleration was disparaged by historians and used to highlight the undesirable monarchical characteristic of deceit. Her actions were depicted by historians as a betrayal of her people. In his account of Mary's early reign, Rapin argued that:

> the Queen in council declared that she would use no force upon men's consciences in affairs of religion. Great care was taken to disperse this Declaration and to magnify it as a great instance of goodness and generosity in the Queen.[950]

Initially sounding positive, Rapin eventually highlighted the depth of Mary's dishonesty towards her subjects. In emphasizing Mary's 'great care' to appear as a tolerant queen, Rapin described a queen who lied to, and manipulated, her people. In the following paragraph, Rapin argued that Mary's genuine intentions were known all along, and that:

> the partisans of the Roman Church were so confident of the Queen's intention to restore their religion, that they made no difficulty of owning it publickly [sic], and of inveighing against the Protestant Religion, though it had still the countenance and protection of the Laws.[951]

If others were aware that Mary always planned to promote the Catholic faith, then Rapin used this passage to show that Mary was not a queen to emulate as she knowingly lied to

---

[949] Rapin, VIII, p. 121.
[950] Rapin, VIII, p. 133.
[951] Rapin, VIII, p. 133.

267

her subjects. To Rapin, lies about matters of faith, and the deception of one's people, were the embodiment of monarchical vice.

The deception in which Mary began her religious persecutions was criticized in other eighteenth-century historical accounts. Millot used a similar method to Rapin to introduce the early stages of Mary's reign. The historian initially gave an optimistic portrayal of Mary's arrival on the throne. He argued that her subjects were far from pleased when Lady Jane Grey was proclaimed Queen, and thus Mary was taking her natural place on the throne. He then stated, however, that Mary suspended the execution of Grey and her husband because of their youth, and because of 'a fear of appearing sanguinary in the beginning of her reign'.[952] This seemingly positive description was used to highlight Mary's deceit. Millot's narrative turned into a criticism of these early actions. He claimed that her early acts of clemency:

> were the source of universal joy. But they were vain and deceitful appearances, soon followed by the rigours of tyranny. The queen naturally solemn, melancholy and opinionated, was so much the more susceptible of the impression of false zeal.[953]

Millot, in a matter of sentences, condemned the way in which she ruled, criticized her tendency for religious fanaticism and disparaged her nature and character. Historical accounts demonstrated that Mary's terrible actions as queen were only made worse by the dishonesty with which she began her reign. Historians discussed her early deceitful actions in order to emphasize the negative qualities of both her character and reign to readers.

Once again, the French historian Griffet offered an alternative opinion. Griffet was critical of these portrayals of Mary as a deceitful queen, as he hoped to vindicate her reputation in historical accounts. He argued that while Mary was remembered for her persecutions of the Protestants, her religious faith did not stop her from granting Edward's wishes for his burial. Griffet observed that 'Mary quietly permitted her

---

[952] Millot, II, pp. 2-4.
[953] Millot, II, p. 4.

brother's obsequies to be performed according to the rites prescribed by the Protestants'.[954] Griffet hoped to give a more compassionate depiction of Mary than other authors, underscoring her thoughtful recognition of her brother's faith. Other historians glossed over the respectful treatment of her brother's Protestant faith, instead using the beginning of Mary's reign as the key indication of her betrayal to her subjects. Griffet admitted Mary had her faults, but argued that historians had ignored her positive attributes, writing: 'Let us judge without passion and partiality'.[955] Griffet argued that historians always tend to portray Mary as 'obstinate, superstitious, violent, cruel, malicious, vindictive'.[956] These depictions alluded to her overzealous faith and to the persecutions during her rule. To Griffet, previous historians had unfairly insulted her character and reign as a whole. Griffet further argued against criticisms of Mary by stating that her actions were no different from those of any other monarch. He wrote:

> It should be remembered, that piles were lighted, and scaffold erected before her time. The barbarous custom of burning Heretics was not new; but rather seemed to be a law established in every European State.[957]

He argued that in France, Francis V and Henry II had done the same, but they were not described as tyrants. Although the burning of heretics was not an action that Griffet condoned or forgave, he criticized historians like David Hume, who focused solely on these events. Griffet believed that many past monarchs had countenanced barbaric actions; Mary should not be singled out for criticism. While Griffet still argued for the need for religious toleration, in his citation of other examples of monarchs who had previously burned heretics he maintained that historians should treat Mary like other monarchs and focus on other aspects of her rule. Griffet's work sheds light on the popular anti-Catholic presence in Britain during the eighteenth century, and the tendency for historians to capitalize on this prevalent view in their depictions, and criticisms, of Mary I.

---

[954] Griffet, p. 14.
[955] Griffet, p. 17.
[956] Griffet, pp. 16-17.
[957] Griffet, p. 24.

Historians argued that monarchs should promote religious toleration and, with the exception of Griffet, those discussed in this chapter condemned Mary for the barbarity of her religious persecutions. Historians thus presented the burning of Protestants as the embodiment of her failure as queen. Rapin, Raynal and Millot all criticized the burnings. Raynal claimed that through Mary's 'sanguinary methods', 'a religion of gentleness armed itself with the sword'.[958] Mary's actions, rather than her Catholicism, were the issue. Rapin argued, similarly, that the 'persecution […] against the Protestants in this reign has nothing it in which ought to seem strange' because Mary was guilty of 'excessive bigotry', 'a natural cruelty', and 'a temper fierce and vindictive, which she cloaked with a pretended zeal for religion'.[959] In the description of an immoral queen, Rapin argued that Mary's intolerance of Protestantism was a natural result. Millot, uncharacteristically, made his accounts of the burnings quite bloody and descriptive, as in his focus on the mistreatment of a young woman:

> One woman they burned who was pregnant, and near the time of her labour. She was delivered in the midst of the flames. The guards would have saved the child; but a barbarous magistrate ordered it to be thrown back into the fire.[960]

Millot used this example to highlight the barbarity of the burnings. He emphasized how the atrocity led to the death of an innocent baby, who had yet to even come into the world and partake in any matters of faith. Millot then placed blame on Mary, because the magistrate represented the will of monarch. To historians, Mary's religious persecutions were the result of her corrupted character rather than her faith, and she was therefore used to convey the problems which ensued if a monarch did not have the nation's best interests at heart.

In order to underscore the immorality of religious persecution, historians presented Mary's husband Philip as the central character who aided Mary in this monarchical failure. Raynal argued that 'the New Queen had adhered to her Religion in a kingdom which had deserted it. To establish it without opposition, she married Philip

---

[958] Raynal, p. 159.
[959] Rapin, VIII, p. 215.
[960] Millot, II, p. 14.

son of Charles V'.[961] He argued that Mary was aware that many of her subjects were Protestant, and that she employed any means necessary to reassert the Catholic faith, using her husband to do so. He accused the couple of opposing the reformation, and claimed, 'the royal pair in this great work' comported themselves 'with all the haughtiness, rigour, and inflexibility of their tempers'.[962] Philip was thus depicted as the crucial partner who helped Mary to achieve her religious aims. Raynal also claimed that under the rule of both Mary and Philip, the destruction of the Protestants seemed more important than their conversion. He wrote that 'It was determined, to obtain by precipitation, by violence, by authority, what ought to have been the work of charity, of patience'.[963] Raynal therefore condemned the barbaric methods Mary employed to convert her people, rather than her Catholic faith or the actual desire to convert others. By calling on charity and patience, he highlighted alternatives to the burning of heretics, making use of ideal eighteenth-century qualities to promote religious toleration. Rapin similarly positioned Philip as Mary's active partner in her misdeeds. He placed blame on Philip and criticized his personality to suggest that vices in character caused barbaric actions and disastrous results in a monarch's reign. He argued that 'she had the misfortune to be incouraged [sic] in [her] disposition by all who were about her person', including Philip who was 'naturally sour and morose'.[964] In describing both of their characters as cantankerous, Rapin placed blame on both Mary and Philip. He therefore argued that poor character traits led to a corrupt monarchy.

Religious persecutions were evidence of poor monarchical behaviour, and historians described these acts to criticize other sixteenth-century queens in a similar manner. Accounts of Catherine de' Medici, for instance, echoed the criticisms which we have encountered in accounts of Mary I. Like Mary I, Medici was a Catholic queen. Moreover, she was queen regent in France during Elizabeth's rule. She was employed by historians as a contrast to the progressive Elizabeth, and played the villainous role of religious persecutor in historical accounts. She was condemned by both French and

---

[961] Raynal, p. 159.
[962] Raynal, p. 159.
[963] Raynal, p. 160.
[964] Rapin, VIII, p. 215.

British historians for her role in the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572, in which dozens of Protestants were killed. Medici's role in the massacre was judged by eighteenth-century historians in a similar way to Mary's Protestant burnings. The 1572 massacre was a targeted group of assassinations and a wave of Catholic mob violence, directed against Huguenots during the French Wars of Religion. The event was traditionally portrayed to have been instigated by Catherine de' Medici, the mother of King Charles IX (1550-1574), and eighteenth-century historians further propagated this notion. Her depictions by both French and British historians demonstrate how religious persecutions, such as those perpetrated by Mary Tudor, were viewed as unforgivable by historians. These actions affected the entire portrayal of her reign, as it had Mary I's.

Catherine de' Medici was criticized in eighteenth-century historical texts to reinforce the argument that monarchs needed to show toleration in matters of faith. The blame might have conceivably been placed on the Duc de Guise, or on the king himself, but as N. M. Sutherland argues, people chose to scapegoat Catherine because 'she had the misfortune to be both a woman and of Italian paternity', and this legacy was carried forward into the eighteenth century.[965] Given the dislike for foreign monarchs, and the way in which Mary was condemned in historical accounts for her age, melancholic character and barrenness, Sutherland's assertion corresponds with the way in which unpopular queens were treated in historical writing. British accounts were critical of Catherine de' Medici, just as French and British accounts had been critical of Mary I, and both queens were accused of religious intolerance and persecutions. In their accounts, historians portrayed Medici as a regnant queen who held more power than her son Charles IX. She was blamed for the St Bartholomew's Day massacre, and depicted as the perpetrator and instigator of the event. Depicting the events as religiously motivated, British historians employed Catherine de' Medici to argue for the need for religious toleration.

---

[965] N. M. Sutherland, 'Catherine de' Medici: The Legend of the Wicked Italian Queen', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 9:2 (1978), 45-56 (p. 46).

The regnant queen was presented by historians as the instigator of the massacre, and they highlighted the queen's manipulation of her son, the king, to stress Medici's apparent desire to persecute the Protestants. David Jones, in *The History of France from the Origin of that Nation to the Year 1702*, informed his readers that Medici had to convince her son to carry through with her plan, because 'the nearer the time drew, the more uneasy was the King, and much ado had the Queen Mother and the rest of the accursed Gang to keep him steddy [sic]' and the massacre was 'the greatest Fury, Barbarity and Inhumanity that ever was heard of' and that 'neither Age nor Sex, nor even Women with Child were spared'.[966] Jones highlighted the inhumanity with which children were killed alongside parents to argue for the barbarity of these actions. He called Catherine de' Medici 'the Queen Mother' to call attention to her influence over her son. This title alluded to the possibility that had Charles been able to reign without such malignant influence, an improved reign could have been achieved, as religious persecution and bloodshed could have been avoided. In Richard Rolt's history of France, the historian placed more emphasis on the king rather than his mother, although she was certainly mentioned as an original conspirator for the plans to massacre the Protestants. He instead chose to emphasize that 'All the *Europeans* looked upon this action with the utmost abhorrence; saying, that, in the accounts of the most barbarous nations, there was not an example of such horrid cruelty'.[967] Rolt highlighted that all of Europe was against Charles IX and Medici's actions in order to argue that religious persecutions were viewed by all as immoral. Rolt's statement further explains why French and British historians condemned both Mary Tudor and Catherine de' Medici, as religious persecution was viewed as barbaric and horrific on both sides of the channel.

Other eighteenth-century historians similarly argued that Catherine de' Medici was the leading propagator of the massacre. Sir Nathaniel Wraxall, a British MP, and an author, traveller, and memoirist in the eighteenth century, published *The History of France under the Kings of the Race of Valois* in 1785. In a footnote to the account of the

---

[966] David Jones, *The History of France from the Origin of that Nation to the Year 1702,* 2 vols (London: D. Brown and A. Bell, 1702), I, p. 582.
[967] Richard Rolt, *A New History of France, by Question and Answer* (London: W. Owen, 1754), pp. 198-199.

massacre, Wraxall used several sources to maintain that Medici was the instigator of the event. He noted that 'the first signal [was] given by Catherine de' Medici'.[968] As regnant queen, she had no right to give the first signal, and Wraxall thus highlighted her as the originator of the massacre and called attention to the way she unnaturally supplanted her son. Wraxall further argued for Medici's villainy by stating that Charles did in fact try to halt the massacre:

> he was seized with new remorse, which was increased by the report of some pistols in the street; and overcome with affright, he sent instantly to command the leaders not to put the design in execution till further orders: but it was too late. The work of death was already begun.[969]

By emphasizing that Charles wanted to stop the atrocity, Wraxall placed further blame on Medici for overstepping her bounds as regnant queen. The historian used the terms 'remorse', and 'affright' to emphasize the brutality of the events taking place at the hand of the queen, and to argue that Charles did not wish for, or plan, the massacre. Wraxall, in the same footnote, argued that 'the queen-mother […] assured him that it was too late to revoke his intention', and as a result Charles was 'driven forward'.[970] To Wraxall, Medici was the perpetrator of the event. Like Jones, he called her 'the queen-mother' in his account to call attention to her role and culpability.[971] In this depiction, Charles was the superior monarch for wanting to stop the persecution. This portrayal alluded to what could have happened had Medici not overstepped her role, and historians thus condemned the queen for being a female figure who told a man, no less a male monarch, what to do.

For historians, Catherine de' Medici's actions during the massacre were the embodiment of her immoral desire for religious persecution. Wraxall described her in

---

[968] Sir Nathaniel Wraxall, *The History of France Under the Kings of the Race of Valois, from the Accession of Charles the Fifth, in 1364, to the Death of Charles the Ninth, in 1574,* 2nd edn, 2 vols (London, C. Dilly, 1785), II, p. 231. The first version was published in 1777 under the title *Memoirs of the Kings of France of the Race of Valois*, which was translated into French in 1784, and saw several English editions before it was revised and made into a more formal historical work for his 1785 publication.
[969] Wraxall, II, p. 230.
[970] Wraxall, II, p. 231.
[971] Wraxall, II, p. 231.

especially dramatic terms. In order to highlight the awfulness of the massacre, Wraxall included a gruesome anecdote:

> The bodies of the slaughtered Huguenots were collected and thrown in heaps before the palace of the Louvre, to satiate at once the curiosity and vengeance of Catherine of Medicis [sic], who fed her eyes with this inhuman spectacle.[972]

Wraxall's account emphasized the brutality of the events, and the queen's apparent desire to view the grisly deaths. The terms 'fed' and 'satiate' insinuated that Medici was consumed with her desire to persecute the Huguenots, and that she received gratification from their bloody demise. Wraxall used Medici's apparent appetite for the macabre to criticize her inability to control, or restrain, her desire for their deaths. The description left readers with an image of a depraved queen, and no doubt about her active involvement in the massacre. In portraying a queen who enjoyed viewing the dead Protestants before her, Wraxall emphasized the barbarity of the massacre, and the immorality of a queen who had allowed such a dreadful event to occur. The author depicted Medici as cruel and evil to convey that religious intolerance was associated only with poor monarchical behaviour.

Ideal monarchical behaviour, on the other hand, featured in historical accounts of Elizabeth I. Historians emphasized Elizabeth's ability to overcome obstacles, in order to advocate for the model characteristics that resulted in her status as an ideal monarch. Rapin stressed Elizabeth's ability to overcome hardships by informing his readers that her enemies were 'persons the most powerful, the most artful, the most subtle, and the least scrupulous in Europe'.[973] He argued that Elizabeth was able to succeed against numerous enemies, including France, Spain, the Court of Rome and the Jesuits, even though she had weaker military and naval capabilities, because 'strength often supplies the want of capacity'.[974] Rapin thus argued that it was Elizabeth's strong character that helped her succeed, and overcome the great obstacles of her long reign. He wrote that 'Nothing shows her capacity more, than her address in surmounting all the difficulties and troubles created by her enemies, especially when it is considered [who] these

---

[972] Wraxall, II, p. 238.
[973] Rapin, IX, p. 220.
[974] Rapin, IX, p. 221.

enemies were'.[975] Rapin argued that she was able to persevere and 'never swerved' due to three maxims: 'to make herself beloved by her people, to be frugal of her treasure, to keep up dissention amongst her neighbours'.[976] Rapin applauded Elizabeth's perseverance, and with these guidelines he instructed monarchs on how to achieve such strength of character. He argued that due to her model determination, Elizabeth was able to achieve 'a state of felicity unknown' to her ancestors and predecessors, which 'doubtless is the touchstone by which all those are to be tried whom God has set over Nations and Kingdoms'.[977] With this statement applauding Elizabeth's successful reign, Rapin argued that Elizabeth should be emulated by other monarchs. Millot also commended Elizabeth's ability to overcome great difficulties and reign in the nation's best interest. He complimented Elizabeth for her 'heroism in danger' and her 'address in difficulties', and her ability to keep England 'clear of those religious wars which inflamed all Europe'.[978] Rapin argued that Elizabeth exhibited ideal monarchical behaviour in her ability to overcome great difficulties. The historian then employed a comparison to the rest of Europe to express how difficult it was for other nations to keep religious peace during the same period. Religious conflict had affected his own country of France, and concerned the historian directly with the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. Rapin, a Huguenot, lived in exile in the Netherlands due to this revocation. Religious toleration was thus an important theme for eighteenth-century historians to support.

Similarly, Raynal championed Elizabeth as a great ruler who overcame many difficulties. He began his account of her reign with a list of her positive qualities, demonstrating how they helped in the defeat of numerous obstacles, in order to argue for Elizabeth's model role as monarch:

> The Queen saw all these rocks; and avoided them by those grand strokes of
> policy which form a very rare spectacle on the theatre of the world, because it is
> not common to see actors of Elizabeth's character. We are astonished even at

---

[975] Rapin, IX, p. 220.
[976] Rapin, IX, p. 221.
[977] Rapin, IX, p. 225.
[978] Millot, II, p. 86.

this day, how young a princess, without experience, without friends, without advice, without a right to the throne wholly unquestionable, was able to reign with more dignity, authority, and tranquillity than any monarch who then wore a crown. While all Europe was a prey to domestic divisions, foreign wars, factions, poisonings, scarcity, assassination, and all the horrors which will render the sixteenth century odious and famous, England saw her commerce extended, her laws strengthened, and her polity perfectioned. History ought to collect with care the sublime principles of such a perfect administration.[979]

Raynal introduced Elizabeth's reign in this manner to highlight her ability to overcome numerous problems, and strengthened Elizabeth's portrayal by depicting a queen who thrived upon, rather than succumbed to, various obstacles. Raynal then underscored her virtuous qualities to explain her successful reign. He highlighted her youth to draw attention to Mary's older age and to present Elizabeth as an ideal female figure. Drawing attention to Elizabeth's 'authority', Raynal then stressed that Elizabeth's strength came from her perseverance and determination to overcome the numerous obstacles that many others had unsuccessfully faced. He then emphasized her 'dignity' and 'tranquillity' to call attention to Elizabeth's self-control. Raynal portrayed Elizabeth as a singular figure and argued that her personal virtues led to her success. Raynal argued that the queen was able to defeat obstacles that the rest of Europe could not, in order to argue that Elizabeth was a monarch to be emulated, and that indeed her rule was 'perfect'.

Elizabeth's strengths were highlighted during accounts of Mary's reign to undermine Mary's rule, and to hint at the successful rule that was to follow. Raynal made his case for Elizabeth's strengths as a monarch earlier in his texts, and in the account of Mary's reign he used the opportunity to argue that Elizabeth 'took the reins of an agitated empire, of which a thousand enemies, all formidable, and all dangerous, meditated the ruin'.[980] This statement served to undermine Mary's actions as monarch, and it conveyed that Elizabeth was the model monarch, especially as she had to

---

[979] Raynal, p. 163.
[980] Raynal, p. 161.

overcome the calamity of her sister's rule. Inflating the threats Elizabeth faced to a 'thousand enemies', Raynal's hyperbole served to emphasize her triumph in defeating such great odds. In this respect, he was typical of eighteenth-century historians who portrayed Elizabeth as an exemplary figure, whose virtuous actions only served to emphasise Mary's terrible behaviour as queen.

Conclusion

Queens were used as prescriptive figures for ideal feminine, patriarchal and monarchical behaviour in eighteenth-century historical texts. Historical works were seen as a beneficial literary genre, through which women could learn about the past and its valuable lessons. Conduct book authors emphasized the reading of history as a useful exercise in morality and virtue. Eighteenth-century historians thus used queens in their historical texts to convey instructions on ideal feminine qualities and behaviour because the historical genre became increasingly accepted as a form of educational text for women, and a respectable alternative to other forms of literature, such as the novel. Pocock argues that the history which eighteenth-century women were advised to study was 'both the record of their transition from slavery to gallantry, but not of agency'.[981] While women were reading history, queens thus proved problematic to writers because when they were the head of the nation, their monarchical role implied agency. Grey and Mary were denied agency when historians used the two women to convey prescribed notions of feminine virtue, while Elizabeth was allowed to be a figure of power due to her masculine qualities and behaviour.

This chapter demonstrates that women played an important role within the developing historical genre in the eighteenth century, both as readers and as subjects. As the agency of women changed in the eighteenth century, their new position as avid readers of history affected the way in which the genre was written and shared. As a

---

[981] Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, p. 190.

result, both French and British histories were used to provide women with instruction on feminine virtue. Sixteenth-century queens enabled historians to provide insights into these ideals. For historians, Lady Jane Grey was the archetype of the ideal eighteenth-century woman. Although only queen for nine days at the age of fifteen, Grey was regarded posthumously as a martyr as well as a political victim and historians used her legacy to their advantage. Moreover, the queen's short reign allowed historians to portray her as a young woman, rather than focusing on issues of queenship. As a result, eighteenth-century constructions of feminine virtue remained at the forefront of her depictions. Grey allowed historians to present ideal patriarchal comportment in their texts, especially as her reign preceded two queens who had power over all men in their kingdom. Eighteenth-century historians emphasized Grey's obedient role in the patriarchy, while simultaneously complimenting her grace in accepting her place, in order to provide instruction on feminine virtue while reinforcing the ideal patriarchal order.

Historians commonly used their accounts of Grey to begin the history of Mary's reign. Only occasionally did historians end the reign of Edward VI with the short reign of Grey in their historical accounts. Using this method, eighteenth-century historians were able to firmly characterize feminine virtuous behaviour. Lady Jane Grey served as a precursor, as historians employed her as a contrast to the two very different queens who followed her. Mary I was employed as a warning to readers: her lack of female virtue, as exemplified by her aging, melancholic character, was presented as the explanation for her failures as queen. Elizabeth I was able to evade such gendered criticisms, as historians built upon early modern depictions of her masculine behaviour as queen. By contrast, other sixteenth-century queens, such as Mary I and Catherine de' Medici, were criticized in historical writing for their contribution to religious persecution. And as we have seen in previous chapters, monarchs involved in religious zealotry were portrayed negatively by both French and British historians. With these early modern queens, historians were able to convey ideal behaviour for queens, and for kings as well.

279

Eighteenth-century historical accounts reflected the anxieties about the role of women in the public sphere during this period. Historians warned readers that a woman's private life affected her public role by exploring the connection between the personal behaviour of the monarch and its effect on the welfare of her country. This blurring of the line between public and private reflected anxieties around gender and queenship, as a queen's female status threatened to subvert the idealised domestic role of eighteenth-century women. In the accounts of sixteenth-century queens, historians reflected on how the monarch's personal life and emotional state clouded the distinction between public and private. Queens are, by the nature of their role, public figures and historians were forced to reconcile these two opposites. Although historians criticized kings when they allowed their private life to affect their public role (as seen with Henry VIII), historians were more apprehensive about the queen's distortion of the public and private, as the woman's place was deemed to be within the private and domestic home. With Lady Jane Grey, they suggested that her public persona encompassed modesty, and was so self-effacing that she still conformed to a feminine ideal. Grey's early death meant that eighteenth-century historians did not have to treat her as a queen. Instead, her status as a young woman prevented her from having to act in an improperly public manner were she to rule England. With Mary, historians portrayed an incorrigible woman with an inability to manage her private passions, features that extended into her public role as queen.

Of all the monarchs portrayed, Lady Jane Grey, Mary Tudor and Elizabeth are among the most comparable between French and British accounts. David Hume's account was similar to those by Rapin, Millot and Raynal. Notable sixteenth-century queens were depicted according to eighteenth-century notions of female virtue, and criticized or praised in relation to eighteenth-century gender roles. Robert O. Bucholz argues that a popular view exists of sixteenth-century queens with 'Mary I as a cruel religious bigot, Mary Queen of Scots as a capricious but glamorous tragic heroine, [and] Elizabeth I as an unattainable but popular mistress of *realpolitik*'. For Bucholz, these accounts attribute or connect every triumph or failure to, or with, the virtues and defects

of the individual ruler's personality.[982] I would argue that eighteenth-century French and British historians contributed to a discourse on Mary I, Mary Stuart and Elizabeth I, furthering the popular notions of these queens today. Eighteenth-century historians, by seeking to convey ideals and virtues in their texts, helped create the practice in historical writing of judging reigns according to an individual king or queen's personality. This method was utilised in the portrayal of sixteenth-century queens, as it was in accounts of king's reigns.

---

[982] Robert O. Bucholz, 'Queen Anne: Victim of her Virtues?', in Campbell Orr, pp. 94-129 (p. 94).

Conclusion

This thesis has argued that French historians depicted English monarchs according to contemporary British cultural ideals. In doing so, it has provided evidence of the shared historiographical practices between the two countries. Rapin, Millot, and Raynal all portrayed English monarchs in a similar manner, writing in a neoclassical style that presented historical figures as objects of moral contemplation. These historians wrote an English history that was aligned with eighteenth-century British cultural views and ideals, as shown by similarities between their work and that of other French historians of English history, as well as David Hume's *History of England*. Even after the publication of Hume's work, Rapin remained successful. Rapin was the leading historian of English history within Britain for the first half of the eighteenth century. Editions of his work continued to be published throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and Tobias Smollett wrote a continuation of his history in the 1780s.[983] Although Rapin's historical work has been acknowledged by scholars such as Philip Hicks, Laird Okie and M.G. Sullivan, currently Rapin is nonetheless treated as a minor formative influence on the development of eighteenth-century cultures of reading and writing history. This thesis demonstrates that Rapin's history of England played a key role in eighteenth-century British historiography, and created a legacy that other French historians – like Raynal and Millot – sought to emulate.

Jeremy Black argues that France and Britain were 'natural and necessary enemies' in the eighteenth century.[984] I would argue, however, that as historians, French and British writers were not a part of this acrimonious relationship. As I have demonstrated, Rapin was considered a successful French historian whose Huguenot status and close relationship with Britain helped him to create a history of England that reflected, and

---

[983] Tobias Smollett, *Rapin's History of England with the Reign of George II*, 5 vols (London: T. Cadell and R. Baldwin, 1784-1789); M.G. Sullivan, 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity of the Historian in Eighteenth-Century England', *History of European Ideas*, 28 (2002), 145-162 (p. 151).

[984] Jeremy Black, *Natural and Necessary Enemies: Anglo-French Relations in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Duckworth, 1986).

imparted, British cultural ideals. However, Raynal, Millot, and other French historians of differing religious backgrounds also had their works translated and published in eighteenth-century Britain. French historians of English history were successful because they wrote educative, prescriptive texts on ideas of virtue that were in line with both French and British values. As Woolf has argued, in the lead up to the eighteenth century there was a demand for foreign works.[985] As this thesis has demonstrated, French historians were able to build upon this legacy, and did so by writing their histories of England with a British audience in mind. This thesis has proposed that French historians were aware of popular British historical beliefs, debates and politics, and included them to be attractive to British readers. Evidence of this consciousness suggests that these historians sought to promote their work to an audience outside of France, and were aware of the impact and monetary value of a British audience.

French Historians worked within the neoclassical style, offering their portrayals of English monarchs for moral contemplation. They wrote their accounts as practical guides for their readers and offered lessons on virtue and morality. Previously, histories were typically aimed at public statesmen, but the texts of Rapin, Raynal, and Millot aimed to provide guidance to everyday British readers, and as a result widened their reception within eighteenth-century Britain. These works suggest that history as a reading practice for moral contemplation was present throughout the eighteenth century. In the beginning of the period, historians wrote in a prescriptive manner, as they sought to emulate previous classical historians. Later in the century, as history began to compete with the novel, the genre of history was recommended as an educational alternative to leisure reading, as it provided lessons on the past and instruction for the future. This purpose is particularly evident in the way historians discussed female historical figures with a feminine readership in mind. This thesis has argued that authors engaged with, and adapted, the genres of historical writing to offer moral instruction that was appropriate for a diverse eighteenth-century readership.

---

[985] D.R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 269-270.

The French and British historical texts analysed in this thesis demonstrate the prescriptive role of history in the eighteenth century. Depending on the monarch that historians were discussing, they imparted specific ideals of masculinity or femininity. Contemporary notions of virtue and vice thus played an important role in the rhetorical and formal strategies of French and British eighteenth-century historians. For example, as Chapter 4 demonstrated, French historians wrote prescriptively about queens, as they responded to a growing female readership of historical accounts. As history in Britain was considered to be a valuable and instructive instrument for a woman's education during this period, and especially later in the century, French historians sought to discuss, criticize and commend sixteenth-century queens to provide moral lessons for female readers. In their accounts of Lady Jane Grey, Mary I, and Elizabeth I, historians used their different historical legacies to address contemporary issues of patriarchy and monarchy, whilst simultaneously imparting feminine ideals of youth, beauty, modesty and chastity to female readers.

Ideals of masculinity also played an important role in eighteenth-century historiography. The recent past of the seventeenth century included the regicide, Civil War, and Glorious Revolution, all of which were momentous events that made the British people aspire to make sense of their past. Evidence of this legacy can be found in descriptions of the virtues and vices that historians included in their descriptions of monarchs and their motives and actions. For example, historians depicted all historical figures and events with the purpose of extolling the eighteenth-century virtues of moderation, and equanimity. As Chapter 1 demonstrated, the events of the seventeenth century were considered to be the result of excessive passions. The regicide was portrayed by both French and British historians as the result of over-zealousness by Parliament. Yet even in their description of earlier historical events, historians promoted the masculine ideal of stoicism. The virtue of self-control was also implicit in criticisms of any type of fanaticism or over-zealousness. Both French and British historians condemned Mary I for the burning of Protestants, and criticized monarchs whose involvement in the Crusades was motivated by religion rather than glory. Their

continued emphasis on the control of passions provides evidence that historians reinterpreted the past in light of contemporary ideals.

My examination of French historians provides further evidence of the diversity of eighteenth-century historical writing. As we saw in Chapter 2, French historians drew inspiration from the epic when writing about the Norman Conquest, the Third Crusade, and the Hundred Years War, and intimated that traditional medieval notions of chivalry produced the ideal king, prince and man. The prominence of war in the eighteenth century also contributed to the profusion of traditional ideals of masculinity in the period's historical accounts. French historians, however, also made use of contemporary ideals of chivalry in their descriptions of the successful king who was honourable, polite, and always in control during battle. In the infusion of both traditional and modern ideals in their methods of historical writing, the accounts of French historians demonstrate that the multiple historical genres of the eighteenth century influenced all forms of history writing, including the neoclassical tradition.

French historians were also keen to convey to readers that actions within one's private and personal life affected one's life in the public sphere. In the eighteenth century, kingship increasingly became a more secular and public role, and the actions and behaviour of monarchs were judged to be more comparable with those of the everyday contemporary man. French historians frequently implied that a monarch's vices, which were supposed to be private, affected his or her public politics. Their accounts reflect the contemporary notion that any indications of vice in the king provided evidence that the monarchical government was corrupt.[986] In Chapter 3 we saw how Henry VIII's tumultuous private relationships with his wives, court and household were perceived to have a direct impact on his public role as king. Historians sought to impart to readers that the monarch's vices within the private sphere of the home directly affected his public life outside of the household. French historians discussed Henry VIII's failure as a husband and father in order to communicate to readers that he had failed as the head of his household, and compared his responsibilities to those of the

---

[986] Marisa Linton, *The Politics of Virtue in Enlightenment France* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), p. 130.

head of a nation. In their descriptions of sixteenth-century queens, moreover, French historians reflected on how a female monarch's private life and emotional state affected her responsibilities as the leader of her country. These accounts suggest the presence of gendered apprehensions about the blurred line between public and private during the period, as a queen's female status threatened to subvert the idealised private role of eighteenth-century women.

The increased focus on the personal lives and passions of monarchs signals another of the ways in which French historians were contributing to the development of the British historical character. As Mark Salber Phillips has argued, 'history could no longer define its terms as exclusively concerned with either males or public actions' and instead sought to create 'more inclusive categories of experiences'.[987] Part of this change in history writing has been noted by Noelle Gallagher, who reveals that British eighteenth-century histories no longer created abstract character types, and instead described figures who invoked 'sympathy or ridicule'.[988] This thesis argued that French historians also contributed to this development in their exploration of historical figures, and their inner lives and motives. French historians, like their British counterparts, aimed to create characters with whom a contemporary British audience could connect.[989] The French historical portrayal of English monarchs with the inclusion of contemporary British cultural ideals therefore suggests that a shared historiographical practice existed across the channel in the eighteenth century.

Both French and British historians during this period were creating characters who were not flat and infallible, but vulnerable and weak. By acknowledging this, this thesis builds upon Neil Hargraves' proposal that British history in the eighteenth century revealed the inner characters of historical figures in order to comprehend the motives for

---

[987] Mark Salber Phillips, *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain, 1740-1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), p. 17.
[988] Noelle Gallagher, *Historical Literatures: Writing about the Past in England, 1660-1740* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), p. 8.
[989] Neil Hargraves, 'Revelations of Character in Eighteenth-Century Historiography and William Robertson's *History of the Reign of Charles V*', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 27:2 (2008), 23-48 (p. 25); Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, pp. 14-18, 29-30.

286

their actions.[990] By describing both the vices and virtues of historical figures, eighteenth-century historians sought to create characters who were relevant and human, and who also provided instruction. This is particularly evident in the material discussed in Chapter 1, in which French historians, as well as David Hume, portrayed Charles I as a vulnerable figure, listing his redeemable qualities in the hope of invoking sympathy for this king and his untimely end. Henry VIII, however, was treated as a tyrannical figure whose wives deserved sympathy instead. In the invocation of empathy for these individuals, and in their portrayal as fallible beings, French historians aimed to impart lessons on morality and virtue. Rapin, as the leading historian of English history in the first half of the eighteenth century, was instrumental in developing this historiographical method as he influenced Hume, in addition to later French historians.

Despite Britain and France's long and tumultuous history of war with one another, French accounts of English history were nonetheless translated and published in eighteenth-century Britain. Although previous historians have emphasized how the relationship between the French and the British was characterized by adversity during this period, this thesis demonstrated that French historians were involved in, and contributed to, eighteenth-century British historiographical cultures. The French neoclassical historical accounts of English history that were translated and published within Britain itself, suggest shared literary cultures existed between the two countries. This exchange has been studied extensively in other literary fields, but historiographical exchange and its impact has remained mostly uncharted hitherto. The existence and significance of shared historiographical cultures, as examined in this thesis, sheds light on how people in Britain and France viewed their past, and how interpretations were shaped by their present.

---

[990] Hargraves, p. 24.

Bibliography: Primary Sources

Anon, *A Modest Address to the Commons of Great Britain, and in Particular to the Free Citizens of London; Occasioned by the Ill Success of Our Present Naval War with France, and the Want of a Militia Bill* (London: J. Scott, 1756)

Blondel, A., *The Force of the Mother's Imagination Over the Foetus Examin'd* (London: J. Brotherton, 1729)

Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, *The Works of Lord Bolingbroke* (London: Carey and Hart, 1841)

Booth, George, *The Present State of Matrimony: or, The Real Causes of Conjugal Infidelity and Unhappy Marriages* (London: John Hawkins, 1739).

Burnet, Gilbert, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, 2 vols (London: T.H. for Richard Chiswell, 1715)

Burton, J., *Lectures On Female Education and Manners* (Dublin: J. Milliken, 1794)

Chapone, Hester, *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind,* 2 vols (London: H. Hughs for J. Walter, 1773)

Culpeper, Nicholas, *Culpeper's Directory for Midwives; or, A Guide for Women, in their Conception, Bearing and Suckling their Children* (London: Peter Cole, 1662)

Daily Journal, *issue 4244* (London: 24 August 1734)

Evening Post or London Intelligencer, *issue 2247* (Leeds; London: 9-12 August 1760)

Fleetwood, William, *The Relative Duties of Parents and Children, Husbands and Wives, Masters and Servants* (London: C. Harper, 1705)

Fordyce, James, *Sermons to Young Women*, 12th edn, 2 vols (New York: I. Riley, 1809)

Foxe, John, *The Actes and Monuments of these Latter and Perilous Days Touching Matters of the Church*, ed. by S.R. Cattley and G. Townsend, 8 vols (London: Burnside and Seely, 1839-1844)

———, *The Book of Martyrs, or the History of Paganism and Popery* (Coventry: T. Luckman, 1764)

Gaillard, Gabriel Henri, *Histoire de la rivalité de la France et de l'Angleterre*, 10 vols (Paris: Saillant and Nyon, 1771-1777)

Gibbon, Edward, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 4th edn, 6 vols (London: W. Strahan, and T. Cadell, 1781-1788)

Griffet, Henri, *New Lights Thrown Upon the History of Mary Queen of England, Eldest Daughter of Henry VIII. Addressed to David Hume*, trans. by [Anon] (London: J. Wilkie, 1771)

Hume, David, *The History of England*, 2nd edn, 8 vols (London: A. Miller, 1763)

———, *The Letters of David Hume,* ed. by J. Y. T. Greig (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932)

Johnson, Richard, *The History of France: From the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (London: E. Newbery, 1786)

Johnson, Samuel, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 2 vols (London: J. and P. Knapton and A. Millar, 1755)

Jones, David, *The History of France from the Origin of that Nation to the Year 1702*, 2 vols (London: D. Brown and A. Bell, 1702)

Kames, Henry Home, *Essays on British Antiquities*, 2nd edn (London: M. Cooper, 1749)

———, *On the Progress of the Female Sex, in Six Sketches on the History of Man* (Philadelphia: R. Bell and R. Aitken, 1776)

Larrey, Isaac de*, Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse, et d'Irelande*, 4 vols (Rotterdam: Reiner Leers, 1707-1713)

———, *The History of the Reign of King Charles I*, 2 vols (London: A. Bell and J. Osborn, 1716)

Lockman, John, *A New History of England by Question and Answer. Extracted from the Most Celebrated Historians; Particularly M. de Rapin-Thoyras, Written Principally for the Instruction of Youth* (London: T. Astley, 1729)

———, *A New history of England, in French and English, by Question and Answer* (London: P. Vaillant, 1749)

London Advertiser and Literary Gazette, *issue 11* (London: 15 March 1751)

Macaulay, Catharine, *The History of England from the Accession of James I to that of the Brunswick Line* (London: J. Nourse, R. and J. Dodsley and W. Johnston, 1763-1783)

Millot, Abbé, *Élémens de l'histoire d'Angleterre, depuis son origine sous les Romains, jusqu'au regne de George II*, 3 vols (Paris: Durand, 1769)

———, *Elements of the History of England*, trans. by Mr Kenrick, 2 vols (Dublin: James Williams, 1771)

———, *Elements of the History of England*, trans. by Mrs Brooke, 4 vols (London: J. Dodsley and T. Cadell, 1771)

Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws,* trans. by J.V. Prichard (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1900)

Orléans, Pierre Joseph d', *Histoire des revolutions d'Angleterre depuis le commencement de la monarchie jusqu'à present*, 4th edn, 3 vols (Amsterdam: D. Mortier, 1714)

———, *The History of the Revolutions in England Under the Family of the Stuarts, From the Year 1603, to 1690* (London: E. Curll and R. Gosling, 1711)

Ovington, John, *The Duties, Advantages, Pleasures and Sorrows, of the Marriage State* (London: T. Page, 1803)

Rapin-Thoyras, Paul de, 'A Dissertation on the Two Parties of the Whigs and Tories, Shewing their Rise, Progress, Views, Strength, Interests and Characters', in *The History of England*, trans. by Nicolas Tindal, 2nd edn (London: J. and P. Knapton, 1733)

———, *A Dissertation on the Rise, Progress, Views, Strength, Interests and Characters of the Two Parties of the Whigs and the Tories,* trans. by Mr. Ozell (London: S. Baker, 1717)

———, *Histoire D'Angleterre*,10 vols (A La Haye: Chez Alexandre de Rogissart, 1724-1727)

———, *The History of England*, trans. by Nicolas Tindal, 15 vols (London: James and John Knapton, 1725-1731)

Raynal, Abbé, *Histoire du divorce de Henri VIII roi d'Angleterre, et de Catherine d'Arragon* (Amsterdam, 1763)

———, *L'Histoire du parlement d'Angleterre* (London; Paris: 1748)

———, *The History of Parliament of England*, trans. by [Anon] (London: T. Osbourne, 1751)

Robertson, William, *The History of Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh; London: Charles Elliot and J. and J. Robinson, 1786)

Rolt, Richard, *A New History of France, by Question and Answer* (London: W. Owen, 1754)

Rousseau, André Michel, *L'Angleterre et Voltaire*, 3 vols (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation at the Taylor Institution, 1976)

Smith, Adam, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, ed. by J.C. Bryce (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983)

Smith, Hugh, *Letters to Married Women* (London: G. Kearsly, 1774)

Smollett, Tobias, *Rapin's History of England with the Reign of George II*, 5 vols (London: T. Cadell and R. Baldwin, 1784-1789)

Tatler, *issue 220* (London: September 5, 1710)

Turner, Daniel, *The Force of the Mother's Imagination Upon her Foetus in Utero* (London: J. Walthoe, R. Wilkin, J. and J. Bonwicke, 1729)

Voltaire, *An Essay on Universal History, the Manners, and Spirit of Nations, from the Reign of Charlemagne to the Age of Lewis XIV*, trans. by Mr. Nugent, 3rd edn, 4 vols (Dublin: S. Cotter, 1759)

Wilkes, J., *The History of England from the Revolution to the Accession of the Brunswick Line* (London: J. Almon, 1768)

Wraxall, Sir Nathaniel, *Memoirs of the Kings of France, of the Race of Valois* (London: E. and C. Dilly, 1777)

———, *The History of France Under the Kings of the Race of Valois, from the Accession of Charles the Fifth, in 1364, to the Death of Charles the Ninth, in 1574*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (London: E. and C. Dilly, 1785)

Bibliography

Addington, Larry H., *The Patterns of War Through the Eighteenth Century* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990)

Allan, David, *Commonplace Books and Reading in Georgian England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Allitt, Patrick, 'Romancing the Throne', *National Interest*, 114 (2011), 29-39

Armitage, David, 'A Patriot for Whom? The Afterlives of Bolingbroke's Patriot King', *Journal of British Studies*, 36:4 (1997), 397-418

Bailey, J.E., *The Life of Thomas Fuller, D.D.* (London: B. M. Pickering, 1874)

Bailey, Joanne, 'Family Relationships', in *A Cultural History of Childhood and Family in the Age of Enlightenment*, ed. by E. Foyster and J. Marten (Oxford; New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010) pp. 15-31

Bakos, Adrianna E., ed., *Politics, Ideology, and Law in Early Modern Europe* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1995)

Barker, Hannah and Elaine Chalus, eds, *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities* (London; New York: Longman, 1997)

Barlow, Clare, 'Virtue, Patriotism and Female Scholarship in Bluestocking Portraiture', in *Bluestockings Displayed: Portraiture, Performance and Patronage, 1730-1830*, ed. by Elizabeth Eger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 60-80

Barrell, John, *English Literature in History, 1730-80: An Equal, Wide Survey* (London: Hutchinson, 1983)

Bullard, Rebecca, *The Politics of Disclosure, 1674-1725: Secret History Narratives* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009)

Betteridge, Thomas and Thomas S. Freeman, eds, *Henry VIII and History* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012)

Black, J.B., *The Art of History: A Study of Four Great Historians of the Eighteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1926)

Black, Jeremy, *Natural and Necessary Enemies: Anglo-French Relations in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Duckworth, 1986)

———, 'The Catholic Threat and the Press in 1720s and 1730s', *Journal of Religious History*, 12 (1983), 364-381

Botein, Stephen, Jack R. Censer and Harriet Ritvo, 'The Periodical Press in Eighteenth-Century English and French Society: A Cross-Cultural Approach', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 23:3 (1981), 464-490

Bourgault, Sophie and Robert Sparling, eds, *A Companion to Enlightenment Historiography* (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2013)

Bowers, Tori, *The Politics of Motherhood: British Writing and Culture, 1680-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Braudy, Leo, *Narrative Form in History and Fiction: Hume, Fielding and Gibbon* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970)

Brewer, John, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988)

Brumfitt, J.H., *Voltaire Historian* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958)

Bucholz, Robert O., 'Queen Anne: Victim of her Virtues?', in *Queenship in Britain 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics*, ed. by Clarissa Campbell Orr (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 94-129

Burke, Peter, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1994)

Burtt, Shelley, *Virtue Transformed: Political Argument in England, 1688-1740* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)

Butler, Melissa A., 'Early Liberal Roots of Feminism: John Locke and the Attack on Patriarchy', *The American Political Science Review*, 72:1 (1978), 135-150

Campbell Mossner, Ernest, 'David Hume's "An Historical Essay on Chivalry and Modern Honour"', *Modern Philology*, 45:1 (1947), 54-60

Campbell Orr, Clarissa, ed., *Queenship in Britain 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics* (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2002)

Cannon, John, ed., *The Whig Ascendancy: Colloquies on Hanoverian England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1981)

Canstan, Yves, 'Pères et fils en languedoc a l'époque classique', *Dix-Septieme Siecle*, 102/103 (1974), 31-43

Carter, Philip, 'An "Effeminate" or "Efficient" Nation? Masculinity and Eighteenth-Century Social Documentary', *Textual Practice*, 11 (1997), 429-443

———, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society: 1660-1800* (Harlow: Longman, 2000)

Champion, Justin, 'Reinventing the Charter: from Sir Edward Coke to "Freeborn John"', *Historian*, 125 (2015), 16-21

Chibnall, Marjorie, *The Debate on the Norman Conquest* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999)

Clement, Jennifer, 'Elizabeth I, Patriotism, and the Imagined Nation in Three Eighteenth-Century Plays', *Intellectual History Review*, 22:3 (2012), 391-410

Cohen, Michèle, '"Manners" Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750-1830', *Journal of British Studies*, 44:2 (2005), 312-329

———, *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 2014)

Colley, Linda, *In Defiance of Oligarchy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)

Constable, Giles, 'The Historiography of the Crusades', in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, ed. by Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001), pp. 1-22

Conway, Stephen, *War, State and Society in Mid-Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Craddock, Patricia, 'Contemplative Heroes and Gibbon's Historical Imagination', in *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, And Fiction, 1500-1800*, ed. by Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 343-360

Cressy, David, 'Remembrancers of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographies of the 1640s', in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 253-264

Crouzet, F., 'The Second Hundred Years War: Some Reflections', *French History*, 10 (1996), 432-50

Dabhoiwala, Faramerz, 'The Construction of Honour, Reputation and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6 (1996), 201-213

Dew, Benjamin and Fiona Price, eds, *Historical Writing in Britain, 1688-1830: Visions of History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014)

Dickinson, H.T., 'St John, Henry, styled first Viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, < http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view /article/24496> [accessed 4 January 2016]

———, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Methuen, 1977)

Doran, Susan and Thomas S. Freeman, eds, *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2003)

———, eds, *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)

Dutton, Richard, '"Methinks the truth should live from age to age": The Dating and Contexts of Henry V', in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 169-200

Duffy, Eamon, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England Under Mary Tudor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008)

Dwyer Amussen, Susan, 'Approaching a New English Social History, 1500-1850', *Historical Journal*, 38:3 (1995), 679-685

Dzelzainis, Martin, 'History and Ideology: Milton, the Levellers, and the Council of State in 1649', in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 265-283

Evans, Jennifer and Sara Read, '"Before midnight she had miscarried" Women, Men, and Miscarriage in Early Modern England', *Journal of Family History*, 40:1 (2015), 3-23

Famiglietti, R.C., *Royal Intrigue, Crisis at the Court of Charles VI 1392-1420* (New York: AMS Press, 1986)

Feather, John, 'British Publishing in the Eighteenth Century: A Preliminary Subject Analysis', *Library*, 8 (1986), 32-46

Forbes, Duncan, *Hume's Philosophical Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975)

Forman Cody, Lisa, *Birthing the Nation: Sex, Science, and the Conception of Eighteenth-Century Britons* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005)

Foyster, E., and J. Marten, eds, *A Cultural History of Childhood and Family in the Age of Enlightenment* (Oxford; New York: Berg, 2010)

Foyster, Elizabeth, 'Male Honour, Social Control and Wife Beating in Late Stuart England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6 (1996), 215-224

Freeman, Thomas S., 'Burning Zeal: Mary Tudor and the Marian Persecution', in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 171-205

———, 'Inventing Bloody Mary: Perceptions of Mary Tudor from the Restoration to the Twentieth Century', in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 78-100

Fussner, F. Smith, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought 1580-1640* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962)

Gallagher, Noelle, 'The Beginnings of Enlightenment Historiography in Britain', in *A Companion to Enlightenment Historiography*, ed. by Sophie Bourgault and Robert Sparling (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2013), pp. 343-373

———, *Historical Literatures: Writing about the Past in England, 1660-1740* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012)

———, 'Historiography, the Novel, and Henry Fielding's Joseph Andrews', *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 52:3 (2012), 631-650

Germann, Jennifer, 'Fecund Fathers and Missing Mothers: Louis XV, Marie Leszczinska, and The Politics of Royal Parentage in the 1720s', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 36 (2007), 105-126

Gerrard, C., *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole: Politics, Poetry, and National Myth, 1725-1742* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994)

Gibbs, Graham C., 'Huguenot Contributions to England's Intellectual Life and England's Intellectual Commerce with Europe, c. 1680-1720', in *Huguenots in Britain and their French Background 1550-1800*, ed. by Irene Scoulaudi (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1987), pp. 20-41

Goodman, Dena, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994)

Gossman, Lionel, *Medievalism and the Ideologies of the Enlightenment: The World and Work of LaCurne de Sainte-Palaye* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1968)

Grafton, Anthony, *What was History: The Art of History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Green, David, *Edward the Black Prince: Power in Medieval Europe* (Harlow; New York: Pearson Longman, 2007

Green, V., *The Madness of Kings, Personal Trauma and the Fate of Nations* (New York: Alan Sutton, 1993)

Hanley, Sarah, 'The Monarchic State in Early Modern France: Marital Regime Government and Male Right', in *Politics, Ideology, and Law in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Adrianna E. Bakos (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1995), pp. 107-26

———, 'Engendering the State: Family Formation and State Building in Early Modern France', *French Historical Studies*, 16:1 (1989), 4-27

Hargraves, Neil, 'Revelation of Character in Eighteenth-Century Historiography and William Robertson's History of the Reign of Charles V', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 27:2 (2003), 23-48

Harrington, Dana, 'Gender, Commerce, and the Transformation of Virtue in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 31:3 (2001), 33-52

Harris, B., *Politics and the Nation: Britain in the Mid-Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)

Harvey, Karen, 'The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800', *Journal of British Studies*, 44:2 (2005), 296-311

———, *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Hay, Denys, *Annalists and Historians: Western Historiography from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Centuries* (London: Methuen, 1977)

Haydon, Colin, *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-Century England, c. 1714-80: A Political and Social Study* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993)

Herrup, Cynthia, 'The King's Two Genders', *The Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006), 493-510

Heywood, Colin, *Growing up in France: From the Ancien Regime to the Third Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Hicks, Philip, *Neoclassical History and English Culture: From Clarendon to Hume* (London: Macmillan, 1996)

Hill, Christopher, *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution: Revisited* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)

———, *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997)

Hilson, J.C., 'Hume: The Historian as Man of Feeling', in *Augustan Worlds: Essays in Honour of R.A. Humphreys*, ed. by J.C. Hilson, M.M.B. Jones and J.R. Watson (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1978), pp. 205-222

Houlebrooke, Ralph A., *The English Family 1450-1700* (London; New York: Longman, 1984)

Howell Jr, Roger, 'Cromwell, the English Revolution and Political Symbolism in Eighteenth-Century England', in *Images of Oliver Cromwell: Essays for and by Roger Howell Jr*, ed. by Roger Howell (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), pp. 63-73

Janara, Laura, 'John Locke's Kindred Politics: Phantom Fatherhood, Vicious Brothers and Friendly Equal Brethren', *History of Political Thought*, 33:3 (2012), 455-489

Jassie, Kenneth N. and Jeffrey Merrick, 'We Don't Have a King: Popular Protest and the Image of the Illegitimate King in the Reign of Louis XV', *Consortium on Revolutionary Europe 1750-1850: Proceedings*, 23 (1994), 211-219

Jones, Robert W., *Gender and the Formation of Taste in Eighteenth-Century Britain: The Analysis of Beauty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

———, *Literature, Gender and Politics in Britain during the War for America 1770-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

Keen, Maurice Hugh, *Chivalry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005)

Kelley, Donald R. and David Harris Sacks, eds, *The Historical Imagination in Early Modem Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

Kenyan, John, *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984)

Kewes, Paulina, ed., *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2006)

Kewes, Paulina, 'The Exclusion Crisis of 1553 and the Elizabethan Succession', in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 49-61

Kidd, Colin, *British Ethnicity Before Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Kowaleski-Wallace, Elizabeth, ed., *Their Fathers' Daughters: Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth, and Patriarchal Complicity* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)

Kramnick, Isaac, 'Corruption in Eighteenth-Century English and American Political Discourse', in *Virtue, Corruption, and Self-Interest: Political Values in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. by Richard K. Matthews (London: Associated University Press, 1994)

Landes, Joan B., 'Republican Citizens and Heterosocial Desire: Concepts of Masculinity in Revolutionary France', in *Masculinities in Politics and War*, ed. by Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 96-115

Langford, Paul, *The Eighteenth Century: 1688-1815* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)

Levin, Carole, 'Lady Jane Grey: Protestant Queen and Martyr', in *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. by Margaret Patterson Hannay (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1985), pp. 92-106

Levine, Joseph M., *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern Historiography* (Ithica; London: Cornell University Press, 1987)

———, *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1991)

Lincoln, Andrew, 'The Culture of War and Civil Society in the Reigns of William III and Anne', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 44:4 (2011), 455-474

Linton, Marisa, *The Politics of Virtue in Enlightenment France* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001)

———, 'Virtue Rewarded? Women and the Politics of Virtue in Eighteenth-Century France. Part I', *History of European Ideas*, 26 (2000), 35-49

Lock, Alexander and Jonathan Sims, 'Invoking Magna Carta: Locating Information Objects and Meaning in the 13th to 19th Centuries', *Legal Information Management*, 15:2 (2015), 74-85

Looser, Devoney, *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820* (Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000)

Lynch, Deirdre Shauna, *The Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1998)

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999)

Macgillivray, Royce, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974)

Marsden, Jean I., 'Sex, Politics, and She-Tragedy: Reconfiguring Lady Jane Grey', *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 42:3 (2002), 501-522

Matthews, Richard K., ed., *Virtue, Corruption, and Self-Interest: Political Values in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Associated University Press, 1994)

Mauzi, R., *L'Idée du Bonheur dans la literature et la pensée française au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: A. Michel, 1960)

Mayer, Robert, *History and the Early English Novel: Matters of Fact from Bacon to Defoe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

McCluskey, Phil, '"Les ennemis du nom Chrestien": Echoes of the Crusade in Louis XIV's France', *French History*, 29:1 (2015), 46-61

McCormack, Matthew, 'The New Militia: War, Politics and Gender in 1750s Britain', *Gender & History*, 19:3 (2007), 483-500

McLaren, Anne, 'Gender, Religion, and Early Modern Nationalism: Elizabeth I, Mary Queen of Scots, and the Genesis of English Anti-Catholicism', *The American Historical Review*, 107:3 (2002), 739-767

Meirlaen, Matthias, 'Philosophical History in the Revolutionary School Curriculum: Claude-François-Xavier Millot's Élémens d'histoire générale', *History of European Ideas*, 36:3 (2010), 302-310

Merrick, Jeffrey, *The Desacralization of the French Monarchy in the Eighteenth Century* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990)

———, 'Fathers and Kings: Patriarchalism and Absolutism in Eighteenth-Century French Politics', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, 308 (1993), 281-303

———, 'Patriarchalism and Constitutionalism in Eighteenth-Century Parliamentary Discourse', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 20 (1990), 317-330

———, 'Politics On Pedestals: Royal Monuments in Eighteenth-Century France', *French History*, 5:2 (1991), 234-264

Morley, John, *Diderot and the Encyclopaedists*, 2 vols (London: Chapman and Hall, 1878)

Morse, David, *The Age of Virtue: British Culture from The Restoration to Romanticism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000)

Mullan, John, *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990)

Nicholson, Eirwen, 'Eighteenth Century Foxe: Evidence for the Impact of the Acts and Monuments in the "Long" Eighteenth Century', in *John Foxe and the English Reformation*, ed. by David Loades (Aldershot; Brookfield: Scolar Press, 1997), pp. 143-177

Nyland, Chris, 'Adam Smith, Stage Theory, and the Status of Women', *History of Political Economy*, 25:4 (1993), 617-640

O'Brien, Karen, 'History and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 98:5 (2005), 397-414

———, 'The History Market in Eighteenth-Century England', in *Books and Their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England*, ed. by Isabel Rivers (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2003), pp. 105-134

———, *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

OED Online, 'despot, n', (Oxford University Press: 2015) <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/51024> [accessed February 15, 2015]

OED Online, 'despotism, n', (Oxford University Press: 2015) <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/51031?redirectedFrom=despotism> [accessed February 15, 2015]

OED Online, 'barbarian, n. and adj.', (Oxford University Press, 2015) <http://0www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/15380?redirectedFrom=barbarian> [accessed 11 February 2016]

OED Online, 'chivalrous, adj.', (Oxford University Press, 2017) < http://0-
www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/31976 > [Accessed 7 March 2017]

OED Online, 'chivalry, n.', (Oxford University Press, 2017) < http://0-
www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/Entry/31979?redirectedFrom=chivalry#eid>
[Accessed 7 March 2017]

Okie, Laird, *Augustan Historical Writing: Histories of England in the English
Enlightenment* (New York; London: University Press of America, 1991)

Ottaway, Susannah R., *The Decline of Life: Old Age in Eighteenth-Century England*
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Page, Anthony, 'The Seventy Years War, 1744-1815, and Britain's Fiscal-Naval State',
War & Society, 34:3 (2015), 162-86

Pallister, Anne, *Magna Carta: The Heritage of Liberty* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971)

Palmeri, Frank, *Satire, History, Novel: Narrative Forms, 1665-1815* (Newark:
University of Delaware Press, 2003)

Patterson Hannay, Margaret, ed., *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons,
Translators, and Writers of Religious Works* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press,
1985)

Paulson, Ronald, 'The Henry VIII Story in the Eighteenth Century: Words and Images',
in *Henry VIII and His Afterlives: Literature, Politics, and Art*, ed. by Mark Rankin,
Christopher Highley, John N. King (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp.
115-139

Pearson, Jacqueline, *Women's Reading in Britain, 1750-1835: A Dangerous Recreation*
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Perry, Gill and Michael Rossington, eds, *Femininity and Masculinity in Eighteenth-
Century Art and Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994)

Perry, Ruth, 'Colonizing the Breast: Sexuality and Maternity in Eighteenth-Century
England', *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 2:2 (1991), 204-234

Phillips, Mark Salber, '"If Mrs Mure Be Not Sorry for Poor King Charles": History, the
Novel, and the Sentimental Reader', *History Workshop Journal*, 43 (1997), 110-131

———, *On Historical Distance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013)

———, *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain, 1740-1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000)

Phillipson, Nicholas T., *David Hume: The Philosopher as Historian* (London: Penguin, 2011)

Pocock, J.G.A., *Barbarism and Religion Volume Two: Narratives of Civil Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

———, 'Commerce, Settlement and History: A Reading of the Histoire des deux Indes', in *Articulating America: Fashioning a National Political Culture in Early America – Essays in Honour of J.R. Pole*, ed. by Rebecca Star (New York: Roman and Littlefield, 2000), pp. 14-44

———, *The Machiavellian Moment* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975)

———, *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976)

Pollack, Linda A., *Forgotten Children: Parent-child Relations from 1500 to 1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983)

Pollard, A.F., 'Tindal, Nicholas (1687-1774)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/article/27463> [accessed 25 June 2016]

Porter, Roy and Mikulas Teich, eds, *The Enlightenment in National Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981)

Porter, Roy, *Enlightenment: Britain and the Creation of the Modern World* (London: Penguin Press, 2001)

Rankin, Mark, Christopher Highley and John N. King, eds, *Henry VIII and His Afterlives: Literature, Politics, and Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Raoul de Cazenove, M., *Rapin-Thoyras, Sa Famille, Sa Vie, et Ses Oevres* (Paris: A. Aubry, 1866)

Rawson, Claude, *Satire and Sentiment 1660-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Reddick, A., *The Making of Johnson's Dictionary 1746-1773* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Rempel, Lora, 'Carnal Satire and the Constitutional King: George III in James Gillray's Monstrous Craws at a New Coalition Feast', *Art History*, 18:1 (1995), 4-23

Roberts, Meghan K., 'Philosophes Mariés and Epouses Philosophiques: Men of Letters and Marriage in Eighteenth-Century France', *French Historical Studies*, 35:3 (2012), 510-539

Rogers, Pat, 'Johnson, Samuel (1709-1784)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/article/14918>, [accessed 28 June 2017]

Sambrook, James, *The Eighteenth Century: The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1700-1789* (London: Longman, 1986)

Sarkie, Andrew, 'Henry VIII in History: Gilbert Burnet's History of the Reformation (v.1), 1679', in *Henry VIII and History*, ed. by Thomas Betteridge and Thomas S. Freeman (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), pp. 151-163

Scott, H.M., *The Birth of a Great Power System, 1740-1815* (Harlow: Pearson, 2006)

Seaward, Paul, 'Clarendon, Tacitism, and Europe's Civil Wars', in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 285-306

Sharpe, Kevin, 'Virtues, Passions and Politics in Early Modern England', *History of Political Thought*, 32:5 (2011), 773-798

Shoemaker, Robert B., *Gender in English society, 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres?* (Harlow; London: Longman, 1998)
Shoemaker, Robert B., 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', *Social History*, 26:2 (2001), 190-208

Simonsuuri, Kirsti, *Homer's Original Genius: Eighteenth-Century Notions of the Early Greek Epic 1688-1798* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979)

Smith, Hannah, 'Politics, Patriotism, and Gender: The Standing Army Debate on the English Stage, circa 1689-1720', *The Journal of British Studies*, 50 (2011), 48-75

Smith, Lisa, 'The Relative Duties of a Man: Domestic Medicine in England and France, 1685-1740', *Journal of Family History*, 31 (2006), 237-256

Stone, Lawrence, *Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977)

Sullivan, M.G., 'Rapin de Thoyras, Paul de (1661-1725)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, < http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/article/23145> [accessed 8 June 2012]

Sullivan, M.G., 'Rapin, Hume and the Identity of the Historian in Eighteenth-Century England', *History of European Ideas*, 28 (2002), 145-162

Susato, Ryu, 'The Idea of Chivalry in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Case of David Hume', *Hume Studies*, 33:1 (2007), 155-178

Sutherland, N.M., 'Catherine de' Medici: The Legend of the Wicked Italian Queen', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 9:2 (1978), 45-56

Thompson, Faith, *Magna Carta: Its Role in the Making of the English Constitution 1300-1629* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1948)

Traer, James F., *Marriage and the Family in Eighteenth-Century France* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1980)

Trevor-Roper, Hugh, 'A Huguenot Historian: Paul Rapin', in *Huguenots in Britain and their French Background 1550-1800*, ed. by I. Scoulaudi (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1987), pp. 3-20

Turner, David M., *Fashioning Adultery: Gender, Sex and Civility in England 1660-1740* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Turner, Ralph, *Magna Carta: Through the Ages* (London: Routledge, 2003)

Wallach Scott, Joan, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988)

Watkins, J., *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Watson Brownley, Martine, *Clarendon and the Rhetoric of Historical Form* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985)

Weil, Rachel, *Political Passions: Gender, the Family and Political Argument in England 1680-1714* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999)

White, Hayden, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973)

Wiles, R.M., *Serial Publishing in England Before 1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1957)

Williams, Carolyn, *Pope, Homer and Manliness: Some Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Classical Learning* (London: Routledge, 1993)

Wilson, Kathleen, *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Wollock, Jennifer G., *Rethinking Chivalry and Courtly Love* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2011)

Woolf, D.R., 'A Feminine Past? Gender, Genre, and Historical Knowledge in England, 1500-1800', *The American Historical Review*, 102:3 (1997), 645-679

———, 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500-1700', in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 31-68

———, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

———, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and "The light of truth" From the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto; London: University of Toronto Press, 1990)

———, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Wootton, David, 'Thomas Hobbes' Machiavellian Moments', in *The Historical Imagination in Early Modem Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800*, ed. by Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 210-242

Wrightson, Keith, *English Society 1580-1680* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1982)

Yallop, Helen, *Age and Identity in Eighteenth-Century England* (London: Routledge, 2015)

Yates, Frances, 'Foxe as Propagandist', in *Ideas and Ideals in the Northern Renaissance*, ed. by Francis Yates (London: Routledge, 1984), pp. 28-39

Ylivuori, Soile, 'Rethinking Female Chastity and Gentlewomen's Honour in Eighteenth-Century England', *The Historical Journal*, 59:1 (2016), 71-97

Zafirovski, Milan, *The Enlightenment and Its Effects on Modern Society* (New York; London: Springer, 2010)

Zagorin, Perez, 'Clarendon and Hobbes', *The Journal of Modern History*, 57:4 (1985), 593-616

Zaw, Susan Khin, '"Appealing to the Head and Heart": Wollstonecraft on Burke on Taste, Morals and Human Nature', in *Femininity and Masculinity in Eighteenth-Century Art and Culture*, ed. by Gill Perry and Michael Rossington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), pp. 123-141