The Ottoman siege of Vienna (1683), English ballads and the exclusion crisis[*]

Dr Anders Ingram

National University of Ireland, Galway

Running head: Ballads on the Siege of Vienna.

Abstract:

The second Ottoman siege of Vienna (1683) generated a higher volume of English writing than any other seventeenth century event involving the Ottomans. This paper focuses upon ballads written in the immediate aftermath of the siege and relates them to the concurrent English political context of the Tory reaction to the Exclusion Crisis. Situating these ballads within the publication milieu of pamphlet news and political polemic, I examine the figures who produced them and the audiences they were aimed at. Following from this I show how the use of commonplace images and associations with the 'Turk' as a recurring figure in early modern writing, allowed these ballads to find, or depict, synchronicities between the events of the siege of Vienna, and the English political scene.

[*]I would like to thank the Irish Research Council for the fellowship which supported this research, and Prof. Daniel Carey and Dr. Christine Woodhead for their help and comments at various stages.

On 11-12 September 1683 an army of allied forces under the command of the Polish king Jan Sobieski III (1629-1696) successfully lifted the two-month Ottoman siege of Vienna. In England this event provoked a spate of ballads: nine are extant on the subject of the siege, with numerous other ballads and pamphlets alluding to this event and the ensuing conflict. Yet far from confining themselves to describing the heroic defeat of the enemy of Christendom these works took the opportunity to draw sophisticated analogies between these continental events and English politics, revealing a cosmopolitan frame of reference for popular political writing. For example, the ballad *On the relief of Vienna, a hymn for the true-protestants*, written within a week of Sobieski's victory,[1] refers in its opening lines to the 'Whigs', those who opposed the succession of James Duke of York on the grounds of his Catholicism.

REnown'd be *Christian* Arms,
The *Turkish Whigs* be damn'd...[2]

Though the title explicitly claims the siege of Vienna as its topic, concurrent English politics are just as relevant to understanding this ballad. The timing of these events was important; by September 1683 the Whig challenge to royal authority had been defeated, albeit only for the duration of the reign of Charles II, and a loyalist reaction was at its height. The siege of Vienna provided English writers with a convenient opportunity to engage in topical political polemic. *On the relief of Vienna* transposes the Turkishness of the Ottomans onto the Whigs ('*Turkish Whigs*'), but also depicts god's grace in granting a victory over the 'Turk' as an allegory of Stuart political triumph:

But He [God] has found an Arm

To do the Royal Work,

And vindicate Himself, against

True-Protestant and *Turk.*

Victory over the Ottomans is presented as 'Royal' while the defeat of the '*True-Protestant*', a satirical allusion to Whig nonconformists, is an act of divine providence and Christian triumph.[3]

On the relief of Vienna is one of an identifiable group of ballads on the siege, which share similarities in content, form and topic, and mostly date very specifically to within a period of two or three months. *The bloody siege of Vienna* is dated 26 October in the Luttrell collection. *The granadiers loyal health*, which refers to the siege and its circumstances, is dated 3 October in the Houghton collection. Considering their specific topical focus it is extremely likely that *A carrouse to the Emperor, the royal pole, and the much-wong'd* [sic] *Duke of Lorrain*; *The Christian conquest*; and *Vienna's triumph* appeared in September or October 1683.[4] *An excellent new song on the late victories over the Turks*, probably also from 1683, appears with minor typographical variants in the collection *120 loyal songs* (1684), which also included two other Vienna ballads, *Rejoyce in tryumph, or a plaudite on the Ottamens defeat at Vienna* and *The Tories tryumph*. The latter commented on the build up to the siege and had appeared as a broadside (i.e. single sheet) with only minor typographical variants in 1682. Evidently the siege was a popular subject for ballads. The military conflict which followed also inspired ballads including *The Christians new victory over the Turks in Hungaria near the Drave* (1685) and *A song upon the randizvous on Hounsley-Heath, with a paralel of the destructions of our English Turks in the west, and the Mahomitans in Hungary* (1685),[5] both produced by printers of earlier Vienna ballads.

Appearing contemporaneously, and addressing the topical subject of the siege, many of these ballads also carried a heavy English political subtext. Perceived overlap between continental events and English politics was particularly significant in the early 1680s as it was a moment of crisis and change in both contexts. The siege of Vienna marked a watershed in Ottoman military power in central Europe and also in European perceptions of the Ottoman Empire.[6] Meanwhile, contemporary English politics were also embroiled in crisis. The following argument will reconstruct the political and print contexts in which the Vienna ballads appeared, and show how the events of the siege proved ripe for appropriation by polemical writers. The first section discusses the events of the siege as they were reported in contemporary news. The second explores the concurrent English political context of the exclusion crisis, subsequent 'Tory reaction', 'Rye House Plot', and the arrests, trials, and executions of prominent Whigs which followed. The third section focuses upon the print context of 'pamphlet'[7] and ballad publication in the 1680s, including news and censorship, ballad form, genre and market, and the role of pamphlet culture in political discourse. The fourth and final section turns to close readings of Vienna ballads, relating them to the range of images, words, physical and moral characteristics, and connotations associated with the 'Turk' as a reoccurring figure in early modern writing, but also the political and print contexts previously discussed. I will then show how these 'commonplaces' – in the sense of commonly held opinions, associations accepted widely as truisms, or stock themes – resonated with the central political concerns of the period, thereby allowing polemical writers to appropriate the events and personages of the siege of Vienna to allegorise English politics, or otherwise attack their opponents. In doing so this article joins a burgeoning historiography that argues that the 1680s saw a major intensification of popular public discourse, and identifies pamphlets, in this case ballads, a crucial source for understanding the popular politics of the period.[8]

I.

In the early 1670s the Hapsburg Emperor Leopold I sought to impose absolutist and Catholic rule on the Hapsburg-controlled areas of Hungary. The accompanying military occupation and religious persecution of Protestants led to the exodus of a large number of Hungarian nobles and peasants to Turkish-held areas of Hungary and Transylvania, where they formed a military revolt with Transylvanian and French support. In 1682 the rebel leader Imre Thököly was crowned king of Upper Hungary with Ottoman military support. Hapsburg incursions against Thököly provided the Ottomans with a pretext to mobilise their forces for an invasion. On the 14th September 1682 *The London Gazette* reported from Frankfurt:

The great subject of peoples discourses is at present the news we have from *Hungary*, where the Rebels have possessed themselves of several places, and the Turks are come from giving them underhand assistances to act in a body of themselves … so that the War is begun between the Emperor and the Port [i.e. Constantinople], and the hopes we had that the Peace would be renewed, seem now lost.[9]

However, due to the approaching winter, a full scale invasion was not launched until the next year. In the meantime the Hapsburgs were able to sign a mutual defence treaty with the formerly pro-French Jan Sobieski III, King of Poland. Throughout the winter months of 1682 and early 1683 *The London Gazette* continued to report on Ottoman mobilisation, Hapsburg diplomatic and material preparations for war, and the dwindling hopes for peace.

It was not until the summer of 1683, with war fully underway, that English news accounts began to appear in large numbers, reporting events with a heady mix of anxiety and eagerness. In July 1683 the Ottoman army, commanded by Grand Vizier Merzifonlu Kara

Mustapha (Grand Vizier 1676-1683), besieged Vienna, 'the *Bulwark* against the *Turks*, the Key of *Germany*, and of the *Christian* World'.[10] The Hapsburg Emperor Leopold I (1640-1705) fled the city to Linz, and the defending forces, led by Count Ernst Rüdiger von Starhemberg (1638-1701), held out for two months, withstanding 18 assaults. Just as it seemed inevitable to many contemporary European observers that the city would fall, allied forces under the overall command of Jan Sobieski III, with a contingent led by Charles V Duke of Lorraine (1643-1690), relieved the city, routing the Ottoman army at the battle of Vienna on 11-12 September.

The siege of Vienna was only the first in a series of military calamities for the Ottoman Empire. At the initiative of Pope Innocent XI, a 'Holy League' was formed in 1684 between the Holy Roman Empire, Poland and Venice, joined by Russia in 1686. The consequences of fighting prolonged military campaigns on several fronts proved catastrophic for the Ottomans. The conflict ended with the treaty of Karlowitz in 1699, which relinquished Ottoman control over Hungary and the Morea, together with other frontier regions. Though some of this territory was recovered in the following decades, the scale of the defeat was unprecedented in Ottoman history, and was viewed as a decisive turning point in Ottoman power by many seventeenth and eighteenth-century European observers.

Printed accounts of the siege appeared in great numbers depicting the epic scale and dramatic twists of these events with relish. The invasion of the 'Turks falling with their formidable Forces like a Torrent into Hungary'[11] was described with trepidation. The desperate plight of the defenders of Vienna, who 'had reason to fear we could not have resisted their nixt Assault' was vividly narrated.[12] News of the eventual 'Christian' victory was relayed with 'joy' and 'solemn thanks ... to Almighty God for the relief of the city of Vienna'.[13]

The immediate aftermath of the siege saw the anxious tone of earlier news reports replaced by a bombastic Christian triumphalism. *A true and exact relation of the raising of the siege of Vienna* began:

Heaven favourably heard the Prayers and Tears of a Cast-Down and Mournful People, and retorted the Terror of a powerful Enemy, and drove him from the Walls of *Vienna*...[14]

Many accounts, such as *A true copy of a letter sent from Vienna September 2d. 1683*, gave this kind of posturing a more explicitly Christian tone:

I Cannot but think it will be grateful News to all Christendom to hear of the Overthrow of the *Turkish* Army, therefore I make bold to send you this Letter to let you, and my Friends in *England* understand, as well as of my self, the preservation of a great part of Christendom, from the fury, rage and threatning Ruine, of that implacable and universal Enemy the *Turk*...[15]

The characterisation of the 'Turk' in opposition to Christendom as an 'implacable and universal Enemy' was common in early modern English, and European, writing on the Ottoman Empire.[16] The tendency to revert to black and white contrasts was especially notable in periods of conflict, for example the Ottoman-Hapsburg war of 1593-1606.

The opposition of Christendom and the 'Turk' was not the limit of English interest in these events. In common with other European news, the siege was seen to reflect a range of broader issues which dominated English political discourse of the late seventeenth century. This perceived resonance and topicality meant that news of the Ottomans, and the 'Turk' as a trope or figure, played a significant role in political pamphleteering and the populist political discourse associated with it. Drawing parallels between English political concerns and the

Ottoman world was nothing new.[17] What *was* new in the 1680s, was the combination of the proliferation of pamphlet writing in the exclusion crisis and its aftermath, the willingness of the authorities and loyalists to engage in a widespread attempt to sway public opinion,[18] and the perceived degree of synchronicity of the events surrounding the siege of Vienna with the concurrent English political context.

However, although the topicality of the Ottomans reached an apogee during the exclusion crisis, the resonance of the 'Turk' with English political concerns was already well established. Steven Pincus has described a 'lively' debate connecting English and European affairs in late seventeenth-century England, which turned upon the application of the concept of 'universal monarchy' to Dutch domination of trade, and French territorial ambition and intrigue.[19] Pincus does not address the 'Turk' as a figure in this debate, perhaps because he wishes to emphasise the importance of a rhetoric of trade and political economy, and downplay religious and confessional language.[20] However, the Ottomans had long been seen as aspirants to universal monarchy: a contemporary history comments 'When *Mahomet* had taken possession of the *Ottoman* Empire, after the death of *Amurath* his Father, he was presently for an universal monarchy'.[21] Further, the association of the 'Turk' with both 'Popery' and tyranny, to which we shall return, made the 'Turk' a potent figure in this debate. *A second consultation between the Pope and the Turk* (1679) has the pope declare:

If *Universal Monarchy*
You do receive from me,
The *Universal Pastor* I
May be allow'd to be.[22]

Pincus himself cites two sources comparing the Dutch to the 'Turk', to emphasise their expansionism and tyranny of trade.[23] Additionally, the long standing Franco-Ottoman *entente*

cordiale,[24] threat of a French invasion of Lorraine while the Hapsburgs fought the Ottomans, and the association of French absolutism with Ottoman Tyranny, gave the pairing of the French with the 'Turk' a purchase in this debate. News of the siege of Vienna resonated heavily with fears of universal monarchy, absolutist government, 'Popery', and French machinations, both in court and on the international stage. Stephen Taylor argues that Puritan Whig author Roger Morrice interpreted news of Thököly's rebellion and Ottoman-Hapsburg conflict as part of a 'crisis of European Protestantism', reflecting his fear of French influence as a powerful and aggressive agent of the counter-reformation.[25] The established associations of the 'Turk' and the concurrence of continental and English events lent analogies comparing the two a special force.

II.

While Hapsburg-Ottoman conflict unfolded in Europe, a political crisis was reaching its conclusion in England. Since the late 1670s England had been riven by a succession crisis, which brought to the fore a number of issues of religious conscience and the relative powers of king and parliament, unresolved from the civil conflicts earlier in the century. In 1673 the Catholicism of James Duke of York, the heir to the throne, had become public knowledge. In 1678, fear of a Catholic successor, and widespread concerns of a drift towards absolutist government on the French model, condensed around allegations by Titus Oates of a supposed 'Popish plot' to murder Charles II and massacre Protestants. By 1679 a parliamentary 'exclusion crisis' had developed, which pitted 'Whigs', who wished to exclude the Duke of York from the succession, against 'Tories', who upheld the right of the king to decide succession. Parliament passed an Exclusion Bill, and Charles II responded by dissolving parliament. The crisis came to a head in 1681, when Charles II called parliament in the

royalist stronghold of Oxford, before dissolving it eight days later, and refusing to call another for the rest of his reign. In the subsequent 'Tory reaction' the Whig movement was crushed through intense legal persecution of nonconformists, the appointment of a Tory Lord Mayor and sheriffs to London government, the arrest and execution of prominent Whig figures, a tightening of control over Whig publishers and the press more generally, and the concerted courting of public opinion through propaganda.[26] Throughout the Popish plot, exclusion crisis, and the Tory reaction which followed it, a war of words was fought through pamphlets, at that time the pre-eminent mode of speaking in print.[27]

In June 1683, the month before the Ottomans besieged Vienna, an alleged plot to assassinate King Charles II and the Duke of York was discovered, as a consequence of which the Whig leaders Lord William Russell and Algernon Sidney were executed (on 21 July and 7 December 1683 respectively).[28] An outpouring of loyalist publications decried the 'Rye House Plot', while Tory propaganda sought to convince public opinion of the strength of the somewhat dubious evidence on which Russell had been executed. Russell's execution marked a turning point in the press campaign between Tories and their Whig opponents. Raymond asserts that by '1683 the Tories had gained the upper hand, and managed to keep Whig ideologues and pamphleteers at bay until 1687'.[29] The Rye House Plot and siege of Vienna were contemporary events in news terms. *The London Gazette* reported in detail on the plot, alongside news of the escalating Hapsburg-Ottoman conflict; throughout the siege itself war news was preceded by copious 'Adresses' to the king from loyal subjects on the occasion 'of that late horrid and damnable Plot and Conspiracy'.[30]

The political context shaped English news in fundamental ways. The Printing Act lapsed in 1679, as a consequence of the king's conflict with parliament. Due to the resulting breakdown in pre-publication censorship, and the political upheavals of the exclusion crisis, the years 1679-1681 had seen an exceptional blossoming of newspaper and pamphlet

publication.[31] However, with the defeat of the Whig challenge by late 1682, the authorities clamped down heavily upon both the Whig and Tory press.[32] The Whig paper *The True Protestant Mercury*, published by Langley Curtis and his wife, was suppressed with Jane Curtis arrested and imprisoned October 1682. The Tory papers *The Domestick Intelligence*, produced by Nathaniel Thompson and Thomas Benskin; George Croom's *The Loyal London Mercury*; and Elizabeth Brooks's *The Loyal Impartial Mercury* were also suppressed 16 November 1682.[33] As a result, the majority of the accounts of the siege which appeared, including those examined above, were one-off pamphlets rather than true 'newspapers'.[34] The remaining newspapers were *The London Gazette*, licensed by royal authority,[35] and the virulently anti-Whig *The Observator*, published by Joanna Brome and written by the arch Tory propagandist Roger L'Estrange, the former press regulator who had lost his position with the lapse of the Printing Act.[36] Despite these restrictions news of Vienna saturated the market in London and beyond.

III.

Widespread interest in news of Vienna was also reflected in the ballad market, and the siege was the topic of numerous items, many of which reflected contemporary political concerns. However, before we turn to a closer examination of some of these ballads, it is necessary to discuss the generic forms which they took and the market in which they were produced. Although it has become axiomatic to note that the 'printed broadside was the cheapest and most accessible form of print',[37] the work of Angela McShane has shown the importance of carefully identifying formats for specific 'ballad products' if we wish to understand the markets and audiences to which they were addressed.[38]

At a basic level we must differentiate between ‘black-letter’ and ‘white-letter’ ballads, designations from Samuel Pepys’s ballad collection. The black-letter ballad was printed on a single side of cheap paper in gothic (‘black-letter’) type, oriented ‘landscape’, generally composed in two parts, with four columns of text and illustrated with woodcuts (see figure 1). White-letter ballads show a greater variation in format and typography. In general they were printed in roman or italic type, oriented ‘portrait’, shorter than their black-letter counterparts, in two rather than four columns, and far less often illustrated (see figure 2). In the late seventeenth century printers began to experiment with new forms of white-letter ballad, for example introducing ‘notation ballads’, with an illustration of musical ‘notation’ under the title (see figure 3).[39]

[all three illustrations shoul be placed here]

figure 1: *The Christian conquest* ([1683]), black letter ballad, by kind permission of the British Library Board, Rox.IV.34.

figure 2: *On the relief of Vienna* (1683), white letter ballad, by permission of The National Library of Scotland.

figure 3: *Vienna’s triumph* (1683), notation ballad, by kind permission of the British Library Board, Rox.III.912.

Typographical and visual formats related strongly to the character and content of these ‘ballad products’.[40] The black-letter ballad was printed to appeal to the widest audience and sold for profit. Until the 1670s the white-letter format had been reserved for political satires, an association which continued until the liberalisation of printing with the final lapse of the Printing Acts in 1695.[41] Often the writing, commissioning, and selling (or free distribution) of white-letter ballads was connected with an attempt to sway or mobilise opinion. Further,

these ballads targeted a more specific audience and alluded to contemporary individuals, events, controversies, and other pamphlets, often in deliberately opaque terms. McShane proposes that this 'suggests that both the authors and their target group were familiar with the political world of London and especially courtiers, lawyers and parliamentarians'.[42] Black-letter ballads could also be political, though they tended to 'complain, comment or moralise generally', in contrast to the direct scurrilous lampoons common to white-letter ballads.[43] Although by the 1680s this typographical division was breaking down, established formats still retained some force and white-letter 'political notation ballads played a large part in campaigns against the Whigs, Monmouth, and Presbyterians, orchestrated by Tory publishers and writers.'[44]

An example of a black-letter Vienna ballad is *The Christian conquest*, printed for the noted ballad partners J. Wright, J. Clark, W. Thackery and T. Passinger (figure 1).[45] The ballad is in black-letter, though the title and some places and names are in roman type for emphasis, in landscape orientation, with four columns and three garish woodcuts. The woodcuts refer generically the ballad's military theme, but not its specific topic. Wright, Clark, Thackery and Passinger, who specialised in black-letter ballads, would have owned a range of woodcuts suited to illustrating common sub-genres such as military or drinking songs. Two of the three featured woodcut images also appear on earlier ballads in the Bodleian Library.[46]

Unlike the white-letter *On the relief of Vienna*, the events of the siege are not interpreted in light of contemporary English politics. The plodding verse emphasises traditional themes such as martial virtue:

The valiant King of *Poland* he
Led on his Men couragiously...

Christian triumphalism and divine providence are also major themes:

The like before scarce e're was known,
for the *Infidels* and *Turks*
had raised mighty works
Before *Vienna's* stately walls;
But God did them defend,
And will prove a certain friend
To such as for help on him calls.

The Christian conquest, with its topical content, Christian moralising, praise of martial virtue and lack of political sub-context, is a fairly typical black-letter ballad, produced by ballad specialists, written to profit from a contemporary news event by appealing to the widest possible audience.

The majority of extant Vienna ballads are white-letter, often by printers with known political convictions. *The bloody siege of Vienna* was produced by 'Tory printer/publisher'[47] James Dean, as was the notation ballad *The granadiers loyal health*. The notation ballad *Vienna's triumph* was printed by Jonah Deacon, an established ballad printer.[48] A further notation ballad, *An excellent new song on the late victories over the Turks*, was published by arch Tory propagandist Nathaniel Thompson. Thompson's *120 loyal songs* (1684) also contained two Vienna ballads, including *The Tories tryumph*, which had been printed as a white-letter broadside by 'J.D' (James Dean) in 1682.[49] *On the relief of Vienna*, with which this article began, was a white-letter ballad, as was *Algernoon Sidneys farewel*, which shall be discussed later. These ballads were not simply a commercial proposition but also had a

political motivation and were printed by a mix of committed Tory printers such as Dean and Thompson, and established printers of ballads willing to move with the political tide.

White-letter items frequently used familiar ballading tropes. For example, ballads on the siege often drew on the language of military ballads, evoking the sounds, sights and smells of battle and framing martial virtue within traditional, and broadly classical, reference points.[50] *The bloody siege of Vienna* invokes the gods Mars and Jove in council as a prelude to the conflict, before depicting the battle itself:

Quartered Men blown in the Air,
Kill, Kill, was all the Language there:
Their Trenches fill'd with slaughtered *Turks*,
Their Camp infected by the smell ...[51]

Both the use of classical deities to depict the conflict in terms of heroic martial virtue, and the use of the sounds, sights, smells and instruments of battle to suggest fighting were common elements of contemporary military ballads.

Many of the Vienna ballads were sung to popular tunes, some originating in the theatre, or associated with other political ballads. The notation which appears on *The bloody siege of Vienna* appeared, slightly modified, in *180 Loyal Songs* (1685) as 'The Devil Assist the Plotting Whigs'.[52] *A carrouse to the Emperor*; *An excellent new song on the late victories over the Turks*; *Rejoyce in tryumph*; and *A song upon the randizvous on Hounsley-Heath* (1685) were all sung to the tune 'Hark the Thundering Cannons Roar'. Claude Simpson attributes this tune to Christopher Fishburn, and notes that more than three dozen ballads were sung to it, including numerous political broadsides in the early 1680s. Several other Vienna ballads were linked to tunes associated with political songs. *The Tories tryumph* was

sung to the tune of ‘Hey, boys, up go we’, a royalist song from 1641, which had been reworked by D’Urfey for his play *The Royalist* in 1682.[53] Simpson suggests that more than 50 ballads were sung to this tune ‘and most of these pieces were on political subjects’, while Christopher Marsh identifies this melody with royalist and Tory ballads.[54] *Vienna’s triumph* was sung to ‘Now, now the fights done’, a theatre tune by Purcell from *Theodosius* (1680). This is another melody to which more than 50 ballads were written, many of which were strongly political.[55] While it is difficult to interpret the meaning of the music to which ballads were set with any degree of certainty, it is likely that many of these ‘bouncy’ and ‘militaristic’ melodies carried what Marsh has called a ‘meaning by association’.[56] Most of the Vienna ballads were written to melodies which were both popular and political, which must have lent their lyrics a stronger hue as well as enhancing their appeal.

White-letter balladry often drew upon the conventions, language, music and form of black-letter ballads. Specific items might also cross-over and be issued in both black and white-letter. *A carrouse to the Emperor*, printed by P. Brooksby (a major producer of black-letter ballads), was modified and reissued shortly after as the white-letter notation ballad *An excellent new song on the late victories over the Turks*, printed by Thompson. Both ballads strike an anti-Whig tone, though the latter does so in considerably stronger terms.

IV

We shall now turn to a close reading of a number of Vienna ballads, focusing upon the more numerous white-letter items, several of which are heavily political. This section argues that these are best understood in the context of the Tory propaganda and anti-Whig pamphlets of the Tory reaction. They exploited not only the timing and events of the siege of Vienna, but also commonplace associations clustered around the figure of the ‘Turk’.

The topic of the ‘Turk’ as a reoccurring figure in early modern English writing is complex. Englishmen wrote about the ‘Turk’ in a broad range of texts across many genres including history, geography, politic discourses, travel accounts, news sheets, letters, captivity accounts, plays, sermons, and religious and political polemics, not to mention ballads, while isolated references might occur in virtually any context. While these disparate sources were shaped as much by their specific contexts, and the constraints and idioms of genre and form, as any overarching discourse of the ‘Turk’, it is worth making some general remarks on the ‘Turk’ as a figure in English writing.

As we have seen, the opposition of the ‘Turk’ to ‘Christendom’ was a staple of many English and European accounts of the Ottomans. The foundation of this opposition was religious difference; seventeenth-century Englishmen associated the Ottoman Turks with Islam so heavily that the latter was frequently referred to as ‘The Turkish Religion’[57] or even ‘Turcism’.[58] Islam, and therefore often the Ottomans, were viewed through the lens of a long standing Christian polemical tradition. This tradition depicted Islam as a heresy, and thereby a diabolically inspired perversion of Christianity, or ‘true religion’, linking its character and doctrines to the supposed moral infirmities of its false prophet. Although this tradition had a long history, it was reworked and revitalised during the early reformation, which coincided with dramatic Ottoman expansion into Europe, notably victories at Belgrade (1521), Mohács (1526) and Buda (1541). In this context reformers such as Luther and Bibliander deployed elements of the medieval Christian polemical tradition on Islam as a tool to critique the Church of Rome and spiritual malaise of Christendom while giving a theological response to the advance of the Ottomans.[59] Drawing on such European precedents, the ‘Turk’ featured heavily in English reformation debates.[60]

As the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries progressed a new ‘type’ developed, that of the ‘renegade’ or apostate, who had ‘turned Turk’, or converted to Islam. By the restoration

this ‘renegade’ was a familiar figure in England from histories, travel accounts, captivity narratives, stage plays, ballads, and political polemics.[61] The ‘Turk’ and ‘renegade’ became reoccurring figures in religious and political controversy and a number of overlapping polemical strategies evolved. These included comparing one’s opponents to the ‘Turk’; accusing them of behaving in a ‘Turkish’ manner; or claiming they had ‘turned Turk’. The latter could refer to supposed or spurious conversion to Islam, or simply imply faithless and treacherous behaviour in a more abstract sense.[62] As Nabil Matar, Matthew Birchwood and Humberto Garcia have explored, the ‘Turk’ was a flexible enough figure to be adapted to any number of contexts, and was drawn on by individuals writing across the political and religious spectrum throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries.[63]

English writing on the Ottomans was not limited to figurative depictions of the ‘Turk’. Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth century a large and sophisticated, if often pejorative, body of English (and continental) works had developed on the topics of the Ottomans, their origins, dynasty, history, lands, polity, religion, laws, subject peoples, and manners. While English scholarly accounts were often shaped by continental sources, a somewhat more pragmatic body of writing developed from a century of Anglo-Ottoman economic and diplomatic contact, and the travel which trade routes facilitated. The Levant trade also brought luxury goods from the Ottoman world, such as carpets and coffee. The cultural impact of English material and intellectual engagement with the Ottoman Empire was reflected on the early modern stage.[64] The Vienna ballads were written in a cultural milieu which had a vivid impression of the Ottomans, embodied in a language of images and ideas, from tyranny to the turban, which resonated heavily with a set of moral, religious and political associations. Given the widespread interest in news of Vienna, the concurrent English political crisis, and polemical associations of the ‘Turk’ and Islam, it is not surprising that the events of the siege were used by English polemical authors to attack their political

opponents by comparing them to the 'Turk' or painting them as 'renegades'. However, while the Vienna ballads drew on familiar commonplace images of the 'Turk' they are also unusual amongst other English writing on the Ottomans in their number, their concentration over a very short period, and the consistently Tory or Loyalist perspective of the political items.

The ballad *Vienna's triumph; with the Whigg's lamentation for the overthrow of the Turks*, printed by Jonah Deacon, appropriates the events and personages of the siege to attack the Whigs. It contrasts the loyalty and bravery of the Imperial commander, Charles V Duke of Lorraine, to the Whigs, accusing them of faithlessness by undermining the authority of the crown, and highlighting the danger of civil discord:

His [Charles V's] Loyalty true
all the World doth admire,
But the *Whiggs* who look blue,
And Commotions desire:
Ruine and strife is
Whiggs Element still,
They'r an obstinate People,
if crost in their Will...

Note that at this time the colour blue was associated with Whigs, having earlier been adopted by Scottish Presbyterians in contrast to royalist red (blue as a Tory colour is an eighteenth-century phenomenon). The ballad continues by explicitly painting the Whigs as renegades and apostates:

To the *Turks* they no Martyrs

but Converts would be,
But in time we may see
them all dye by the Tree.[65]

The final line here is a reference to the arrest and eventual execution of prominent Whigs following the uncovering of the supposed 'Rye House Plot'. The build up and aftermath of the siege of Vienna overlapped to a great extent with the Rye House Plot, and the executions which followed it, and analogies were easily drawn between the two. The ballad *Algernoon Sidneys farewel*, written on his execution (7 December 1683), alludes heavily to the Hungarian rebellion which preceded the siege of Vienna and makes an explicit comparison between the rebellion of Thököly and the Whigs, painting both as renegades and apostates:

No Play too foul to win the Glorious Game:
Witness the great Immortal *Teckleys* Fame.
In holy Warrs 'tis all *True Protestant*
Kings to dethrone, and Empires to supplant.
Nay the Antichristian THRONE to shake,
Curst Monarchy, 'tis Famous even to make
The *Alcoran* the *Bibles* Cause assume:
And *Mahomet* the Prop of *Christendom*.[66]

The alleged Whig conspirator Sidney, and by implication every other '*True Protestant*', is like '*Teckley*' an antichristian renegade, who in rebelling against the king, has abandoned the '*Bible*' and '*Christendom*' for '*Mahomet*' (Muhammad) and the '*Alcoran*' (Koran).

The rebellion of Protestant Hungarians under Thököly seemed a tailor made cudgel with which Tory polemicists might beat the Whigs and non-conformists. The analogy was strengthened by the fact that some Whigs, like Roger Morrice, interpreted Thököly's rebellion as part of a wider Protestant struggle against the counter-reformation. The anti-Whig ballad, *A new song, being the Tories tryumph* dated 25 September 1682 by Luttrell, compares 'Bleu *Protestants*', to Hungarian rebels:

Bleu *Protestants* can make no work,
Unless like *Hungary*,
They for Religion Joyn the *Turk*,
For *Christian Liberty*.[67]

While this ballad only mentions '*Hungary*' tangentially, the analogy between Hungarian rebels and Whigs is common in Vienna ballads and contemporary pamphleteering.[68] *The bloody siege of Vienna* makes a play of calling Protestant rebels in Hungary '*German Whiggs*':

But HUNGARY, that Bloody *Sceen*,
Of which the *German Whiggs* have been
The provocation, and the Cause,
'Gainst God, the Emperour, and their Laws,
Yet still pretend Religion;
At the same time brought in the *Turk*,
They all are turn'd *Mahometan*,
Like ours, against the *Duke of York*.[69]

Notably, both of these ballads associate Whigs with religious nonconformity, and allege that calls for liberty of conscience in religion are tantamount to rebellion and 'turning Turk'. Tory propagandists such as L'Estrange identified the Whigs with Presbyterians and non-conformists and depicted them as the disturbers of the social and religious order, introducers of dangerous innovations and underminers of authority and the law. The portrayal of Whigs/non-conformists as 'Turks', and therefore as arch traitors, apostates, and malignants who threatened to overturn the social order, fitted well within this rhetorical strategy.

The type of the 'renegade' was not the only part of the Christian polemical tradition regarding Islam open to exploitation. Details of this tradition, especially polemical lives of the prophet or parodied versions of Islamic religious practice, also provided ammunition for witticisms and barbs. The black-letter *A carrouse to the Emperor* and its white-letter version, *An excellent new song on the late victories over the Turks*, both combine a play on the Islamic prohibition of wine with the common ballad themes of toast drinking and drunkenness for polemical effect.

McShane has described how an imagery opposing royalist wine and 'popular' ale and beer had developed by the mid-century. By the 1670s and 1680s this gave way to a 'politicisation of drink and drunkenness', where sobriety and the refusal to drink loyal healths had become associated with sedition, disloyalty and disturbing the social order.[70] *An excellent new song on the late victories over the Turks* quips on the identification of wine with loyalty, and beer, specifically 'small beer' with whiggism.[71] Through this conceit the Ottomans are painted as Whigs (and vice versa):

MAHOMET was a sober Dog,
A Small Beer drouzy senseless *rouge*...

The ballad continues by contrasting loyal wine with coffee, which was identified with both the 'Turk' and the seditious political debates of the coffee house. It ascribes the Christian victory to wine, and the Ottoman defeat to Islamic prohibition of wine and Turkish use of coffee (perhaps also indulging in a terrible pun on the word 'ground'):

Weak *Coffee* can't keep its ground
Against the force of *Claret*...

Through this typology of drinking the events of the siege of Vienna are again made to sing to the tune of English politics. 'Valiant *Poles*' drink royalist wine, while the 'Turk' drinks only 'coffee' or 'dull tea', and '*Mahomet*' drinks whiggish '*Small Beer*'. The final verse picks up on a further powerful theme in contemporary English political discourse: fear of French intrigue.

Infidels are now o'recome,
But the most Christian Turk's at hom[e]
Watching the Fate of Christendo[m,]
But all his hopes are shallow;
Since the Poles have led the Danc[e,]
Let English CEASAR now advanc[e]
And if he sends a Fleet to France,
He's a Whig that will not follow.

The ‘most Christian Turk’ is a reference to Louis XIV and puns on both ‘the most Christian King’ title of the Kings of France, and the association of the Ottomans and French with arbitrary government.[72] The defeat of the ‘Turk’ at Vienna is presented as a blow to the French interest. The verse ends by rejecting perceived French influence on the Stuart court by suggesting an invasion (while in reality Charles II dismissed parliament in 1681 and avoided recalling it with French financial assistance). The black-letter version of this ballad shares an anti-Whig orientation though it is less nakedly political. ‘*A Small Beer* drouzy senseless *rouge*’ is ‘A Coffe-drinking drousie rogue’, while ‘*France*’ of the white-letter version is a coy ‘Fra---’.

The intensity of English interest in the siege of Vienna is explained not only by its intrinsic drama and importance, but also by the extent to which these events and commonplaces of the ‘Turk’ resonated with contemporary political discourse. Amongst these commonplaces was a heavy association of the ‘Turk’ with the pope and the devil on the one hand, and ‘tyranny’ on the other. These struck a chord with the central political fears of the 1680s, famously summed up by Andrew Marvell as ‘Popery and arbitrary government’.[73]

Commonplace depictions of the ‘Turk’ and pope as the two heads of the Antichrist had a long history going back to the polemics of the early reformation. However, the association of the ‘Turk’, pope and devil was still very much current in late seventeenth-century England. In the popish plot trials, when the accused monk William Marshall claimed that his accuser Titus Oates could not have seen him say mass at the Savoy meeting house as only known friends were admitted there, Lord chief justice Scroggs could assert: ‘If the great Turk had come there with a pair of Beads and a Crucifix, you would have let him come in.’[74] A few years later, in the Tory reaction, similar associations were drawn on by propagandists. In October 1682 the loyalist Sir William Pritchard was elected Lord Mayor, as part of Charles II’s campaign to regain control of London from a Whig mayor and Sheriffs. The white-letter

ballad, *The contented subjects, or the citizens joy* (to the tune of 'Now, Now the Fight is Done') printed by Peter Brooksby on the election of Pritchard, declares: 'Let the *Turk* and the *Pope*, both of him stand in fear'.[75]

A further commonplace association with the 'Turk' which struck a chord with the politics of the exclusion crisis was tyranny. 'Tyranny' was a term with its roots in Aristotelian political categories, as well as a broader set of commonplace images, associations and characteristics.[76] In a political sense a tyranny, as opposed to a legitimate monarchy, was a polity ruled by force or fear rather than law. In the same way that a just and lawful monarch ensured the healthy spiritual and temporal life of his people, the domination of a tyrant debased them, making them servile. To early modern Englishmen the Ottoman Empire was the axiom of tyranny and arbitrary government. Most lengthy and detailed seventeenth-century English accounts of the Ottoman Empire, such as those of Richard Knolles, Paul Rycaut, George Sandys and Fynes Moryson, depicted its polity as a 'tyranny', or a state founded and sustained on the principle of slavery, where the persons, property, liberty and life of the subjects belonged directly to the ruler. This characterisation was not limited to learned accounts of Ottoman history, geography and political philosophy. Images of Ottoman tyranny were also common to the early modern stage and ballad. The commonplace of the Ottoman sultan as a tyrant, unrestrained by law in either his actions or passions, permeates news and pamphlet accounts of the siege of Vienna:

The *Turkish* Emperour, in this present Year, 1683, Like a Tyrant thirsting after *Christian* Bloud (by the Encouragement of the Rebel *Count Teckley*) sent again into *Hungary*, Two Hundred Thousand Men, under the Conduct of the *Grand Visier* to Commence a War with the *Christians*, which is now carried on with great Fury.[77]

‘Tyranny’ as a generic category of political philosophy was also habitually applied to other polities, as it had been to Muscovy in the sixteenth century, or used as a device to critique a monarch’s methods, character and manner of rule. The generality of the category of tyranny and its long classical pedigree made it a useful rhetorical tool, while its association with the Ottoman Empire meant that by comparing a specific ruler or state to the ‘Turk’ a writer could imply that it or they were tyranical, as we have seen in contemporary writing on Dutch ‘universal monarchy’.

Images and rhetoric of Tyranny were drawn upon frequently in the 1680s by polemicists on either side. One of the key issues at stake during the exclusion crisis was the relative powers and lawful limits of the king and parliament; in raising troops to defend the English outpost at Tangier, Charles II found himself accused of trying to create a standing army, which might serve as an instrument of tyranny. Later, in dismissing parliament, the king was accused of arbitrary government and exercising a tyrannical power over his people. Tory polemicists responded that by questioning the king’s right to decide the succession, the Whigs undermined the law, and thereby acted tyrannically themselves. Tory polemicist and pamphleteer John Northleigh compared the Whigs to the ‘Turk’ to emphasise this danger:

But with what Face then can such Wretches talk of his Majesty’s assuming an Arbitrary Power, when all the while they endeavour to make their petty Kings in *Representative* [i.e. parliament] more absolute then the *Turk* himself?[78]

The notion of parliamentary tyranny was not new. It drew on royalist polemic which claimed that Interregnum parliaments had ruled illegally and arbitrarily, through the use of a standing army, following the judicial murder of Charles I. Northleigh himself drew parallels between

the Whigs and the rebels of the Civil War, and he was not the only author to make this association. For example, the ballad *No protestant plot, or, the Whigs loyalty* (1683) warned:

Hells restless Factious Agents still Plot on,
And Eighty Three smells rank of Forty One...[79]

In the wake of Vienna several Tory polemicists combined images of Turkish and Interregnum tyranny to attack the Whigs, and added these to the familiar association of Whigs and non-conformists with the 'Turk'. In *The Observator*, the Tory propagandist L'Estrange compared Islam and dissenting religion in order to associate Hungarian rebels ('Tekelites') with the Whigs:

Both Religions are *Equally Founded* in BLOUD:[80] And *They do Both Exercise the Greatest* CRUELTY *Imaginable under the Pretence of* TOLERATION. Mr *Ricaut* reckons upward of *72 Sects of* DISSENTERS among the TURKS: But ... we have above *Twice as many Sects* among OUR TECKELITES.

This passage draws upon Rycaut's *Present state of the Ottoman Empire* (1668), which compared Islamic legal schools and 'sects' to the English 'Sectaries', 'puritans' and 'fanaticks' on whom Rycaut blamed the Civil War.[81] L'Estrange goes on to conflate the tyranny of the Interregnum with that of the 'Turk' as an extended attack on the Whigs:

Had not OUR *Sultan Oliver* his *Janizaries*, as well as *Solyman the Magnificent*? What did HIS *Major-Generalls* fall short of so many BASHAWS? And were not OUR *Lords and*

Commons in *One and Forty*, as *Lawless* as the most ABSOLUTE *Tyrants* that Ever liv'd upon the Face of the Earth?[82]

L'Estrange compares the Ottoman Janissary corps (a standing army which formed the sultan's household troops) with the parliamentarian army of the Civil War and Interregnum as an instrument of tyranny. He depicts the Ottoman invasion of Christendom as a warning of the danger the Whigs present to England. By comparing Whigs and dissenters with the tyrannical rebels of the Civil War on the one hand, and the Hungarian 'Teckelites' on the other, he compounds the Whig menace. As the Civil War parliamentarians had ushered in the chaos of the Civil War in the name of liberty of conscience, and the 'Teckelites' welcomed the Turk into Hungary in the name of Protestantism, the Whigs ('our Tekelites') would reintroduce parliamentary tyranny into Britain. All three could be depicted through an archetype of rebellion: the apostate 'renegade'. This logic is also evident in the ballad *The bloody siege of Vienna*, from which we have already noted a reference to 'German Whiggs':

Guns went thump, thump; *Plague Dam the Rump*
That taught all Nations to Rebel.[83]

The 'Rump Parliament', which had ordered the trial and eventual execution of Charles I for treason, is cast as a paradigm of infidelity which has 'taught all Nations to Rebel' and is thereby complicit in the revolt of Thököly. Commonplace associations of the 'Turk' with both the 'renegade' and 'tyranny' allow the ballad to move from the siege of Vienna to the Whigs, and then to the Rump Parliament without incongruity.

The Vienna ballads varied in their form, content and audience. They ranged from the topical black-letter ballad *The Christian conquest,* with no discernible political stance,

through the ballads of Brooksby (who McShane speculates had Tory leanings) and Jonah Deacon who were willing to move with the tide and produce political material when there was a market. At the other extreme were ballads by James Dean, C.W. and Thompson, the latter of whom explicitly described his ballad output as part of a wider effort to sway public opinion against the Whigs:

AMongst the several means that have been of late years to reduce the deluded Multitude to their just Allegiance, this of BALLADS[84] and LOYAL SONGS has not been of the least influence. While the *Fergusons*,[85] and *Heads* of the Factions were blowing up *Sedition* in every corner of the Countrey, these flying *Choristers* were asserting the *Rights of Monarchy*, and proclaiming *Loyalty* in every street. The *mis-inform'd Rabble* began to listen; they began to hear to TRUTH in a SONG, in time found their *Errours*, and were charm'd into *Obedience*.[86]

Despite Thompson's campaign he had no official status and in fact found himself in trouble with the authorities frequently throughout 1681-85.[87] The Tory reaction was characterised by a government crackdown on the licentiousness of the press, as much as an increased willingness to engage in political discourse to convince the public of the necessity of these measures. Pamphleteering of the period reflected complex factors such as public reaction to the Rye House Plot, a large market for political pamphlets responding to recent events, fear of recrimination on the part of publishers, as well as the political motivations of loyalists such as Thompson and L'Estrange. Nonetheless, the political Vienna ballads are overwhelmingly anti-Whig in character. While the figure of the 'Turk' had been used by writers across the religious and political spectrum throughout the century, the specific historical moment in which the Vienna ballads appeared led to a much narrower range of depictions.

In common with much pamphlet culture, the Vienna ballads are heavy with allusions to contemporary political controversies. They often include oblique references to individuals, events, scandals and debates which would only have been intelligible to those with knowledge of the news and personalities of the political world of London. *On the relief of Vienna*, quoted in the introduction, opens:

REnown'd be *Christian* Arms,
The *Turkish Whigs* be damn'd,
And lowsie *Holwel* in their Head,
Who our *blue Saints* has shamm'd.[88]

'Holwel' is John Holwell, astrologer and author of the controversial *Catastrophe mundi* (1682), which predicted that the 'Turk' would conquer 'Germany, and France and Italy and part of Spain', after which he would 'turn Christian' and 'destroy the Dregs of the Church of Rome'. A further suggestion in the same work that the tyrannical behaviour of rulers would bring their subjects to rebellion led to Holwell's trial and fining for seditious libel in July 1683.[89] The ballad continues

These are your *True-blue men*,
Who *Persecution* cry,
When *They*, with *Julian* their old Friend,
The *Christian God* defie!

The ballad accuses the Whigs of apostasy ('The Christian God defie!') in the name of conscience. 'Julian their old Friend' is a reference to Samuel Johnson's (1649–1703) *Julian*

the apostate (1682). This Whig tract drew a historical parallel between the fourth-century apostate Emperor Julian, and James Duke of York, suggesting that as early Christians had resisted their pagan Emperor, so the contemporary English should resist a Catholic successor.[90]

In a similar vein, *The granadiers loyal health* makes a number of allusions to contemporary figures:

Howard and *Sackfield* for the Crown,
They'l make our English *Turks* come down,
And send 'em unto *Teckeis* Gang,
There let 'em either Starve or Hang...[91]

'Howard' is William Howard, third Baron Howard of Escrick (*c.*1630–1694), a Rye House Plot conspirator turned informer, whose testimony was used in the trials of Russell, Sidney, and Hampden.[92]

Thompson's ballads claimed to promote loyalty 'in every street', others were set to popular melodies, or punned on news and political and literary controversy. The degree to which the Vienna ballads allude to contemporary affairs is indicative of their place in a pamphlet literature which participated in populist political discourse and, like L'Estrange's *The Observator*, aimed at the London street.[93] Though their degree of political commitment varies, all the white-letter Vienna ballads reflect the wider loyalist anti-Whig campaign of the Tory reaction, which Tim Harris has argued was generally successful in swaying public opinion in favour of the government.[94]

Conclusion

The Vienna ballads were unusual amongst the mass of early modern English writing on the Ottoman Turks. Although they were filled with familiar commonplace images of the ‘Turk’, and were certainly not the first publications to manipulate these tropes, they stand out for their large number, topicality, concentrated publication over a short period of time, and consistency of rhetoric and political perspective. While the figure of the ‘Turk’ had been used by polemicists and writers across the religious and political spectrum throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries, in the specific historical moment of the Tory reaction to the exclusion crisis a far more limited range of representations appeared, and the Vienna ballads were overwhelmingly anti-Whig in character.

In late 1683 the importance and drama of the military events which were unfolding on the continent combined with the culmination of a major crisis in English politics to create a heightened moment of public political discourse, in which polemical strategies exploiting the resonances of the ‘Turk’ were ubiquitous. If the central issues at stake in the exclusion crisis were ‘Popery and arbitrary government’, associations of the ‘Turk’ with tyranny and the pope lent themselves easily to the articulation of these concerns, while the siege gave such comparisons a topical force. These ballads, and indeed the wider literature of pamphlets produced in England as a response to the siege, provided a lens through which to view English politics, but also a means to comment upon and participate in public political discourse.

Anders Ingram, National University of Ireland, Galway. University Road, Galway, Ireland.
anders.ingram@nuigalway.ie

[1] Dated 19 Sept. in the British Library Luttrell collection, BL C.175.e.2; Angela McShane, *Political broadside ballads of seventeenth-century England: a critical bibliography* (London, 2011), 356.

[2] *On the relief of Vienna* (1683).

[3] On the origins of the term 'True Protestant' in anti-Catholic rhetoric and its subversion by Tory satirists, see Elizabeth Clarke, 'Re-reading the exclusion crisis', *Seventeenth Century* 21 (2006), 141-159.

[4] McShane, *Political broadside ballads of seventeenth-century England*, dates these ballads c. 11-19 Sept. 1683.

[5] This ballad referenced military manoeuvres on Hounsley-Heath, modelled on the successful Imperial siege of Buda, and drew a parallel between events in Hungary and the West Country rebellion.

[6] Both English and European perceptions of the threat of the Ottomans, and the role of the 'Turk' in political discourse, diminished significantly following the treaty of Karlowitz in 1699, see Asli Çirakman, *From the "Terror of the World" to the "Sick Man of Europe": European images of Ottoman Empire and society from the sixteenth century to the nineteenth* (New York, 2002). On Ottoman power in Europe post Karlowitz, see Rifaat A. Abou-el-Haj, 'The formal closure of the Ottoman frontier in Europe: 1699-1703', *Journal of the American Oriental society* 89 (1969), 467-75; Suraiya Faroqhi, 'The later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839', in *The Cambridge history of Turkey*, (3 vols, New York, 2006), III.

[7] A short, cheap work typically in a quarto format, see Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and pamphleteering in early modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2003), 4-11.

[8] On the exceptional growth of pamphlet literature in the 1680s see Raymond, *Pamphlets and pamphleteering in early modern Britain*, 164.On the 1680s as a transformative period for popular public discourse see Tim Harris, '"Venerating the honesty of a tinker": The king's friends and the battle for the allegiance of the common people in restoration England', in Tim Harris, ed., *The politics of the excluded, c. 1500-1850* (Basingstoke, 2001), 195-232; Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in early modern England', in Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, ed., *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England* (Manchester, 2007), 1-30; Grant Tapsell and George Southcombe, *Restoration politics, religion and culture* (Basingstoke, 2010), 124-141. On the development of popular politics prior to the 1680s see Joad Raymond, *The invention of the newspaper: English newsbooks, 1641-1649* (Oxford, 1996); David Zaret, 'Petitions and the "Invention" of Public Opinion in the English Revolution', *American Journal of Sociology* 101 (1996), 1497-1555; Chris Kyle, 'From Broadside to Pamphlet: Print and Parliament in the 1620s', *Parliamentary History* (2007) 26, 17-29; Markku Peltonen, *Rhetoric, politics and popularity in pre-revolutionary England* (Cambridge, 2013).

[9] *London Gazette* 1756 (14-18 September 1682).

[10] *A particular account of the suddain and unexpected siege of Vienna* (London, 1683), in *Early English Books Online* (EEBO), http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:12610763.

[11] *A brief relation of the siege of Vienna*.

[12] *A brief relation of the siege of Vienna*.

[13] *London Gazette* 1860 (13-17 Sept. 1683); *London Gazette* 1861 (17-20 Sept. 1683).

[14] *A true and exact relation of the raising of the siege of Vienna and the victory obtained over the Ottoman army* (London, 1683), 1.

[15] B.W., *A true copy of a letter sent from Vienna September the 2d. 1683* (London, 1683).

[16] Samuel C. Chew, *The crescent and the rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance* (New York, 1965); Franklin Le Van Baumer, 'England, the Turk, and the common corps of Christendom', *The American Historical Review* 50 (1944), 26-48; Çirakman, *From the "Terror of the World" to the "Sick Man of Europe"* (2002).

[17] On parallels drawn between English politics and the regicide of Osman II in 1622, see Gerald MacLean *Looking East: English writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (Basingstoke, 2007), 201-217.

[18] Tapsell and Southcombe, *Restoration politics*, 124-141.

[19] Steven Pincus, 'From butterboxes to wooden shoes: the shift in English popular sentiment from anti-Dutch to anti-French in the 1670s', *The Historical Journal* 38 (1995), 333-361; Steven Pincus, 'The English debate over universal monarchy' in John Robertson, ed., *A union for empire, political thought and the British union of 1707* (Cambridge, 1995), 37-62.

[20] Pincus, 'The English debate over universal monarchy', 58.

[21] *The life of the renowned Peter D'Aubusson* (London, 1679), in EEBO, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:13571831, 30.

[22] *A second consultation between the Pope and the Turk* (London, 1679).

[23] Pincus, 'From butterboxes to wooden shoes', 339, 339-40.

[24] C.D. Rouillard, *The Turk in French history, thought and literature, 1520-1600* (Paris, 1938), 105-165.

[25] John Spurr, ed., *The entring book of Roger Morrice*, (6 vols., Woodbridge, 2007), II; Stephen Taylor, 'An English dissenter and the crisis of European Protestantism: Roger Morrice's perception of European politics in the 1680s' in David Onnekink, ed., *War and religion after Westphalia, 1648-1713* (Farnham, 2009), 177-195.

[26] Mark Knights, *Politics and opinion in crisis, 1678-81* (Cambridge, 1994), 306-347; Mark Goldie, 'The Hilton gang and the purge of London in the 1680s', in Howard Nenner, ed., *Politics and the political imagination in later Stuart Britain* (Rochester, 1997), 43-73; Tim Harris, *Restoration* (London, 2005), 211- 259.

[27] Phillip Harth, *Pen for a party* (Princeton, 1993); Raymond, *Pamphlets and pamphleteering in early modern Britain*, 323-381.

[28] On the use made of these allegations by Charles II's government, see Doreen J. Milne, 'The results of the Rye House Plot and their influence upon the revolution of 1688: The Alexander prize essay', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5 (1951), 91-108.

[29] Raymond, *Pamphlets and pamphleteering in early modern Britain*, 350.

[30] *London Gazette* 1864 (27 Sept. -1 Oct. 1683).

[31] G.M. Peerbooms, *Nathaniel Thompson: Tory printer, ballad monger and propagandist* (Enschede, 1983), 34-39; Raymond, *Pamphlets and pamphleteering in early modern Britain*, 164.

[32] Tim Harris, *London crowds in the reign of Charles II* (Cambridge, 1987), 132.

[33] Peerbooms, *Nathaniel Thompson*, 58.

[34] Newspapers as 'defined by seriality, precise periodicity, physical continuity, consecutive numbering and a stable title', Raymond, *Pamphlets and pamphleteering in early modern Britain*, 107.

[35] P.M. Handover, *A history of the London Gazette 1665-1965* (London, 1965), notes the siege of Vienna 'created an abnormal demand for the official newspaper', 22.

[36] Peter Hinds, 'Roger L'Estrange, the Rye House Plot, and the regulation of political discourse in late-seventeenth-century London', *Library* 3 (2002), 3-31, argues that even after L'Estrange lost the position of Press Licenser he used his position as a Justice of the Peace to clamp down on the opposition press.

[37] Tessa Watt, *Cheap print and popular piety 1550-1640* (Cambridge, 1991), 11.

[38] Angela McShane, '"Rime and Reason" The political world of the English broadside ballad, 1640-1689' (PhD thesis: University of Warwick, 2004); Angela McShane, 'Typography matters: branding ballads and gelding curates in Stuart England', in John Hinks and Catherine Armstrong, eds., *Book trade connections* (London, 2008), 19-44. McShane, *Political broadside ballads of seventeenth-century England*.

[39] McShane, "Rime and Reason", 39. Notation was not necessarily accurate and may often have been decorative.

[40] McShane, "Rime and Reason", 27.

[41] Michael Treadwell, 'The stationers and the printing acts at the end of the seventeenth century' in John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie, eds., *The Cambridge history of the book in Britain* (5 vols.,Cambridge, 1999-2011), IV, 769-772.

[42] McShane, 'Typography matters', 28-29.

[43] McShane, "Rime and Reason", 39.

[44] McShane, "Rime and Reason", 39.

[45] *The Christian conquest* (London, [1683]) in EEBO, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99888118; on this publishing partnership, see Cyprian Blagden, 'Notes on the ballad market in the second half of the seventeenth century', *Studies in Bibliography* 6 (1954), 161-180. Italics indicate roman type against the black-letter of the passage in quotations from black-letter ballads.

[46] The mounted figures appear in *The matchless murder* (J. Conyers, [1682]). The men with guns appear in *The Scotch rebellion* (J. Conyers, [1679]) and *News from Ostend* (F. Coles, T. Vere, J. Wright and J. Clark, [1678]). Note that the latter is published by Wright and Clark. Woodworm markings and chips in the frame indicate that these images come from the same woodblocks, see Image Matching Tool http://ballads.bodleian.ox.ac.uk.

[47] McShane, "Rime and Reason", 68.

[48] McShane, *Political broadside ballads of seventeenth-century England*, 356.

[49] The highly political nature of this ballad means that the 'J.D.' of the imprint is more likely to have been James Dean than Jonah Deacon.

[50] Angela McShane, 'Recruiting citizens for soldiers in seventeenth-century English ballads', *Journal of Early Modern History* 15 (2011), 105-137.

[51] *The bloody siege of Vienna* (London, [1683]), in EEBO, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99825579.

[52] Claude Simpson, *The British broadside ballad and its music* (New Brunswick, 1966), 176.

[53] Simpson, *The British broadside ballad and its music*, 304-08.

[54] Christopher Marsh, *Music and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2010), 292, 302.

[55] Simpson, *The British broadside ballad and its music*, 523-25.

[56] Marsh describes the Ionian melody 'Hey, boys, up go we' as 'bouncy' and 'Hark the Thundering Cannons Roar' as 'militaristic', see Marsh, *Music and Society in Early Modern England*, 299-321.

[57] Lancelot Addison, *The life and death of Mahumed, the author of the Turkish religion*... (London, 1679) , in EEBO, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:12881594.

[58] Thomas Smith, *Remarks upon the manners, religion and government of the Turks* (London, 1678), 144.

[59] Harry Clark, 'The publication of the Koran in Latin: a reformation dilemma', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 15 (1984), 3-13; Norman Housley, *Religious warfare in Europe* (Oxford, 2002).

[60] Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam And The Ottomans In Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2005), 19-86.

[61] N. I. Matar, 'The renegade in English seventeenth-century imagination', *Studies in English literature, 1500-1900* 33 (1993), 489-505; Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English theater and the multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630*

(New York, 2003).

[62] Housley, *Religious warfare in Europe*, 131-159; MacLean, *Looking East* , 5-12.

[63] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: drama and culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge, 2007), 156-181; Humberto Garcia, *Islam and the English enlightenment 1670-1840* (Baltimore, 2012); Nabil Matar, *Islam in Britain, 1558-1685* (Cambridge, 1998).

[64] Vitkus, Daniel J. ed., *Three Turk plays from early modern England: Selimus, a Christian turned Turk, and the Renegado* (New York, 2000); Vitkus, *Turning Turk*; Richmond Barbour, *Before orientalism: London's theatre of the East, 1576-1626* (Cambridge, 2003); Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England*; Dimmock, *New Turkes*.

[65] *Vienna's triumph* (London, 1683).

[66] *Algernoon Sidneys farewel* (London, [1683]).

[67]*A new song, being the Tories tryumph* (London, 1682).

[68] On 'teckelites' in 'Tory burlesque', see Garcia, *Islam and the English enlightenment 1670-1840*, 33-46.

[69] *The bloody siege of Vienna*.

[70] Angela McShane, 'The politicisation of drink and drunkenness in political broadside ballads', in Adam Smyth, ed., *A pleasing sinne: drink and conviviality in seventeenth-century England* (Cambridge, 2004), 76-78.

[71]On 'small-beer' as a term for Whigs, see A. Behn, *The city-heiress, or, Sir Timothy Treat-all a comedy* (London, 1682), in EEBO, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:12399646, 'why what a Pox dost thou bring that damn'd Puritanical, Schismatical, Phanatical, Small beer-face of thine into good Company?', 29.

[72] *The most Christian Turk: or, a view of the life and bloody reign of Lewis XIV* (London, 1690), in EEBO, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99828115.

[73] [Andrew Marvell], *An account of the growth of Popery and arbitrary government in England* (Amsterdam, 1677) in EEBO, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:12364869.

[74] *The tryals and condemnation of Lionel Anderson, Alias Munson, William Russel, Alias Napper, Charles Parris, Alias Parry, Henry Starkey, James Corker, and William Marshal, for high treason, as Romish priests*, (London, 1680), in EEBO, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:11950055, p 26. The trial took place 18 July 1679, Marshall was tried alongside James Corker, William Rumley (all Benedictine monks) . Sir George Wakeman (the king's physician) was also tried.

[75] *The contented subjects, or the citizens joy* (London, [1682]).

[76] Marshal Poe, *"A people born to slavery": Russia in early modern European ethnography, 1476-1748* (Ithaca, NY, 2000), 150-157.

[77] *A particular account of the suddain and unexpected siege of Vienna*.

[78] [John Northleigh], *A gentle reflection on the modest account, and a vindication of the loyal abhorrers, from the calumnies of a factious pen* (London, 1682), 10.

[79] *No protestant plot, or, the Whigs loyalty* (London, 1683).

[80] Full caps indicate black-letter.

[81] Paul Rycaut, *The present state of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1668), 105, 127, 135.

[82] Roger L'Estrange, *Observator* 399 (6 Sept. 1683). Bashaw (Pasha): Ottoman governor or military commander.

[83] *The bloody siege of Vienna*.

[84] Full caps are retained.

[85] Whig polemicist and Rye House Plot conspirator, see Melinda Zook, 'Ferguson, Robert (d. 1714)', *ODNB*.

[86] Nathaniel Thompson, *A choice collection of 120 loyal songs* (London, 1684), sig a2r.

[87] Peerbooms, *Nathaniel Thompson*, 68-82.

[88] On 'Shamming' and the exclusion crisis, see Kate Loveman, *Reading Fictions, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* (Aldershot, 2008), 85-108.

[89] Bernard Capp, 'Holwell, John (b. 1649, d. in or after 1686)', *ODNB*; Warren Johnston, *Revelation restored: the apocalypse in later seventeenth-century England* (Woodbridge, 2011), 184-5.

[90] Melinda Zook, 'Johnson, Samuel (1649–1703)', in *ODNB*.

[91] *The granadiers loyal health* (London, 1683), in EEBO, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:13523105.

[92] Richard L. Greaves, 'Howard, William, third Baron Howard of Escrick (*c.*1630–1694)', in *ODNB*.

[93] McShane characterises the likely audience of this kind of ballad as 'political activists on the London streets', McShane, "Rime and Reason", 218; see also Tim Harris, *London crowds in the reign of Charles II*, chap 5-7. On the *Observator*, see Mark Goldie, 'Roger L'Estrange's *Obsevator* and the exorcism of the plot', in Anne Dunan-Page and Beth Lynch, eds., *Roger L'Estrange and the making of restoration culture* (Aldershot, 2008), 70-71.

[94] Tim Harris, '"Venerating the honesty of a tinker" (2001), 195-232; Tim Harris, 'Was the Tory reaction popular?: attitudes of Londoners towards the persecution of dissent, 1681-1686', *London Journal* 13 (1987-88), 106-120.