

Remembering Revolution: Seditious Memories in England and Wales, 1660-1685

Edward James Legon

University College London
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History

I, Edward Legon confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

Abstract

The mark which was left by the English Revolution remained visible well beyond the 'watershed' of 29 May 1660. This thesis attests to this fact by illustrating the degree to which memories of those events endured long into the post-revolutionary era of Charles II's reign. However, rather than focusing, as hitherto all studies of this subject have done, on the memories of those who emerged 'victorious' in the 1660s, this thesis takes as its subject matter the 'seditious' memories of those who remained sympathetic to the 'Cause' of the 1640s and 1650s after the Restoration of 1660. By placing these seditious memories in the context of pervasive and persistent attacks on the revolution, this thesis demonstrates how the possession and articulation of these memories enabled revolutionaries to contest, resist and subvert experiences of authority which related to, and derived from, control over the meaning of the recent past. In doing so, it illustrates that a re-imagining of the revolution enabled revolutionaries, in turn, to re-imagine the present and the future as well. Through an engagement with evidence of oral culture, this thesis looks beyond the 'conventional' histories of the printed public sphere, and considers the memories of men and women whose voices often remain marginalised. In doing so, it offers a fresh understanding of later seventeenth-century England and Wales in which the importance of memory, identity and the complex relationship between these concepts is emphasised.

Contents

Acknowledgements	9
Abbreviations	11
Introduction <i>'Into the Saddle once more'</i>	17
Chapter 1 <i>Memory and Experiences of Authority, 1660-1678</i>	37
Chapter 2 <i>Seditious Memories: Re-imagining the Past, Present and Future, 1660-1678</i>	81
Chapter 3 <i>Communities of Seditious Memories, 1660-1678</i>	124
Chapter 4 <i>Seditious Memories in Public, 1660-1678</i>	162
Chapter 5 <i>Seditious Memories and the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-1685</i>	191
Chapter 6 <i>Seditious Memories and the Post-Revolutionary Generation</i>	226
Conclusion <i>'On the right side'</i>	251
Bibliography	261

Acknowledgements

This thesis would have been impossible without the love and support of my friends and family, especially that of my parents and Katharine. For its content, I am thankful for the advice of Dr Matthew Neufeld, and colleagues at UCL, especially Alice Ferron and Eilish Gregory, and the attendees of the IHR's 'British History in the Seventeenth Century' seminar series. The generous help of Dr David Magliocco has been indispensable throughout. I am also grateful to Professor Julian Hoppit for his supervision. Above all, the tireless assistance and input of Professor Jason Peacey have made this process a pleasure.

Abbreviations

Achinstein, <i>Literature and Dissent</i>	Sharon Achinstein, <i>Literature and Dissent in Milton's England</i> (Cambridge, 2003)
Appleby, 'Veteran'	David J. Appleby, 'Veteran Politics in Restoration England, 1660-1670', <i>The Seventeenth Century</i> , 28:3 (2013), pp. 323-342
BLA	Bedfordshire and Luton Archives and Record Service
Baxter, <i>Letters</i>	N. H. Keeble and Geoffrey F. Nuttall (eds.), <i>Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter</i> (2 vols., Oxford, 1991), ii
Baxter, <i>Reliquiae</i>	Matthew Sylvester (ed.), <i>Reliquiae Baxterianae: Or, Mr. Richard Baxters Narrative of The most Memorable Passages of his Life and Times</i> (London, 1696)
Bowen, 'Seditious speech'	Lloyd Bowen, 'Seditious speech and popular royalism, 1649-60', Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (eds.), <i>Royalists and Royalism during Interregnum</i> (Manchester, 2010), pp. 44-66
CR	A. G. Matthews, <i>Calamy Revised: Being a Revision of Edmund Calamy's Account of the Ministers and Others Ejected and Silenced, 1660-2</i> (Oxford, 1934)
CSPD	Mary Anne Everett Green, F. H. Blackburne Daniell, and Francis Bickley (eds.), <i>Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, May 1660-Feb. 1685</i> (28 vols., London, 1860-1939); <i>Calendar of State Papers: Preserved in the Public Record Office, Domestic Series, James II, Volume II, January, 1686-May, 1687</i> (London, 1964)
DCY	Frances Andrews (ed.), <i>Depositions from the Castle of York, relating to</i>

	<i>offences committed in the Northern Counties in the seventeenth century</i> (London, 1861)
<i>A Door of Hope</i>	<i>A Door of Hope: or, a call and declaration for the gathering together of the first ripe fruits unto the standard of our Lord, King Jesus</i> ([London], 1661)
ERO	Essex Record Office
Fentress and Wickham	James Fentress and Chris Wickham, <i>Social Memory</i> (Oxford, 1988)
Firth and Davies	Sir Charles Firth and Godfrey Davies, <i>Regimental History of Cromwell's Army</i> (2 vols., Oxford, 1940)
Greaves, <i>Deliver</i>	Richard L. Greaves, <i>Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663</i> (Oxford, 1986)
Greaves, <i>Enemies</i>	Richard Greaves, <i>Enemies Under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664-1677</i> (Stanford, CA, 1990)
Greaves, <i>Secrets</i>	Richard L. Greaves, <i>Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688-1689</i> (Stanford, CA, 1992)
Greaves and Zaller	Richard L. Greaves and Robert Zaller (eds.), <i>Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century</i> (3 vols., Brighton, 1983)
HL	<i>House of Lords Record Office</i>
HPHC	<i>The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons from the Restoration to the Present Time</i> (London, 1742), i
Harris, <i>London Crowds</i>	Tim Harris, <i>London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and politics from the Restoration until the exclusion crisis</i> (Cambridge, 1987)

- Henry, *Diary* Matthew Henry Lee, (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry of Broad Oak, Flintshire, 1631-1696* (London, 1882)
- Hopper, 'Farnley Wood' Andrew Hopper, 'The Farnley Wood Plot and the Memory of the Civil Wars in Yorkshire', *The Historical Journal*, 45:2 (2002), pp. 281-303
- Hughes, *Gender* Ann Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution* (Abingdon, 2012)
- Hutton, *Restoration* Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford, 1985)
- Josselin, *Diary* Alan Macfarlane (ed.), *The Diary of Ralph Josselin, 1616-1683* (Oxford, 1991)
- KI *Kingdoms Intelligencer*
- MCR J. C. Jeaffreson, *Middlesex County Records* (4 vols., London, 1886-1892), iii, iv
- McShane, *PBB* Angela J. McShane, *Political Broadside Ballads of Seventeenth-Century England: A Critical Bibliography* (London, 2011)
- Miller, *After the Civil Wars* John Miller, *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Harlow, 2000)
- Montaño, *Courting* John Patrick Montaño, *Courting the Moderates: Ideology, Propaganda, and the Emergence of the Party, 1660-1678* (Newark, DE, 2002)
- Neufeld, *Public Remembering* Matthew Neufeld, *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge, 2013)
- Newdigate, *Newsletters* Philip Hines, Jr. (ed.), *Newdigate Newsletters: Numbers 1 through 2100 (3 January 1673/4 through June 1692), (s. l., 1994)*

NLI	National Library of Ireland
ODNB	H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (ed.), <i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: From the Earliest Times to the Year 2000</i> (61 vols., Oxford, 2004)
Neufeld, <i>Public Remembering</i>	Matthew Neufeld, <i>The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England</i> (Woodbridge, 2013)
Pepys	Robert Latham and William Matthews (eds.), <i>The Diary of Samuel Pepys: A New and Complete Transcription</i> (11 vols., London, 1970-1983)
SHC	Surrey History Centre
SRO	Somerset Record Office
Scott, <i>England's troubles</i>	Jonathan Scott, <i>England's troubles: Seventeenth-century English political instability in European context</i> (Cambridge, 2000)
Seaward, <i>Cavalier Parliament</i>	Paul Seaward, <i>The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667</i> (Cambridge, 1988)
Sharp, 'Popular political opinion'	Buchanan Sharp, 'Popular political opinion in England, 1660-1865', <i>History of European Ideas</i> , 10:1 (1989) pp. 13-29
TNA	The National Archives
V&A	The Victorian and Albert Museum
Whitelocke, <i>Diary</i>	Ruth Spalding (ed.), <i>The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605-1675</i> (Oxford, 1990)
Wood, <i>1549</i>	Andy Wood, <i>The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England</i> (Cambridge, 2007)

Notes

Acts of Parliament are cited throughout by their title and official reference. Acts used were located in the following: Great British Record Commission,

Statutes of the Realm: From Original Records, etc. (11 vols., London, 1819), v; J. P. Kenyon (ed.), *The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge, 1966). Where evidence within broadside ballads was located using Angela McShane's *Political Broadside Ballads of Seventeenth-Century England: A Critical Bibliography*, this has been acknowledged throughout.

Introduction – ‘Into the Saddle once more’

At the end of November 1684, hundreds of mourners escorted the coffin of Captain John Mason (or Masson¹) from Armourer’s Hall in the City of London to the frozen earth of Moorfields burial ground.² The mourners included several of Mason’s former comrades; veterans of the English Revolution who, despite having sheathed their swords over thirty years beforehand, identified themselves by rings, hatbands and, no wonder given recent temperatures, scarves. If the latest government surveillance was accurate, among Mason’s cortège that day were several notorious former members of the New Model Army, including John Gladman and Ralph Alexander.³ Perhaps a little drunk on ‘burnt claret’ and ‘canary’, hopes were exchanged over Mason’s coffin that ‘twilbe made upp in his [death]’ and ‘the difference at Courtt will [widen], & make way for them to gett into the Saddle once more.’⁴ What the events of John Mason’s funeral bring into focus is that the identities and aspirations of these old revolutionaries remained bound to a time when they had been in the ‘saddle’; both literally and metaphorically. For these individuals, like thousands of others, had participated in the opposition to Charles I and his government which had culminated in the civil wars of 1642-46 and 1648-49, during which time an unprecedented proportion of the British population were slaughtered and unimaginable wartime atrocities were committed.⁵ Moreover, these men had witnessed the redistribution of

¹ Judging by an earlier piece of government surveillance, the Captain “Masson” referred to was the Captain John Mason, later Lieutenant-Colonel in the New Model Army, who had been rescued by Colonel Thomas Blood, another ex-parliamentarian and the famous would-be thief of the Crown Jewels, in February 1667. Hence, Mason clearly long outlived the floruit dates of 1647-1667 which have been given to him by Richard Greaves and Robert Zaller, see – Greaves and Zaller, ii, p. 226.

² At an average of 3°C November 1684 was, according to contemporary measurements, the coldest for the next century and since records began. See Gordon Manley, ‘Central England temperatures: monthly means 1659 to 1973’, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 100 (1974), pp. 393-395.

³ TNA, SP 29/437/44.

⁴ TNA, SP 29/438/93.

⁵ Ian Gentles argues that a higher proportion of the British population were killed during the 1640s and 1650s than in the notoriously bloody First World War, see Ian Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638-1652* (Abingdon, 2007), pp. 437, 437n. For experiences of the civil wars, see Charles Carlton, *Going to the Wars: The Experience of the British Civil Wars, 1638-1651* (London, 1992). For wartime atrocities, see Barbara Donagan, ‘Atrocity, War Crime and Treason in the English Civil War’, *The American Historical Review*, 99:4 (October, 1994), pp. 1137-1166.

power outwards and downwards to a scale never before seen; when the estates of their royalist foes had been sequestered and redistributed, the House of Lords and the episcopal hierarchy were dismantled, and Charles I was tried and executed (1649), leading to eleven years of a republican Commonwealth and Protectorate. Weak and subject to strong external forces, however, the centre around which the interests of these individuals had coalesced could not hold. When it seemed that mere anarchy had been loosed upon the world amid the tensions of 1659, the Commonwealth fell apart. Between May 1660 and August 1662, the monarchy and the established church were restored, and, notwithstanding abortive plots in London in January 1661 and in the northern counties in October 1663, a relatively stable period of government supervened.

In histories of the later seventeenth century, the long pall which this revolution cast over the subsequent period is beginning to be acknowledged. Nonetheless, hitherto no attention has been paid to the memories of those, like Mason's mourners, who possessed a distinct sense of nostalgia for the events of the mid-seventeenth century; nostalgia which influenced hopes 'to gett into the saddle once more'. By way of an introduction, this historiographical imbalance will be addressed through an examination of the development of interest in the subject of memory among historians of the later seventeenth century. Having done so, the chapter will offer methods through which 'seditious memories', such as those aforementioned, can be understood. To that end, this chapter will draw upon interdisciplinary interest in experiences of authority, as well as memory and identity in and beyond the early modern era. Hence, this thesis will be situated at the intersection of several areas of historical interest, upon which it will cast new light in return.

I

In order to demonstrate what this thesis has to offer, it is necessary first to situate it within an emergent emphasis upon memory in studies of the later seventeenth century, and illustrate that the time is ripe for a consideration of certain memories which hitherto have been overlooked. Since the 1970s, studies of how the construction of the past has impacted upon societies have

proliferated in the humanities and the social sciences.⁶ That the influence of this trend is clearest in history – a discipline which measures its success in the impact of the past upon society – is perhaps unsurprising. While the traumatic events of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have attracted much of the earliest researches into memory, the early modern era in Europe is beginning to receive its fair share of attention.⁷ Indeed, a cohort of early modern historians are now seeking to ‘leave behind, for a while, the study of past ideas and practices of “history” narrowly framed as the ancestor of the modern discipline, and instead turn to a detailed excavation of the various forms and modes in which the past manifested itself in daily life.’⁸ In the late 1980s, the tremors of this historiographical shift towards memory were felt among a then small group of ‘Restoration’ historians as a consequence of the now seminal work of Jonathan Scott. Scott argued that the past was an inescapable aspect of the period 1660-88, and that it was no longer possible to describe the return of the monarchy in 1660 as a watershed or a turning point.⁹ For Scott, the Three Kingdoms were ‘prisoners’ of the recent past, because fears of repeating the revolution were incorporated into enduring, post-reformation anxieties about ‘popery and arbitrary government’.¹⁰ Scott’s clarion call for later seventeenth-century historians to acknowledge the spectre of the past has been heeded several times over, and the old claim that the English Revolution ‘vanished, leaving only a scowl behind’ has been discounted.¹¹ Even proponents of the idea that the later seventeenth century deserves exceptional scrutiny as a prospective, rather than retrospective, era

⁶ For histories of memory studies see Jeffrey K. Olick and Joyce Robbins, ‘Social Memory Studies: From “Collective Memory” to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices’, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24 (1998), pp. 105-140; and Barbara A. Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering* (Maidenhead, 2003), pp. 50-74.

⁷ See, for instance, Daniel Woolf, ‘Memory and Historical Culture in Early Modern England’, *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, 2:1 (1991), pp. 283-308; Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture: 1500-1730* (Oxford, 2003); Raingard Esser, *The Politics of Memory: The Writing of Partition in the Seventeenth-Century Low Countries* (Leiden, 2012).

⁸ Daniel Woolf, ‘Afterword: Shadows of the Past in Early Modern England’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76:4 (Winter 2013), p. 650.

⁹ Jonathan Scott, ‘England’s Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot’, Tim Harris, Paul Seward and Mark Goldie (eds.), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 111-112.

¹⁰ See *Ibid.*, *passim.*; Jonathan Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677-1683* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 27-49; Scott, *England’s troubles*, pp. 162-166.

¹¹ John Morrill, ‘Introduction’, John Morrill (ed.), *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s* (London, 1992), p. 14.

have conceded that ‘the English Civil War and its aftermath did have radical and transformative effects.’¹² Elsewhere, historians of the period have spoken of an ‘obsession with the past’ during the later seventeenth-century,¹³ and others have dispensed with the adjective ‘Restoration’ altogether (as will this thesis), favouring instead the label ‘post-revolutionary’ which reflects the enduringness of the revolution after 1660.¹⁴ Above all, recent studies of the period have left little doubt that the myth of a ‘return of normalcy’ after the revolution has been slain.¹⁵

One of the by-products of Scott’s claims about the later seventeenth century has been to provoke interest in *why* the revolution was remembered. On the one hand, this has involved interest in the psychological impact of traumatic experiences of warfare and dispossession.¹⁶ More often, however, historians have explored Scott’s claim that *anxieties about the recurrence* of civil conflict on the scale of 1638-51 were pervasive in post-revolutionary Britain.¹⁷ John Patrick Montañó, for instance, has demonstrated how the ghost of the past enabled the regime to inhabit a middle ground of ‘moderation’ from which ‘fanatics’ – those who dissented from the established church and were identified with the revolution – were sniped at.¹⁸

¹² Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven, CT, 2009), p. 482.

¹³ George Southcombe and Grant Tapsell, *Restoration Politics, Religion, and Culture: Britain and Ireland, 1660-1714* (Basingstoke, 2010), p. 148.

¹⁴ For a notable use of this term, see Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, ‘Rethinking the public sphere in early modern England’, Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (eds.), *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 1-30.

¹⁵ See David J. Appleby, ‘The Restoration county community: a post-conflict culture’, Jacqueline Eales and Andrew Hopper (eds.), *The County Community in Seventeenth-Century England and Wales* (Hatfield, 2012), p. 123.

¹⁶ For the psychological impact of warfare, see Mark Stoye, ‘Memories of the Maimed: The Testimony of Charles I’s Former Soldiers, 1660–1730’, *History* 88:290 (2003), pp. 204-226; and Erin Peters, *Commemoration, Oblivion, and Cultural Memories: Print Culture in Restoration England, 1658-1666* (PhD thesis, University of Worcester, forthcoming). For the psychological impact of dispossession, see Fiona McCall, *Baal’s Priests: The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution* (Farnham, 2013); and Fiona McCall, ‘Children of Baal: Clergy Families and Their Memories of Sequestration during the English Civil War’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76:4 (Winter 2013), pp. 617-638.

¹⁷ Tim Harris, for instance, has argued that ‘it was not simply that the civil war made political partisans out of people; we have to recognize ... a profound fear of the same thing happening again’, ‘Understanding popular politics in Restoration Britain’, Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (eds.), *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 129. For a similar use of this argument, see Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 4, 20.

¹⁸ Montañó, *Courting*, *passim*.

The adoption of Scott's reading of memory has not been uncritical, however. In order to rescue the fierce political divisions of the later seventeenth century from their reduction to collective fears and prejudices, historians such as Tim Harris and Mark Knights have underscored the role of the regime in stirring them in order to garner support for the expurgation of dissent after the Restoration.¹⁹ Indeed, Melinda Zook has argued that Scott's emphasis on the repetitive nature of the seventeenth century, and that the year '41 had 'come again' by 1681, revealed that he had been 'won over' by 'Tory caterwauling' and 'royalist propaganda'.²⁰

If historians are divided over whether fears of "41 come again' were inherent or manufactured, however, their opinions converge on the implication that *such fears existed* and provided the post-revolutionary regime with a means of shepherding the inhabitants of the Three Kingdoms into acquiescence with episcopal and monarchical forms of government. Even Melinda Zook, conceded 'that the English were ... determined not to repeat the experience' of revolution.²¹ The problem with this dominant interpretation is that it has resulted in a disproportional emphasis on a *royalist* interpretation of the recent past during the reign of Charles II (and indeed James II) which held the events of the 1640s and 1650s to be a rebellion against and usurpation of 'natural' forms of government in church and state. In particular, an emphasis has been placed upon the means through which royalists commemorated their fallen heroes, such as the beatified 'martyr', Charles I.²² Indeed, some historians have spoken in terms of a memory of the English Revolution which was 'controlled' by those who

¹⁹ Tim Harris, 'The Legacy of the English Civil War: Rethinking the Revolution', *The European Legacy*, 5:4 (2000), p. 505; Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 11. See also Grant Tapsell, *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 11.

²⁰ Melinda Zook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England* (University Park, PA, 1999), p. xix.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. xix.

²² Lois Potter, 'The royal martyr in the Restoration: national grief and national sin', Thomas N. Corns (ed.), *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1999). pp. 240-248; Kevin Sharpe, "'So Hard a Text'?: Images of Charles I, 1612-1700', *The Historical Journal*, 43:2 (June 2000), passim.; and Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 129-171.

emerged victorious in 1660, leaving little room for alternatives.²³ If any alternatives to the royalists' interpretation of the revolution did exist in the wake of the Restoration, historians do not acknowledge their existence until the turn of the *next* century when the 'inheritors' of parliament's cause in the civil wars, the 'Whigs', sought to legitimate the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688-89 and the regime's campaign against Jacobitism.²⁴ Indeed, it has been common for historians of the later seventeenth century to assume the silence of Whig historians on the subject of the 1640s and 1650s *before* the Glorious Revolution, at the expense of a less provocative invocation of the historic spectre of 'counter-reformation' and 'arbitrary government'.²⁵

There is no question that the assumption of a principally royalist 'public memory' of the revolution is the result of its dominance in available evidence. Accordingly, some historians of the later seventeenth century have acknowledged that the regime's possession of a stranglehold over the means of producing printed material after the Restoration has resulted in the royalist timbre of this evidence.²⁶ Irrespective of whether royalism was inherent or manufactured after the Restoration, however, most historians have tended to infer that *revolutionaries* – those against whom such material was targeted – were unable to escape the moral force of the royalists' interpretation of the recent past. William Lamont, for example, in his work on Richard Baxter, a supporter of parliament's opposition to Charles I in the first civil war, has written of his 'moderation and reconciliation' after the Restoration.²⁷ Likewise, Tim Cooper has argued that Baxter's memories concentrated on efforts to heap 'blame' for the emergence of radicalism (from which he distanced himself) during the revolution upon religious

²³ Mark Stoye, 'Remembering the English Civil Wars', Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver (eds.), *The memory of catastrophe* (Manchester, 2004), p. 23.

²⁴ Blair Worden, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (London, 2001).

²⁵ See Zook, *Radical Whigs*, p. 48.

²⁶ Royce Macgillivray, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague, 1974), pp. 2-3. R. C. Richardson calls the period 1660-88 the 'Royalist-dominated period of historiography', *The Debate on the English Revolution* (London, 1977), p. 18.

²⁷ William Lamont, 'Richard Baxter, "Popery" and the Origins of the English Civil War', *History*, 87:287 (2002), p. 343.

separatists such as John Owen.²⁸ Andrew Hopper's biography of the parliamentarian general Thomas, Lord Fairfax, places a similar emphasis on those 'treacherous officers, agitators and a "levelling faction"' who he blamed 'for the purge of parliament, the King's death and establishment of the republic.'²⁹ Elsewhere, Jonathan Sawday has gone as far as to argue that, after the revolution, the republican poet John Milton became 'a historian who [could] no longer believe in human history'.³⁰ Royce Macgillivray has drawn a similar conclusion that 'the humiliating failure of the Parliamentary cause both before and at the Restoration had left most of its former defenders in such moral disarray that they found little further defense possible'.³¹

The idea that a royalist interpretation of history, which either spoke to or stirred up fears of the recurrence of civil war, experienced no serious challenge in the wake of the Restoration has found its firmest articulation in the most recent, and hitherto the only full-length, study of memory in post-revolutionary Britain: Matthew Neufeld's *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England*. For Neufeld, 'public remembering' after the Restoration was not about contesting the meaning of the past, but 'commending and justifying, or contesting and attacking, the Restoration settlements that underlay the Anglican confessional state.'³² In Neufeld's opinion, for the sake of national security, the regime placed 'a legal *cordon sanitaire* around the puritan impulse' after the Restoration, and this was justified by a 'memory of the civil wars and Interregnum that vindicated an exclusively Anglican confessional polity.'³³ Indeed, Neufeld has argued elsewhere that those who had participated in the revolution were largely unwilling to contest the royalists' version of the past since it was 'politically [expedient] for men ... to recall their experiences during the Interregnum as if, all along, the return of Charles Stuart had been their heart's greatest

²⁸ Tim Cooper, *John Owen, Richard Baxter and the Formation of Nonconformity* (Farnham, 2011), p. 296.

²⁹ Andrew Hopper, *'Black Tom': Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 225-226.

³⁰ Jonathan Sawday, 'Re-writing a revolution: history, symbol, and text in the Restoration', *The Seventeenth Century*, 7:2 (1992), p. 196.

³¹ Macgillivray, *Restoration Historians*, p. 4.

³² Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, p. 2.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

hope.³⁴ Following the lead of other historians, Neufeld has also suggested that the Whig historians of the later period of Charles II's reign were broadly negative in their portrayal of the revolution, employing it as a reminder of the consequences of 'popery and arbitrary government'.³⁵ Indeed, Neufeld does not perceive a debate about the revolution's meaning until after the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89.³⁶ Thus, while offering hitherto the most sophisticated treatment of memories of the revolution after 1660, Neufeld has consolidated the marginal status of views which differed from a fiercely royalist interpretation of the revolution.

In demonstrating the current state of the historiography of memory in the later seventeenth century, it is not the intention of this thesis to diminish the important work of the historians aforementioned. On the contrary, subsequent chapters will draw upon the implications of these histories that the royalists' interpretation of the past was pervasive, persistent and informed experiences of authority in post-revolutionary England and Wales. Nevertheless, with regard to current theories of remembering and the evidence at hand, it is necessary to challenge the assumption which underpins all of these interpretations: that those who supported the Stuarts during the 1640s and 1650s were able to 'invent' the past with total impunity after the Restoration, that this was emblematic of, or played upon, common revulsion of the revolution, and that revolutionaries could hope only to forget.³⁷ In order to do so, it is crucial to acknowledge the conclusions of scholars of human memory that the endeavour to invent or otherwise control the past is elusive and that 'memories of the same event can be formulated very differently by various groups'.³⁸ There is always, in other words, the

³⁴ Matthew Neufeld, 'Introduction: Putting the Past to Work, Working through the Past', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76:4 (Winter 2013), p. 484.

³⁵ Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, pp. 98-120.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 136-168.

³⁷ See Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983).

³⁸ Misztal, *Theories*, p. 66. See also Janelle Greenberg and Laura Martin, 'Politics and Memory: Shanborn's Case and the Role of the Norman Conquest in Stuart Political Thought', Howard Nenner (ed.), *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain: Essays Presented to Lois Green Schwoerer* (Rochester, NY, 1997), p. 121.

opportunity for a 'counter-memory'.³⁹ It is the primary intention of this thesis to illustrate that a counter-memory of the English Revolution can be teased from the shadows of an illusorily immutable royalism.

In order to locate this counter-memory, of course, printed sources which favoured a royalist interpretation of the revolution will offer up little. Nonetheless, as several scholars have demonstrated, sympathetic treatments of the revolution do exist. Jonathan Scott, for instance, has spoken of a 'radical memory' which emerged during the crises at the end of Charles II's reign, one which provided the foundations of the resistance theory of Algernon Sidney and John Locke.⁴⁰ Meanwhile, Derek Hirst and David Norbrook have directed attention towards Lucy Hutchinson's sympathetic portrayal of her husband's support for parliament during the civil wars and the Commonwealth.⁴¹ Elsewhere, in his recent treatment of battle commemoration, Ian Atherton has considered the manner in which parliamentary victories in the civil wars – particularly the relief of the siege of Taunton in May 1645 – were remembered.⁴² In addition to this kind of evidence, sympathetic versions of the revolution can be observed in other written media, such as diaries and letters, all of which evaded the regime's censors. Indeed, this thesis will tend to favour manuscript material, or material which was published after 1688, on the basis that, as Anthony Milton has argued, emphases on printed material during periods of censorship can result in a distorted picture of what constituted 'moderate'

³⁹ For the notion of "counter-memory" (or "popular memory"), see Michel Foucault, 'An Interview with Michel Foucault', trans. by Martin Jordin, *Radical Philosophy*, 11 (Summer 1975), pp. 24-29; and Popular Memory Group, 'Popular memory: theory, politics, method', Richard Johnson, Gregor McLennan, Bill Schwarz and David Sutton (eds.), *Making Histories: Studies in history-writing and politics* (London, 1982), pp. 205–252. For an application of this idea to early modern England, see Andy Wood, *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2013), p. 21.

⁴⁰ Scott, *England's troubles*, p. 344.

⁴¹ Derek Hirst, 'Remembering a Hero: Lucy Hutchinson's *Memoirs of her Husband*', *English Historical Review*, 119 (2004), pp. 682-91; David Norbrook, 'Memoirs and Oblivion: Lucy Hutchinson and the Restoration', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Volume 75, Number 2 (Summer 2012), pp. 233-282.

⁴² Ian Atherton, 'Remembering (and Forgetting) Fairfax's Battlefields', Andrew Hopper and Philip Major (eds.), *England's Fortress: New Perspectives on Thomas, 3rd Lord Fairfax* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 95-119.

opinions.⁴³ The vast bulk of the evidence of this counter-memory, however, will emerge from the oft-neglected records of *oral* communication, the utility of which in the recovery of marginalised voices has been expounded by a number of historians of seventeenth-century political culture.⁴⁴ Indeed, this thesis will follow the examples of Christopher Hill, Richard L. Greaves, Buchanan Sharp, Andrew Hopper, Andy Wood and David Cressy in illustrating how cases of 'seditious' and 'treasonable' speeches in state papers and court sessions records, as well as execution or 'scaffold' speeches, from the period 1660-85 often included sympathetic references to the revolution.⁴⁵ Where this thesis will differ from these studies will be in a more systematic and analytical exploration of these sympathies than has been attempted before.

While this evidence provides an opportunity to explore the interstices of post-revolutionary society, it is necessary to acknowledge some of its pitfalls. As Tim Harris has argued, 'extreme caution is needed when using ... seditious words, since informations were often brought by paid spies, who knew how to exploit the sensibilities of the government.'⁴⁶ Gary De Krey has urged similar caution when 'working with evidence derived from government informers, from confessions made under duress and from accusations made in the hope of pardon.'⁴⁷ These sensible voices need not invalidate evidence of seditious and treasonable words entirely, however. Firstly, it is important not to exaggerate the unfairness, or indeed the primitiveness, of the legal system in seventeenth-century Britain. As Andrew Hopper has pointed out, 'for accusations to be credible they were levelled at people with well-known

⁴³ Anthony Milton, 'Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England', *The Historical Journal*, 41:3 (September 1998), p. 651.

⁴⁴ Harris, 'Understanding popular politics', p. 128; Bowen, 'Seditious speech', p. 45.

⁴⁵ Christopher Hill, *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution* (London, 1980), p. 15; Christopher Hill, 'Republicanism after the Restoration', Christopher Hill, *England's Turning Point: Essays on 17th Century English History* (London, 1998), p. 67; Greaves, *Deliver*; Greaves, *Enemies*; Greaves, *Secrets*; Sharp, 'Popular political opinion', pp. 13-29; Hopper, 'Farnley Wood', pp. 281-303; Andy Wood, *Riot, Rebellion and Popular Politics in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 2002), p. 176; David Cressy, *Dangerous Talk: Scandalous, Seditious, and Treasonable Speech in Pre-Modern England* (Oxford, 2010), pp. 203-222.

⁴⁶ Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 163.

⁴⁷ Gary S. De Krey, 'London Radicals and Revolutionary Politics, 1675-1683', Harris, et al., *Politics of Religion*, p. 147.

... reputations.⁴⁸ Moreover, Lloyd Bowen has argued convincingly that ‘the law was concerned with the exact words spoken, and we can be fairly confident that the tenor of ... political criticisms has survived.’⁴⁹ Secondly, as Paul Kléber Monod has argued, notwithstanding the potential for malicious allegations, the contextual information surrounding cases of seditious words is often sufficiently detailed for historians to make judgments about whether they were subject to exaggeration or fabrication.⁵⁰ Finally, even if an extreme relativist position is taken about the validity of evidence, one might agree with the historian of early modern ‘popular’ political culture, Andy Wood, that ‘the terminology of the alleged social critique was often quite predictable, revealing generic qualities which are frequently identical to the terminology of anonymous threatening letters or openly acknowledged speech.’⁵¹ Indeed, in post-revolutionary England and Wales, the kinds of opinions which were uttered corresponded with those which were written and published, and survive today in the form of the manuscript or unlicensed printed material that will be used throughout this thesis. Thus, with a readiness to show caution in the use of the evidence which is available, this thesis will explore the largely uncharted territory of the ‘seditious’ counter-memory of the English Revolution during the reign of Charles II.⁵²

II

While the primary intention of this thesis is to address the absence of enquiries into alternative, or ‘seditious’, memories of the English Revolution, a second endeavour will be to ask what these memories reveal about politics and society during the reign of Charles II. Hitherto all studies which have employed seditious words cases and similar sources from this period have done so as ‘direct evidence’ of ‘expressions’ of ‘popular political opinion’;

⁴⁸ Hopper, ‘Farnley Wood’, pp. 292-293.

⁴⁹ Bowen, ‘Seditious speech’, p. 49

⁵⁰ Paul Kléber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 239.

⁵¹ Andy Wood, ‘“Poore men woll speke one day”: Plebeian Languages of Deference and Defiance in England, c.1520-1640’, Tim Harris (ed.), *The Politics of the Excluded, c.1500-1850* (Basingstoke, 2001), p. 82.

⁵² Hereafter, the use of seditious or treasonable words will be based upon the assumption that evidence given against an individual led to a ‘true bill’ (or *billa versa*), that is, the assumption of guilt on behalf of the majority of a grand jury. In any cases where there is doubt about the validity of evidence, this will be stated explicitly.

namely, *opposition* to the political and religious settlements which accompanied the restoration of the monarchy.⁵³ This is a limiting interpretation, however, which assumes that one's refusal to repent of past actions illustrates one's wishes to repeat them. The implication of this interpretation is that, in the context of 1660-85 when the will to overthrow the monarchy and the established church was in fact weak, seditious memories are able to speak only of a radical minority.⁵⁴ The use of this evidence can lead to rather dismissive claims, such as those of David Cressy, that court records connote only the 'alehouse chatter' of 'a disgruntled minority', or the 'ordinary anti-authoritarian belligerence of drunk or disgruntled commoners.'⁵⁵

In contrast to these studies, this thesis will take a rather more open-ended approach to evidence of seditious memories; one which adopts the stance that, as Zsuzsa Gille has argued in relation to nostalgia in post-Communist Russia and Eastern Europe, 'lamenting the losses that came with the collapse of state socialism', or, in this case, the English Revolution, 'does not imply wishing it back.'⁵⁶ It will be argued instead that post-revolutionary sympathies for the events of the 1640s and 1650s are comparable in relation to one common factor: a conscious counterposition of the royalist interpretation of the revolution, which as historians have implied (although not fleshed out), was a pervasive feature of everyday life after the Restoration of 1660. There was, in other words, a cultural divide in post-revolutionary England and Wales between those who ascribed positive and negative meanings to common experiences of the revolution. In the first place, then, seditious memories speak of the methods by which individuals constructed cultural meaning in the wake of the Restoration of 1660. This is not the end of the story, however. As historians of memory in later

⁵³ Sharp, 'Popular political opinion', p. 13.

⁵⁴ J. C. D. Clark, *Revolution and Rebellion: State and society in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 98; Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 51; Alan Marshall, *Intelligence and Espionage in the Reign of Charles II, 1660-1685* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 13.

⁵⁵ Cressy, *Dangerous Talk*, p. 203.

⁵⁶ Zsuzsa Gille, 'Postscript', Maria Todorova and Zsuzsa Gille (eds.), *Post-Communist Nostalgia* (New York City, NY, 2010), p. 286.

seventeenth-century Britain have argued, the 'dominance' of royalist interpretations of the revolution after 1660 represents the regime's efforts to legitimate *authority* or 'the power or right to define and regulate the legitimate behaviour of others'.⁵⁷ For these historians, this authority was comprised of efforts to regulate behaviour which pertained to opinions in constitutional and spiritual matters, such as republicanism or religious nonconformity. However, through the acquisition of the means to propagate royalist interpretations of the revolution (the overthrow of the 1660 Act of Oblivion) and to censor alternative opinions (the 1661 Sedition and 1662 Licensing Acts), it also involved regulating *how the past ought to be remembered*. In chapter 1, this process will be described in relation to the royalists' acquisition of executive power immediately after the Restoration. Having done so, it will be possible to argue that royalist attacks on the past, and the related structural prejudice of 'anti-fanaticism', facilitated pervasive and persistent 'experiences of authority'. These experiences, it will be demonstrated, are evident in the speeches and writings of revolutionaries in the 1660s and 1670s.

With royalist interpretations of the past thus represented, it will be possible to demonstrate how evidence of counter-memories denotes not only the construction of alternative cultural meanings, but also the means through which the aforementioned experiences of authority were negotiated, resisted, subverted, or otherwise contested. The foundation stone of this approach will be the old notion that 'men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances encountered, given and transmitted from the past.'⁵⁸ In other words, it will be argued that attempts to exert authority, such as those of which royalist interpretations of the recent past were constitutive, were contestable. Moreover, it will be crucial to point out that, royalist memories legitimated authority on a *micro-* as well as a macro-political level, such as in quarrels between members of the same community,

⁵⁷ Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle, 'Introduction', Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle (eds.), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1996), p. 1.

⁵⁸ Quoted in S. H. Rigby, *Marxism and History: A Critical Introduction, Second Edition* (Manchester, 1998), p. 10.

and that contests of this authority could thus be ‘microbe-like[,] ... proliferating within technocratic structures and deflecting their functioning by means of a multitude of “tactics” articulated in the details of everyday life’.⁵⁹ Hence, this thesis will be able ‘to develop an account of early modern social order which is sensitive both to the variety of forms of hierarchy and to the possibilities available to the relatively weak for limiting its effects on their lives.’⁶⁰ For this purpose, this thesis will make use of what James C. Scott has referred to as ‘hidden transcripts’ or ‘those offstage speeches, gestures, and practices that confirm, contradict, or inflect’ royalist memories (the ‘public transcript’).⁶¹ Moreover, by depicting seditious memories as a means through which experiences of authority were contested after the Restoration, it will also be possible to converge with a well-established field of historiography which has explored how revolutionaries, and particularly religious nonconformists, came to terms with what Christopher Hill referred to as the ‘experience of defeat’ from 1660 onwards.⁶²

By using evidence of oral communication in order to amplify marginalised memories, this thesis must acknowledge a great debt to the work of Andy Wood, whose research into ‘social memory’ in early modern England is renowned. Wood’s work has considered the manner in which, through oral culture, subaltern groups, such as agricultural and mining

⁵⁹ Michel De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley, CA, 1984), p. xv. See also Michael J. Braddick and John Walter, ‘Introduction. Grids of power: order, hierarchy and subordination in early modern society’, Braddick and Walter (eds.), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 8.

⁶⁰ Braddick and Walter, ‘Introduction’, p. 1.

⁶¹ John Walter, ‘Public transcripts, popular agency and the politics of subsistence in early modern England’, Braddick and Walter, *Negotiating Power*, p. 147; James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven, CT, 1990), pp. 4-5.

⁶² See Christopher Hill, *Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (London, 1984), passim.; N. H. Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Leicester, 1987); Richard L. Greaves, *John Bunyan and English Nonconformity* (London, 1992); Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent*; Beverly Adams, ‘The experience of defeat revisited: suffering, identity and the politics of obedience among Hertford Quakers, 1655-65’, Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby (eds.), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 249-268, pp. 249-268; David J. Appleby, *Black Bartholomew’s Day: Preaching, polemic and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester, 2007); Warren Johnston, *Revelation restored: the apocalypse in later seventeenth-century England* (Woodbridge, 2011); and Stephen Bardle, *The Literary Underground in the 1660s: Andrew Marvell, George Wither, Ralph Wallis, and the World of Restoration Satire and Pamphleteering* (Oxford, 2012).

communities, preserved versions of the past with which experiences of authority could be negotiated.⁶³ In many respects, this thesis will adopt Wood's crucial linkage of authority and memory, and use it as a means of approaching the evidence of a seditious counter-memory between 1660 and 1685. This thesis will endeavour to penetrate deeper than Wood's studies of memory, however. In order to do so, the relationship between memory and authority will be regarded as a window onto a process which is largely *internal*, and yet manifested in speech. This thesis will argue that it is possible to probe deeper into the minds of those whose memories have been recorded by appreciating that remembering is a process which self-validates social identities and facilitates planning for the future.⁶⁴ It will be an understanding of these internal ramifications of conjuring, sharing and contesting seditious memories that will provide the thematic structure of this thesis after chapter 1.

Of primary importance to this approach is the idea that remembering is an *act*, or 'a process of active restructuring, in which elements may be retained, reordered, or suppressed',⁶⁵ and that this process involves the ascription of meanings to experiences which are shared at the level of societies.⁶⁶ This act of remembering sews a thread from the past into the present that establishes the continuity of the meanings which members of a society attach to shared experiences.⁶⁷ On the one hand, this idea implies that the act of conjuring the past permits an individual to validate his or her position in relation to society.⁶⁸ The act of remembering, in other words,

⁶³ Andy Wood, 'Custom, Identity and Resistance: English Free Miners and their Law, c.1550-1800', in Griffiths, et al. *The Experience of Authority*, pp. 249-285; Wood, *1549*; pp. 209-264; Andy Wood, *Memory of the People*.

⁶⁴ This thesis attempts to take part in what Barbara A. Misztal refers to as the 'dynamics of memory approach', see Misztal, *Theories*, pp. 67-73.

⁶⁵ Fentress and Wickham, p. 40. See also, Robert E. McGlone, 'Deciphering Memory: John Adams and the Authorship of the Declaration of Independence', *The Journal of American History*, 85:2 (September 1998), p. 415.

⁶⁶ Fentress and Wickham, *passim*.; Peter Burke, 'History as Social Memory', Thomas Butler (ed.), *Memory: History, Culture and the Mind* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 97-98.

⁶⁷ Nicola King, *Memory, Narrative, Identity: Remembering the Self* (Edinburgh, 2000), pp. 2-3; Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Chicago, IL, 2004), pp. 96-97; W. James Booth, *Communities of Memory: On Witness, Identity, and Justice* (Ithaca, NY, 2006), p. 6; and Geoffrey Cubitt, *History and Memory* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 199-200.

⁶⁸ Paul Connerton, *How societies remember* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 35. For theories of identity and self-validation, see Sheldon Stryker and Peter J. Burke, 'The Past, Present, and

validates one's identity, or sense of self, in relation to the social world.⁶⁹ On the other hand, however, this approach suggests that *sharing* the meaning of experiences, through communication, reinforces the identities of which these meanings are constitutive.⁷⁰ Remembering, therefore, is always geared towards the anchoring of individuals within their societies, but sometimes this is achieved through interaction with society itself. When this process does take place in the social world, *consensus* about the meaning of the past occurs within so-called 'communities of memory'.⁷¹ It is within these communities, it has been proposed, that individuals are bestowed with feelings of comfort and solidarity.⁷² While this schema offers an understanding of the role of remembering within society, it neglects to mention the *range* of meanings through which experience constitutes identity.⁷³ Put differently, remembering is a process which can lead to *conflict*, as well as consensus, as different identities clamber for validity, and indeed ascendancy, within the public sphere.⁷⁴ Indeed, some scholars of memory have argued that, in order to ensure the reproduction of social identities within this melee, the process of 'socialisation' mediates the transmission of memories *across generations*.⁷⁵ This, in turn, leads to the possession of 'post-memories', or those which belong to individuals who do not possess experiential knowledge of the episode which was remembered.⁷⁶ Remembering is not, however, merely reflective, it is *restorative* as well. In other words, while memories can legitimate who one

Future of an Identity Theory', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63:4 (December 2000), pp. 284-297.

⁶⁹ Fentress and Wickham, p. 7. Elizabeth Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 111.

⁷⁰ Jan Assmann, 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', trans. by John Czaplika, *New German Critique*, 65 (Spring-Summer, 1995), p. 127.

⁷¹ Robert N. Bellah, Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler and Steven M. Tipton, *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (Berkeley, CA, 1985), p. 153; Booth, *Communities of Memory*, p. 52.

⁷² Iwona Irwin-Zarecka, *Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1994), p. 54; Wood, 1549, p. 214.

⁷³ Paul Ricoeur, 'Memory-Forgetting-History', Jörn Rüsen (ed.), *Meaning and Representation in History* (New York, NY, 2006), pp. 14-15.

⁷⁴ Foucault, 'An Interview', p. 25; Cubitt, *History and Memory*, p. 224; Wood, *Memory of the People*, p. 25.

⁷⁵ Bellah, et al., *Habits of Heart*, p. 154; Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts*, pp. 105-106.

⁷⁶ Marianne Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust* (New York City, NY, 2012).

is, they can also influence what one does, as well as hopes for what can be achieved in the future.⁷⁷

Remembering, then, is what Elizabeth Tonkin has labelled a ‘cognitive empowering’ which enables individuals, quite literally, to make (although not to make-up) their own history, and to use this history in order to mould the present and the future.⁷⁸ In order to do so, remembering is an individual, as well as a social, process. Moreover, differences in opinion about the past lead to conflict and attempts to gain control of the right to ‘speak for [the] past’.⁷⁹ Finally, in order to secure how one’s actions are remembered, the past is *passed on* to posterity. These processes result variously in feelings of self-validation, hope and solidarity within those who remember. In this thesis, it will be argued that a careful treatment of the evidence of seditious memories can reveal *all* of these processes at work. In doing so, it will suggest that revolutionaries did not merely disagree with royalists about what the past meant, but that the negotiation, resistance and subversion of the experiences of authority of which royalists’ censure was constitutive involved various, subtly different forms and articulations of memory. In order to carry out such an exploration, the thesis will shift between three dimensions of *context* in which seditious memories were articulated during the reign of Charles II, and which correspond with the aforementioned theories of human remembering: *social*, *temporal*, and *generational*.⁸⁰ Within these contexts, it will be argued that seditious memories permitted revolutionaries, and indeed others, to achieve two things. Firstly, these memories validated religio-political identities of which the attachment of certain meanings to the English Revolution was crucially constitutive. Secondly, they enabled revolutionaries to ‘reside’ within, but also to endeavour to restore, a world which was built in the image of this seditious past, escaping thereby the reality to which the

⁷⁷ Fentress and Wickham, p. 51; Svetlana Boym, ‘Nostalgia and Its Discontents’, *Hedgehog Review*, 9:2 (2007), p. 8.

⁷⁸ Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts*, p. 111.

⁷⁹ Katharine Hodgkin and Susannah Radstone, ‘Introduction: Contested pasts’, Katharine Hodgkin and Susannah Radstone (eds.), *Memory, History, Nation: Contested Pasts* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2003), p. 1.

⁸⁰ For the importance of context in interpreting seditious words cases, see Monod, *Jacobitism*, p. 239.

royalist interpretation of the past lent itself. In chapter 2, it will be argued that both of these processes occurred within contexts which were solely *personal* between 1660 and 1678 among those who experienced the English Revolution. In doing so, it will be argued, some of those who participated in the revolution continued to conceive of themselves in relation to 'revolutionary' religio-political identities, such as 'Covenanters', followers of 'the Good Old Cause', and so on. In chapter 3, it will be argued that the same men and women, during the same time period, partook in this process within *social* contexts – not just as isolated individuals – and that this process led to the construction of 'communities of memory' in which a collective identity was mediated. This process of social remembering will be spoken of as the means through which revolutionaries experienced solidarity, but also how political action (sometimes radical) was facilitated. Chapter 4 will round up the social dimensions of seditious remembering by considering how participants contested the meaning of the revolution in *public* between 1660 and 1678. This will involve considering how the identities of 'cavalier' and 'roundhead' continued to inform divisions well into the reign of Charles II, but also how the appropriation of revolutionary identities enabled men and women to position themselves in opposition to authority, and how the purposeful evocation of a return to the 1640s and 1650s could be used in order to threaten royalists. Thus, through an exploration of the different contexts which are appreciable in evidence of opinions about the past it will be possible not only to shed light on the counter-memory of the English Revolution, but also to achieve what Susannah Radstone and Katharine Hodgkin have described as the difficult task of bridging 'that "gap" between memory's "private" inside and its public "outside"'.⁸¹

The final two chapters of this thesis will shift from 1660-78 to the 'exclusion crisis' and 'Tory reaction' periods of 1678-85. In chapter 5, it will be argued that, since 'Tories' revived the kinds of attacks on the past which were considered in chapter 1, seditious memories returned during this period

⁸¹ Susannah Radstone and Katharine Hodgkin, 'Regimes of Memory: An Introduction', Susannah Radstone and Katharine Hodgkin (eds.), *Memory Cultures: Memory, Subjectivity and Recognition* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2003), p. 3.

on a scale unseen since the 1660s, and that they can be explained in similar ways. Moreover, it will become clear that these kinds of memories were common among those who supported the 'Whig' movement. In chapter 6, it will be argued that some of these memories were articulated by people who had not experienced the events in question, particularly during the 'exclusion crisis'. Indeed, it will be demonstrated that a 'post-memory' of the revolution existed which illustrates how those who participated in it had attempted to pass on these memories to posterity. This chapter will conclude with a consideration of the charismatic and enigmatic Whig activist Stephen Colledge and how, since he was too young to have experienced the revolution himself, his seditious memories were informed by his involvement within the Whig movement, but also by the fact that his extended family included more participants in the revolution than has been hitherto acknowledged by historians.

Whether alone, with like-minded individuals, or with those who held strongly critical views about the English Revolution, then, men and women articulated seditious memories. In doing so, they were able to legitimate the past, and, as a consequence, validate identities which were bound up with it. Moreover, men and women were able to imagine different versions of the present and future, from which a visceral sense of hope could be summoned, and political action might be facilitated. It was through this process that those who participated in the revolution were able to negotiate, resist and subvert experiences of authority during Charles II's reign which were informed by a critical interpretation of those actions. Through this analysis of seditious memories, it will be possible to reach some interesting conclusions about life in England and Wales during the reign of Charles II. To begin with, it will be possible to shed light on how men and women constructed meaning in later seventeenth-century England and Wales in relation to the events of the turbulent past, and to answer thereby Ann Hughes's call for historians 'to explore the more profound effects of war, revolution and regicide on personal

and political identities.⁸² Indeed, through a consideration of seditious memories, it will be possible to contribute to a historiography of identities in the seventeenth century, the focus of which has been confined hitherto to the construction of gendered, national and religious identities.⁸³ Moreover, the wider implications of this study will be that historians of the early modern period can utilise theories of social remembering. Indeed, this exploration of memory and identity will enable this thesis to heed the rallying cries of several historians to bridge the wide gap between the disciplines of history and social psychology.⁸⁴ Finally, a methodology which interprets memories in relation to the social construction of cultural meaning, as opposed to their capacity to speak of political opinion, means that it will be possible to consider in an original manner the difficulties of applying the labels of 'moderate' and 'radical' to those who employed certain discourses.⁸⁵ Nevertheless, it will be accepted throughout this thesis that revolutionaries referred to distinct 'revolutions' which were more or less 'radical', and that the luxury to distinguish between them was a product of the hindsight which came with the constitutional and ecclesiological settlements of the early 1660s. It is with these settlements, and their relationship with seditious memories and experiences of authority, that this fresh exploration of the later seventeenth century must begin.

⁸² Ann Hughes, 'A "lunatick revolter from loyalty": the Death of Rowland Wilson and the English Revolution', *History Workshop Journal*, 61 (Spring, 2006), p. 201.

⁸³ For religious identities, see David J. Davis, *Seeing Faith, Printing Pictures: Religious Identity during the English Reformation* (Leiden, 2013); and Adam Morton and Nadine Lewycky, 'Introduction', Nadine Lewycky and Adam Morton (eds.), *Getting Along? Religious Identities and Confessional Relations in Early Modern England – Essays in Honour of Professor W. J. Sheils* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 1-27. For nation identities, see Sarah Barber, 'The formation of cultural attitudes: the example of the three kingdoms in the 1650s', Allan I. Macinnes and Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.), *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbours* (Dublin, 2002), pp. 169-185. For gendered identities, see Hughes, *Gender*.

⁸⁴ See various contributions to *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46:4 (2012).

⁸⁵ For studies of the problems of the label of 'radical' in relation to the revolution, see Glenn Burgess, 'Radicalism and the English Revolution', Glenn Burgess and Matthew Festenstein (eds.), *English Radicalism, 1550-1850* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 62-86; Jason Peacey, 'Radicalism Relocated: Royalist Politics and Pamphleteering of the Late 1640s', Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan (eds.), *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth Century English Radicalism in Context* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 51-68.

1 – Memory and Experiences of Authority, 1660-1678

At the end of September 1660, the past paid a visit to Colonel William Sydenham of Clapham (Surrey) in the forms of Ursulah Clerke, the daughter of a royalist soldier, and Theophilus Woodnoth (or Wodenote), a Church of England minister who had been ejected from the rectorship of Linkinhorne (Cornwall) in the mid-1640s.¹ This was not a cordial visit, for the pair bore an order to seize goods which Sydenham, formerly a colonel in the New Model Army, was accused of having plundered from Clerke's father during the civil wars.² Sydenham was defiant, however, refusing to relinquish anything to Clerke. Indeed, Sydenham chose instead to '[justify] his former illegal actions', explaining that 'he lookt upon w[ha]t was then don by him or his souldiers just and that the p[ar]ties father deserv'd justly to suffer beeing of the Kings p[ar]ty.' Although Sydenham was 'urg'd to repent and give thanks for soe much mercy', he retorted that 'he did not repent at all for any thing he had don and if the lawe were ag[ains]t him yet the Act of Oblivion tooke him off, though he knew not how long it would hold, and for his p[ar]te he car'd not'.³ Sydenham's brusque treatment of Clerke and Woodnoth in September 1660 illustrates the existence of seditious memories which counterposed the royalists' interpretation of the revolution as a rebellion against and usurpation of the natural forms of government in church and state. It will be argued in subsequent chapters that hundreds of other seditious memories from the period 1660-85, not all of which were articulated as publicly as those of Colonel Sydenham, can be used likewise to illustrate that the revolution's meanings were in fact contested after the Restoration. In order to make this claim, it is necessary to illustrate the prevalence of the royalists' interpretations of the revolution, and the *censure* which these interpretations entailed, after 1660: the expectation that, like Sydenham, men and women who had participated in the revolution ought to 'repent'. Thus, the principal intention of this chapter is to illustrate the pervasiveness and persistence of this censure in England and Wales during the 1660s and 1670s.

¹ Jason McElligott, 'Wodenote, Theophilus (*bap.* 1588, *d.* 1662)', *ODNB*, lix, pp. 933.

² TNA, SP 29/9/87.

³ TNA, SP 29/19/34.

This chapter will fulfil a second duty, however: one which will enable a deeper understanding of seditious memories in subsequent chapters. If one returns to the case of Colonel Sydenham, it is clear that, in addition to a hostile confrontation over past actions, relationships of *power* were at play. In the first place, an order obtained from the king commanded Sydenham's acquiescence with Ursulah Clerke and Theophilus Woodnoth in their principal endeavour: to commandeer his 'ill-gotten gains'. Yet there was something less tangible with which Clerke and Woodnoth expected to secure Sydenham's acquiescence: a *negative* interpretation of his former actions in particular, and the revolution in general. As Matthew Neufeld has argued, then, a *royalist* interpretation of the revolution was something with which forms of authority in church and state could be legitimated after 1660.⁴ There was a second, less tangible, relationship of power evident on Colonel Sydenham's doorstep, however: one which has been overlooked by historians. Clerke and Woodnoth did not simply expect Sydenham to give up his goods, but also to concede to their censorious interpretation of the revolution. This expectation was manifested in their outrage that he chose not to 'repent' for his actions. In other words, Clerke and Woodnoth held an 'authority to remember' the revolution. Accordingly, in justifying his participation in the revolution, Sydenham was able to contest not only the authority of Clerke and Woodnoth to commandeer his goods, but also *their authority to speak for his past*. In the first part of this chapter, this unexplored 'authority to remember' will be anatomised, and the manner in which it came to inform an institutionalised structural prejudice of 'anti-fanaticism', with which religio-political persecution was legitimated, will be addressed.

Having made these points, it will be possible to argue that *both* experiences of censure *and* the persecution which derived from anti-fanaticism were pervasive and persistent in the wake of the royalists' acquisition of power from May 1660 onwards. In order to make this claim, the second part of this chapter will draw on the work of John Patrick Montaña,

⁴ See Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, p. 2.

Matthew Neufeld and others by describing the diverse media through which censure of the revolution and its participants was transmitted. However, this chapter will go further than these studies in expressing the sheer scale of this exercise, citing the media of preaching, print, performance, oral culture and public spectacle. Moreover, this section will use the speeches and writings of those who were on the receiving end of royalist censure in order to emphasise the prevalence of these experiences of authority. In the final section of this chapter, the extent to which anti-fanatical prejudices informed the regime's punitive religio-political policies will be regarded in relation to the legislation of the Cavalier Parliament, and the government surveillance through which this authority was bolstered. Again, how far revolutionaries were conscious of the influence of anti-fanatical prejudices in this legislation will be emphasised with recourse to their speeches and writings during this period. Throughout, it will be demonstrated that these were not the experiences of a minority, such as those who participated in the Regicide and the establishment of a Commonwealth from 1649 onwards, but also those who had opposed the Crown throughout the reign of Charles I.

I

Historians have tended to overlook the 'authority to remember' which Ursulah Clerke, Theophilus Woodnoth and thousands of other royalists possessed. Instead, it is generally assumed that revolutionaries were complicit or acquiescent in an interpretation of the revolution which was strongly negative. There was, in other words, no contest over *who* should speak for the past from 1660 onwards, and the well-known shift from the conciliatory atmosphere of the Restoration to the recrimination of the period 1661-67 is regarded as having been a smooth, if perhaps challenging, one.⁵ In contrast to such inferences, it will be argued here that this shift resulted from a struggle over the authority to remember immediately before and after the Restoration between revolutionaries who wished to 'bury' the revolution and royalists who refused to do so. It is in relation to the fact that the latter group emerged victorious from this struggle between 1660 and 1661 that it

⁵ See Sawday, 'Re-writing a revolution', pp. 171-199.

becomes possible to frame the royalist censure of revolutionaries not as a natural consequence of the Restoration, but as an 'experience of authority'.

In order to pursue this argument, it is important to acknowledge that the Restoration was brought about not by royalists alone, but by a 'coalition' of interests who agreed to surrender the authority to remember the revolution to a popular figurehead, Charles II.⁶ Thanks to the work of Tim Harris, it is now widely accepted that the Restoration was successful because of the skill of the returning king in representing himself to this coalition as 'all things to all people'.⁷ Hence, support among Presbyterians and other moderate revolutionaries for the Restoration in the spring of 1660 resulted from the king's support for the toleration of Reformed Protestants, while members of the New Model Army responded favourably to the payment of arrears and the king's permission for its members to pursue trades without the statutory period of apprenticeship.⁸ Thus, even staunch parliamentarians such as Sir Denzil Holles could be heard to revel in 'what Joy, what Chearfulness, what lettings of the Soul, what Expressions of transported Minds, a stupendous Concourse of People' had attended the proclamation of the Restoration on 8 May 1660.⁹ What historians of 1660 have overlooked, however, is that a *mnemonic* settlement comprised another precondition of revolutionary support for the Restoration. In May 1660, the 'Convention Parliament' passed 'An Act of Free and General Pardon Indemnity and Oblivion'. On a pragmatic level, the act ensured that no royalists and only a handful of revolutionaries (those responsible for the trial and execution of Charles I) would be prosecutable for crimes which had been committed during the revolution. Additionally, and perhaps more remarkably, however, the Act ordered that 'all names and terms of distinction may likewise be put into utter oblivion'. Moreover, it was enacted that 'any person or persons ... [who] shall presume maliciously ... to revive the memory of the late differences or the

⁶ For the use of the term 'coalition', see Christopher Hill, *A Turbulent, Seditious and Factious People: John Bunyan and his Church, 1628-1688* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 10-11.

⁷ Tim Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715* (London, 1993), p. 32.

⁸ Appleby, 'Veteran', p. 334.

⁹ *HPHC*, p. 13.

occasions thereof' would be fined.¹⁰ Historians have tended to see this policy of 'oblivion' as a means of overlooking the divisions of the past in order that the Three Kingdoms might move on; to turn away from 'the undeniable misery and hardship wrought by the war-induced loss of life and property, not to mention the social and religious divisions the conflict had stirred, along with the unpopularity of Charles I's execution'.¹¹ What these interpretations can wrongly assume, however, is that oblivion 'condemn[ed] the "Good Old Cause" to ridicule at best and ignominy at worst.'¹² Rather than condemning the revolution to the historical dustbin, oblivion was actually intended to *rescue* the recent past. Crucial here is the fact that, for many of the revolutionaries who supported the Restoration, the events of the 1640s and 1650s were no accident or misadventure, but the confluence of a wide range of religio-political objectives which were held to be 'constitutional', 'godly' and, above all, 'Providential'. The identities which were constructed from these meanings were not the preserve of the radicals who overthrew the monarchy and established the Commonwealth, but belonged to the broader group who had resisted the onset of 'popery' during the 1630s, had gone into battle for 'king and parliament' in the 1640s, or pursued the 'reformation' of the 1650s (see chapter 2). For revolutionaries, whose backing for the Restoration was essential in the spring of 1660, the safekeeping of these *meanings*, which were anchored into the past, was crucial. Thus, the Act of Oblivion, which Charles recognised to be the very 'Corner-Stone' of the Restoration settlements, 'ring-fenced' the past and secured it, and the identities of which it was constitutive, from royalist censure. In return, of course, revolutionaries were prohibited from sympathising with the revolution. In the words of George Southcombe and Grant Tapsell, 'remembering was figured as rebellion.'¹³

Oblivion, then, could be described as pre-empting the efforts at 'peace and reconciliation' which have defined modern post-conflict societies, such

¹⁰ Act of 12 Car. II, c. 11, sec. xxiv (1660).

¹¹ Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, p. 4.

¹² Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent*, p. 23.

¹³ Southcombe and Tapsell, *Restoration*, p. 9.

as in Northern Ireland.¹⁴ With the best of intentions, it seems, the hostile identities of the recent past were to be superseded with a single one which would ensure 'the reunion of the nation'.¹⁵ Thus, while some retribution had to be meted out in order 'to satisfy the nation's appetite for vengeance and the kingdom's need to expiate its sin',¹⁶ the king's more general clemency following his return is one of the defining aspects of the Restoration.¹⁷ Indeed, of the hundreds of thousands who had opposed and overthrown Charles I, or otherwise prevented the Restoration, only a fraction was indicted, and all but *fourteen* of these avoided the grizzly end of hanging, drawing and quartering by escaping to mainland Europe or America, having their punishment commuted to imprisonment, or being exonerated completely. There was, then, an emphasis on the fact that a *minority* had committed unforgiveable actions during the revolution: a view which is evident in the wording of the royal proclamation of January 1661 which set out how the anniversary of the Regicide (30 January) ought to be observed.¹⁸ Thus, it was 'a Party of wretched men, desperately wicked and hardened in their Impiety' or 'a small Remnant of ... Creatures (not a tenth part of the whole)' who were responsible not only for the Regicide, but also bringing down 'the true Reformed Protestant Religion'.¹⁹

The official spirit of conciliation was therefore potent after 1660, and if there was to be any blame for the sufferings of the recent past, it was never to extend beyond a visible minority. The language of key members of the regime immediately before and after the Restoration testify not only to this spirit, but also to the sincere intentions which appear to have motivated it. Edward Hyde, the Earl of Clarendon, for example, went as far as to warn the

¹⁴ See Nuala C. Johnson, 'The contours of memory in post-conflict societies: enacting public remembrance of the bomb in Omagh, Northern Ireland', *Cultural Geographies*, 19:2 (Nov. 2011), pp. 237-258.

¹⁵ Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 127.

¹⁶ Howard Nenner, 'The Trial of the Regicides: Retribution and Treason in 1660', Nenner, *Politics*, p. 23.

¹⁷ For this view, see Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford, 1989), p. 141; Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, p. 181.

¹⁸ John Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (Harlow, 1993), p. 23.

¹⁹ [Charles Stuart], *By the King. A Proclamation, For Observation of the Thirtieth day of January as a day of Fast and Humiliation according to the late Act of Parliament for that purpose* (London 1661), p. 2.

Convention Parliament that any 'evil and envious Looks, murmuring and discontented Hearts were directly against the Equity of [Oblivion], and, as far as they were discover'd, shou'd be so esteemed by his Majesty.'²⁰ Moreover, even when the bodies of the regicides had been cut down, dissected and paraded on the walls of the City of London in October 1660, he was forced to admit that 'I am weary of hanging ... let it sleep.'²¹ Meanwhile, the king himself warned those who transgressed the Act that 'he would find such an Acceptation from Me as he wou'd have who shou'd persuade me to burn Magna Charta, cancel the old Laws, and erect a new Government after my own Invention and Appetite.'²² Indeed, the king made clear on several occasions that he 'wish[ed] that the memory of what is past, may be buried to the world' and, some centuries ahead of his time, that 'recrimination was not purgation'.²³ That the Convention Parliament was enthusiastic to follow Charles's orders was illustrated on numerous occasions during the Restoration. Shortly before the king returned, for example, William Lenthall was forced to apologise to the Serjeant-at-Arms of the House of Commons for saying that 'he that first drew his Sword against the late King, committed a great Offence as he that cut off his Head.'²⁴ Meanwhile, as Paul Seaward has illustrated, the Commons were hesitant to pursue a bill concerning a parish rate for the relief of poor and maimed royalist soldiers which contained 'partisan' wording.²⁵

In the immediate aftermath of the Restoration, then, the authority to remember was placed squarely in the king, whose order to round up the regicides affected a tiny minority of those who had opposed the Stuarts over the previous decades. Having effectively closed off the public sphere from discussions about the recent past, of course, the king risked incurring the resentment of those who had been his staunchest supporters during the revolution and had suffered a great deal as a consequence. In the words of one royalist from Shropshire, 'the King had done more in pardoning the

²⁰ *HPHC*, p. 24

²¹ Cited in Nenner, 'The Trial', p. 38.

²² *HPHC*, p. 29.

²³ Cited in Nenner, 'The Trial', p. 22; cited in McCall, *Baal's Priests*, p. 55.

²⁴ *HPHC*, p. 16.

²⁵ Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, p. 210.

Rebels, than God either would or could do'.²⁶ On a purely practical level, the king's pardon prevented royalists from bringing revolutionaries to justice for what had happened in the past, and were directed instead to pursue reparations through the courts.²⁷ The resentment which this caused was aired loudly after the Restoration, as several historians have established.²⁸ In a ballad of 1661, for instance, the pardon was described as having 'Entitle[d] Theeves to keep our Goods, / Forgive our Rents, as well as Bloods'.²⁹ Material losses were not the sole source of royalist resentment, however. As the aforementioned ballad went on to complain, not only had the king's pardon prevented royalists from seeking reparations, but the policy of oblivion in particular meant that 'Judges ... award that none / Of our Oppressours should attone' and that 'Brethren, who must still dissent, / Whose froward Gospell brook no Lent' would 'recant, but n'ere repent': wording which echoed the aforementioned sentiments of Ursulah Clerke and Theophilus Woodnoth.³⁰ Elsewhere, Andrew Cooper complained that, rather than being endorsed by the regime, the royalists' interpretation of the revolution was instead 'Lighted ... out from Oblivion's Cell / To which they were condemn'd, the world to tell'.³¹ A prominent, but frequently overlooked aspect of royalist grievances after May 1660, then, was the fact that the policy of oblivion freed revolutionaries from the need to *repent*, and suffered royalists to remain silent.

As a remedy to these grievances, some royalists chose to circumvent oblivion in order to make clear who was to blame for their sufferings. In doing so, these individuals were able to take some of the authority to remember into their own hands. In 1660, for example, a pamphlet was published in which a royalist character prevailed over a 'Phanattick' in an argument about the wrongfulness of the revolution. The pamphlet, which professed to serve

²⁶ [Ralph Wallis], *Room for the Cobler of Gloucester and his Wife* (s. l., 1668), p. 11.

²⁷ Gary S. De Krey, *Restoration and Revolution in Britain: A Political History of the Era of Charles II and the Glorious Revolution* (Basingstoke, 2007), p. 28.

²⁸ See Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, pp. 55, pp. 196-197; Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, p. 164.

²⁹ *The Cavaleers Letany* (London, 1661). McShane, *PBB*, no. 388.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ A[ndrew] C[oo]per, *Stratologia, Or, The History of the English Civil Warrs, In English Verse* (London, 166[0]), pp. [v-vi].

'as a warning-piece to all Rebellious Sectaries,' was almost certainly a means through which its royalist readership might achieve some kind of vicarious 'justice' in the wake of the Restoration.³² Likewise, the minister Samuel Stone published one of his sermons in order to illustrate to revolutionaries how 'the guilt of their former horrible commissions' lay still 'upon their souls before God without Repentance', arguing that 'fresh actings will be more aggravate and accumulate even to the endangering of their salvation which no temporal pardon or oblivion can help them in.'³³ Even as late as January 1662, Benjamin Denham saw the need to publish some 'home truths' about nonconformists 'w[hi]ch otherwise had beene buried in the grave of oblivion, and dyed w[i]th my owne person'.³⁴ What these authors represented, then, was a fierce resentment not only of the lack of reparations, but also of the burial of the past without an adequate post mortem.

One virulent strain of royalist resentment involved an attack on the Presbyterians, many of whom had held onto positions of power after the Restoration owing to their conspicuous support for the return of the king.³⁵ What this favouring of the Presbyterians overlooked, argued royalists, was the degree to which these individuals had been responsible for the rebellion in the first place. One pamphlet, for instance, served to illustrate 'the whole Series of their Behaviour, and deriving the Pedigree of Affairs, since the War.'³⁶ Another argued that 'A *Presbyter* is such a Monstrous thing / That loves Democracy, and hates a King.'³⁷ Many of these representations of Presbyterians involved efforts to explicate the comparative *constancy* with which royalists had endeavoured their lives, liberties and estates for the

³² See frontispiece of *A Full Relation Or Dialogue Between a Loyallist and a converted Phanattick since the time of the late Rebellion* ([London], 1660).

³³ Samuel Stone, *Deceivers Deceiv'd: Or, The Mistakes of Wickedness In Sundry Erroneous and Deceitful Principles, practices in our late fatal Times, and suspected still in the Reasonings of unquiet Spirits* (London, 1661), p. [iii].

³⁴ TNA, SP 29/49/97.

³⁵ See, for example, *The Grand Rebels Detected, Or, The Presbyter Unmasked* (London, 1660).

³⁶ *A Lively Pourtraict of our New-Cavaliers, Commonly Called Presbyterians* (London, 1661), p. 3.

³⁷ [John Denham], *The True Presbyterian Without Disguise: Or, A Character of a Presbyterian Wayes and Actions, in Verse* (London, 1661), p. 1.

Stuarts during the revolution. Five days before the return of the king, for example, William Langley wrote that 'It was the exprobatation of Athens, that she suffered those men to dye in Exile, Ignominy and Oblivion, that with their [virtuous endeavours] had rear'd her up in the pillars of fame' since 'their worthy acts gave glory to that City, and that City covered them with the inglorious dust of obscurity.'³⁸ If his allusion was not clear enough, Langley went on to ask 'How many worthy persons have ventured; and lost lives and estates for the good of their King and Kingdom, and lie as forlorn, forgotten[?]'³⁹

The strength of royalist resentment about the manner in which oblivion had robbed them of the authority to remember related to concerns that the lessons of the past had been insufficiently learned. We get a sense of these fears in the strongly-worded reply of the arch-royalist Sir Roger L'Estrange to a pamphlet which had urged moderation in the treatment of revolutionaries. In a passage armed with a fierce sardonicism, L'Estrange asked the author if royalists were 'obliged by the Act of *Oblivion*, to quit our *Nature*, and our *Reason* with our *Passions*: – to such a Losse of *Memory*, as utterly defaces the very *Images* of things *Past*, and robs us of the benefit of our dear-bought *experience*[?]'⁴⁰ Another royalist echoed L'Estrange's sentiments, speaking of his hopes 'That the lively Copy of a truly Loyal subject may not be buried in Oblivion, but be brought to light afresh, for the encouragement of others to persevere according to Allegiance, in Loyalty, Duty and Obedience.'⁴¹ The anxieties inherent in these words were not confined to the inability to transmit this 'dear-bought *experience*' to contemporaries, but also to future generations. Hence, one royalist spoke of his desires that 'the Parliament could passe such an act of Oblivion' in which arguments which had been made with impunity during the 1640s and 1650s were held to account, and

³⁸ William Langley, *The Death of Charles The First Lamented, With the Restauration of Charles The Second Congratulated: Delivered in a Speech, at the Proclaming of our gracious King, at his Town of Wellington, May 17. 1660* (London, 1660), pp. [i-ii].

³⁹ *Ibid.*, [p. ii].

⁴⁰ [Roger L'Estrange], *A Caveat to the Cavaliers* (London, 1661) p. 10. L'Estrange's pamphlet was a response to James Howell's *A Cordial for Cavaliers* (s. l., s. a.).

⁴¹ [George Wharton], *Select and choice Poems Collected out of the Labours of Captain George Wharton* (London, 1661), p. 2.

thus revolutionaries were 'not only pardoned but forgot'.⁴² For royalists, then, a redistribution of power along the same lines of the revolution, and the suffering which would result, were inevitable if the Three Kingdoms did not heed their warnings. At the heart of the royalists' history lesson, which many of them were desperate to teach in the wake of the Restoration, was a fiercely partisan interpretation of the recent past. Many royalists perceived that the origins of the revolution lay in the gradual encroachment of radical forms of Protestantism since the sixteenth century. It was a small group of incendiaries within these sects, they argued, that had inveigled the masses into support for the overthrow of the monarchy and the established church. It was not only sectaries who were to blame for the rebellion and usurpation, however, but also Presbyterians: the inheritors of a tradition of resistance which had radiated from mainland Europe. Moreover, whereas the events of the 1640s and 1650s were regarded as evidence of the remission of God's hand in the affairs of the Three Kingdoms, the Restoration of 1660 was viewed as an unparalleled act of divine Providence.⁴³ This royalist interpretation of the past had its roots in the revolutionary era itself, when, as David Cressy has argued, 'conservatives used historical writing as a device for assigning blame.'⁴⁴ As the evidence above demonstrates, the compulsion to assign blame did not subside in 1660.

In many instances, the broad-brushed view that nonconformists had caused the revolution fed into a structural prejudice of 'anti-fanaticism': named after the term which was employed most often by royalists in order to invoke the connection between the religious identities of those who participated in, and were the causes of, the revolution. This prejudice was distinct from the anti-puritanism to which historians have referred, since, unlike the early seventeenth century, it was predicated on royalists'

⁴² [Thomas Tomkins], *The Rebels Plea, Or, Mr. Baxters judgement, Concerning the late Wars* (London, 1660), p. 45.

⁴³ See Jessica Munns, 'Accounting for Providence: Contemporary Descriptions of the Restoration of Charles II', Dan Doll and Jessica Munns (eds.), *Recording and Reordering: Essays on the Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Diary and Journal* (Cranbury, NJ, 2006), pp. 102-121.

⁴⁴ David Cressy, 'Remembrances of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographies of the 1640s', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68:1-2 (2005), p. 263.

memories of the revolution.⁴⁵ Overshadowing even the anti-catholic hostility for which the later seventeenth century is notorious,⁴⁶ this 'anti-fanaticism' pervaded hundreds of pamphlets during the reign of Charles II, placing nonconformists 'outside the frame of political rationality, possessed by a violent conviction that brooks no argument and will only rest, if ever, once every rival view or way of life is eradicated.'⁴⁷ Few of these pamphlets were as forceful as Richard Leigh's *The Transproser Rehears'd* (1673) in which he recapitulated thirteen years' worth of resentment about the Act of Oblivion. In opposition to the king's recent decision to indulge the forms of worship outside the Church of England, Leigh argued that nonconformists 'were the same *cunning revengeful Men*, as before, and that it is easier to straighten a Crooked Body, then bend a stubborn Fanatick'. When Leigh wrote 'before', of course, he was referring to the revolution for which the 'Fanaticks', in his opinion, had been solely responsible. In addition, Leigh lamented how these revolutionaries continued to

waken the memory of those Crimes, that might (but for them) have slept eternally in the *Act of Oblivion*, either imagining that that *Act* concerns only the suffering Royalists, or that the Instruments of our late Miseries have so great an Interest in it, that they have a Pardon granted not only for what is past, but to come; and so having cancel'd all their old Scores, they might now begin upon a new.⁴⁸

What this evidence suggests is the extent to which royalist resentment about oblivion, and those who had been 'let off the hook' in May 1660, abounded well into the 1660s and 1670s. What it disguises, however, is that it would not have been possible for these casual prejudices against fanatics to have

⁴⁵ Patrick Collinson, 'Antipuritanism', Coffey, John, and Lim, Paul C. H. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 19-33.

⁴⁶ See John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England: 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1973); Peter Lake, 'Anti-popery: the Structure of a Prejudice', Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (eds.), *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642* (Harlow, 1989), pp. 72-106; Jeffrey Collins, 'Restoration Anti-Catholicism: A Prejudice in Motion', Charles W.A. Prior and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *England's Wars of Religion Revisited* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 281-306.

⁴⁷ Alberto Toscano, *Fanaticism: The Uses of an Idea* (London, 2010), p. xi.

⁴⁸ [Richard Leigh], *The Transproser Rehears'd: Or The Fifth Act of Mr. Bayes's Play* (Oxford, 1673), pp. 76-77.

been aired at all had the policy of oblivion been as effective as Leigh believed it was. In reality, in other words, oblivion had been overthrown long before these words were published.

In order to discover why oblivion was overthrown, and the authority to remember redistributed into the hands of royalists, it is necessary to turn to events which occurred in the first year of Charles II's reign. By the beginning of 1661, the hopeful political atmosphere of the previous spring had dissipated owing to fears of anti-government plots, and the actual rebellion of radical Fifth Monarchists in London in January 1661. In the wake of these well-publicised events, royalists were given the opportunity to emphasise the dangers of fanaticism to a degree hitherto impossible.⁴⁹ As John Patrick Montaña has argued, 'the 'calamitous rising' of the Fifth Monarchists in January 1661 was 'a very public example of the reliability of episcopal warnings about fanatics.'⁵⁰ In addition to these events, the neutralisation of the New Model Army had made it less hazardous for royalists to speak out about the revolution.⁵¹ It was for these reasons, perhaps, that in January 1661 Edward Sare, a glazier from Burnham (Essex) was able to warn his neighbour, a revolutionary, that 'now ... wee have liberty to speak as well as you'.⁵²

Less than a year into the Three Kingdoms' new conciliatory era, then, oblivion was suffering under the weight of evidence of royalist claims about the past, as well as the difficulty of silencing such claims. By March 1661, the demise of the Act of Oblivion was all but sealed when the first general election of Charles's reign returned a parliament which remains notorious for its 'cavalier' membership.⁵³ Quickly, as many historians have demonstrated,

⁴⁹ Adams, 'The experience of defeat', p. 245; Appleby, 'Veteran', p. 329.

⁵⁰ Montaña, *Courting*, p. 61.

⁵¹ Hutton, *Restoration*, pp. 151-152.

⁵² ERO, Q/SR 388/26.

⁵³ Studies have shown how as many as 330 of the 617 MPs elected in 1661 had shown 'sympathy for the royal cause' during the 1640s and 1650s. Meanwhile, a relatively meagre 220 MPs had fought for parliament or held office during the Commonwealth and

these men were able to open the floodgates of the public sphere to fierce recrimination.⁵⁴ Indeed, in no place was this transformation from reconciliation to recrimination more evident than in parliament itself. On the anniversary of the Restoration in May 1663, for example, Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke's attempts to secure certain lands for his son were opposed on the grounds of his former allegiances. Whitelocke recorded in his diary that 'several ... spake ag[ains]t it' because he, 'having bin a Rebell, deserved no favor to be shewed to him'.⁵⁵ On another occasion, during the acrimonious debate over the Irish Cattle Bill in 1666, the ex-Cromwellian Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery, attempted to discredit Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, in relation to his service under the Commonwealth and Protectorate.⁵⁶ There can be little doubt that this recriminatory tone to the new parliament had been set by the new Commons Speaker, Sir Edward Turnour, who told MPs in 1661 'that as the former Spirit of Reformation at first brought us into Misery; so the Spirit of Giddiness which God sent among our Reformers, at length cursed us'.⁵⁷ Even the king ordered MPs in the wake of the Fifth Monarchists' uprising to 'be as severe as you will against new Offenders, especially if they be so upon Old Principles, and putt up those Principles by the Roots'.⁵⁸

In 1661, therefore, royalist views about the past, and the prejudice of anti-fanaticism into which these views fed, had become *institutionalised*. For royalists around the country, this alteration was a cause for celebration. In the summer of 1661, therefore, royalists were guaranteed by the author of one broadside ballad that 'Your wounds and scars / in Charles his Wars / They shall not be forgotten', because the new king, who sat 'in the Chair / Of Judgement Right and Reason', would for 'his Fathers friends / ... make a

Protectorate. Furthermore, of the 175 temporal peers in the House of Lords, 73 had served Charles I, while 36 were the sons of those who had and a further 14 had joined the exiled court of Charles II. On the other hand, there were only 30 peers who 'had been unequivocal parliamentarians'. Finally, of the spiritual peers who sat in the House of Lords, only a handful had not been ejected during the 1650s. Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, pp. 36-37.

⁵⁴ See, for example, Wood, *Riot*, p. 174.

⁵⁵ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 667.

⁵⁶ Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, pp. 74-75.

⁵⁷ *HPHC*, p. 36.

⁵⁸ *HPHC*, p. 32.

mends / And punish knaves for Treason.⁵⁹ Elsewhere, a ballad published at the same time took great pleasure in proclaiming that '*Fanaticks*' ought now to 'be quiet' so 'That *Truth* and *Peace* may reign'.⁶⁰ Indeed, as these lyrics suggest, the regime ensured not only that the revolution would be remembered, but also that this memory would be asymmetrical. Before 20 June 1661, this was achieved by means of the Treason Act (1351), under which the imagining or compassing of the monarch's death and opposition to his or her right to rule were punishable. Following the election of the Cavalier Parliament, these offences came under the much more loosely defined auspices of the Sedition Act, which made actionable any effort to

compass[,] imagine[,] invent[,] devise or intend death or destrucon or any bodily harm tending to death or destrucon maim or wounding[,] imprisonment or restraint of... the King or to deprive or depose him from the Stile Honour or Kingly Name of the Imperiall Crowne of this Realme ... or to levy war against His Majestie.⁶¹

Since local justices were given the responsibility of interpreting these laws, and since many of these were royalists who were reluctant to contemplate the various gradations of support for the revolution, it is easy to see how straightforwardly any *sympathetic* references to the recent past might be interpreted as evidence of desires to harm the person of Charles II, or to question his right to rule. The success of this censorship will be evident throughout this thesis in the fact that many seditious memories were spoken out of the regime's earshot.

In the immediate aftermath of the Restoration, therefore, the struggle over whether the English Revolution ought to be remembered or forgotten was won by the royalists who were unwilling to remain quiet about their sufferings during the 1640s and 1650s. In reality, this process began with the steady acquisition of power by royalists in local government before the

⁵⁹ [Thomas Jordan], *Here is some comfort for Poor Cavaleeres* (London, [1661]). McShane, *PBB*, no. 381.

⁶⁰ *A Countrey Song, Intituled, The Restoration* ([London], 1661).

⁶¹ Act of 13 Car. II. c. 1, sec. i (1661).

Restoration of May 1660, but it was concluded with the election of the Cavalier Parliament in the spring of 1661.⁶² Ironically, it had been those revolutionaries who were unwilling to accept the Act of Oblivion – the Fifth Monarchists⁶³ – who had been most responsible for unleashing the full force of recrimination upon the fanatics. Some royalists were clearly conscious of this ‘victory’ in the struggle over the authority to remember. In 1663, for instance, Thomas Gibson advised his neighbour, Michael Blackburne of Almondbury (West Yorkshire), that, being a revolutionary, *he* must now ‘keep a good tongue in [his] head’.⁶⁴ Indeed, an important conclusion to draw from this analysis is that the authority to remember which royalists secured in the first year of the reign of Charles II was an authority over many more than the ‘small Remnant of ... Creatures (not a tenth part of the whole)’ who had been responsible for the Regicide. Even those, like Sir Denzil Holles, who had filled up with joy at the ‘stupendous Concourse of People’ who had welcomed the Restoration, were forced to admit that they must have been ‘in a kind of Delirium or Dotage’.⁶⁵ It is to experiences of the authority to remember among revolutionaries that this chapter will now turn.

II

The Fifth Monarchists’ rising in January 1661 was almost certainly anticipated as an inevitable reaction of the radical fringe to the executions of the regicides in October 1660: ‘the Blood of precious Saints, and Martyrs’.⁶⁶ If negative responses to the Restoration were confined to a small rising of a discredited millenarian minority, the reconciliation of 1660 would have been a remarkable success. In reality, of course, and principally owing to the actions of the Fifth Monarchists in January 1661, the number of people who were liable to suffer from royalist censure increased exponentially in the first year of Charles II’s reign from those who had supported the Regicide to a much

⁶² For this transferral of power on a local level *before* the Restoration, see Paul D. Halliday, *Dismembering the Body Politic: Partisan Politics in England’s Towns, 1650-1730* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 73.

⁶³ As Tim Harris has argued, the Fifth Monarchists were ‘the only group to consistently oppose the restoration of monarchy’, Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 60.

⁶⁴ Quoted in Hopper, ‘Farnley Wood’, p. 292.

⁶⁵ Scott, *England’s troubles*, pp. 177-178.

⁶⁶ *A Door of Hope*, p. 1.

broader section of society. Thus, while the brutal executions which had been sanctioned by the king in May 1660 were the original means through which a censorious version of the past (albeit a small section of it) was to be transmitted, the royalists' acquisition of power from 1660 onwards opened up a number of channels through which anti-fanaticism might flow. Through a consideration of these channels, and how revolutionaries reacted to royalist censure, it is possible to gauge the scale of the experience of the authority to remember after 1660.

The principal channels of the attack on the past which were opened after 1660 were the pulpit and the press.⁶⁷ The former of these, as John Patrick Montaña has demonstrated, was particularly favoured for its ability to penetrate society where print could not.⁶⁸ Indeed, as Montaña has established at length, the sermons of royalist churchmen, such as William Sancroft, George Morley, Nathaniel Hardy, William Haywood, Edward Stillingfleet, Richard Meggott, Miles Barnes and Thomas Cartwright, were steeped in anti-fanatical prejudices.⁶⁹ While all sermons offered royalists an opportunity to admonish those who, in many instances, had been responsible for their ejection and exile, the anniversaries of the Regicide (30 January) and of the Restoration (29 May) were particularly suitable to such preaching. On 30 January 1661, for example, the parishioners of Waltham Abbey (Hertfordshire) were subjected to a long harangue by Thomas Reeve, a man who had suffered considerable hardship as an opponent of the revolution, in which he held revolutionaries to account.⁷⁰

While anniversary sermons are well known to historians as vehicles of governmental ideology during the reign of Charles II (and indeed afterwards),

⁶⁷ For the role of the press and the pulpit in government propaganda, see Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004), p. 36, and Christopher Durston, "For the Better Humiliation of the People": Public Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving During the English Revolution', *The Seventeenth Century*, 7:2 (1992), pp. 129-149.

⁶⁸ Montaña, *Courting*, p. 15.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 60, 64-65, 143-144, 148, 151, 154, 160, 160-161.

⁷⁰ Thomas Reeve, *A Dead Man Speaking Or the Famous memory of King Charles the I. Delivered in a Sermon upon the 30th of Jan: last, in the Parish Church of Waltham Abbey* (London, 1661). For Reeve's sufferings during the Revolution, see Jason McElligott, 'Reeve, Thomas (1593/4–1672)', *ODNB*, pp. xlvi, p. 346.

none of these scholars has acknowledged the *impact* of such preaching upon parishioners, many of whom would have been conscious targets. There is no way, of course, of 'listening in' to the thoughts of those who experienced such sermons. Nonetheless, throughout the reign of Charles II, there were numerous complaints made to Whitehall of what might be described as 'mis-commemoration' of 30 January and 29 May. In subsequent chapters, it will be argued that mis-commemoration can be associated with alternative views about the meaning of the revolution. Nonetheless, some evidence suggests that the decision to avoid church on these days reflected a desire not to be tarred with the brush of culpability for the past sufferings of royalists. Philip Henry, for instance, the Presbyterian minister at Worthenbury (Flintshire), made clear his feelings that the anniversaries ought not to be transformed into means of lambasting those, like him, who had supported parliament during the civil wars. For this reason Henry used his diary on 30 January 1665 to beseech God that he might 'forgive [th]e sin w[hi]ch is cal[le]d to rememb[er] this day', but also that he might 'let [th]e innocency of [th]e Innocent bee cleared up.'⁷¹ For Henry, it was crucial that, as the king had promised in May 1660, only a minority ought to face rebuke for the events of January 1649. It is of little surprise, then, that Henry looked on in horror as his fellow nonconformists were routinely castigated for the civil wars and the resulting Regicide in the years which followed. Indeed, on 29 May 1681, and at the height of the backlash against those who had called for the exclusion of James, Duke of York, from the succession, Henry complained that the day witnessed 'a general rayling ... in all the churches & chapels round about, which I am wel assured the lord hims[el]f wil in due time reckon for'.⁷² To be sure, a diary entry from a year earlier speaks of his weariness at preaching on the anniversary of the Regicide. 'With all due reverence to [th]e law markers', he argued, '[th]er is no warrant or president for such an observation in [th]e word of God' and although he did 'abhor' the Regicide, he '[li]ked] not [th]e annual commemoration of it, though p[er]haps many good men doe'.⁷³ From this aside that 'p[er]haps many good men doe',

⁷¹ Henry, *Diary*, p. 166.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 299.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 283-284.

it is possible to infer that Henry was not acquainted with many who were keen to observe the fast.⁷⁴

For Philip Henry, then, preaching on 30 January and 29 May was a task to be performed through gritted teeth. For others who dreaded the *attendance* of sermons on these days, it is possible that church was avoided altogether. Intriguingly, Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke, a participant in the revolution, made no references to having attended church on 30 January or 29 May in the first three years of Charles II's reign. In fact, on the anniversary of the Regicide in both 1661 and 1662, he recorded that he 'he went not abroad' and 'did not goe abroade' respectively.⁷⁵ It is conceivable, therefore, that Whitelocke did not attend church through a sense of guilt, or, perhaps more likely, a desire not to have guilt for the Regicide foisted upon him. It is thus plausible that some of those who also elected to avoid church on 30 January and 29 May did so for similar reasons.⁷⁶ In chapters 4 and 5 these refusals to attend 30 January and 29 May sermons will be regarded as a conspicuous representation of an individual's views about the revolution. For now, however, it is reasonable to argue that some of the disinclination to observe these anniversaries, which were often pervaded with anti-fanaticism, might have originated in a wish to avoid royalist censure.

The experience of censure was not, of course, confined to attendance at church. As Rosemary Dixon has demonstrated, sermons were often reproduced in printed form, reaching a considerably wider and more diverse audience as a consequence.⁷⁷ In fact, these sermons contributed to anti-fanatical rhetoric which emanated from the regime's second most effective propaganda tool, the press. In his recent study of memory after 1660, Matthew Neufeld has shown how the royalists' control over the press was

⁷⁴ For additional references to ministers who refused to preach on 30 January and 29 May, see TNA, SP 29/50/2; SP 29/55/16.

⁷⁵ Whitelocke, *Diary*, pp. 625, 642.

⁷⁶ For the avoidance of church on 30 January and 29 May, see TNA, SP 29/56/134; SP 29/113/63 I.

⁷⁷ Rosemary Dixon, 'Sermons in Print, 1660-1700', Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington and Emma Rhatigan (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 460-479.

responsible for the production of numerous ‘sanctioned histories’ after 1660, all of which were fiercely critical of the revolution.⁷⁸ As will become evident in chapter 4, the historiography of the period 1660-78 was entirely devoid of material which was sympathetic to the revolution. While it is not possible here to go into great detail about the contents of these histories, it suffices to transpose to the period after 1660 Andy Wood’s evocative statement that ‘the printed historical narrative ... formed a scaffold on which the opponents of authority were fated upon every reading, like Prometheus at his rock, to be ripped and torn over and over again.’⁷⁹ It would be erroneous to assume, however, that anti-fanatical invective was consigned to the pages of these, sometimes rather impenetrable official histories. Royalist censure was a mainstay of other, much livelier forms of propaganda, such as the regime’s output concerning current affairs. During the 1660s and 1670s, the production of printed (and manuscript) news was, in the words of John Patrick Montañó, ‘overseen by officials at court’.⁸⁰ For the regime, the steady stream of news provided an opportunity to demonstrate the threat of fanaticism with frequent references to the revolution.⁸¹ In July 1661, for example, the government newspaper, the *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, warned its readers that ‘that lying Spirit, which so long hath abused the good people of England, hath not yet left the old practice but lately has railed a bottomless fiction against some Members of the Honorable House of Commons’.⁸²

In addition to the news, the staunchly royalist Sir Roger L’Estrange used his role as the Surveyor of the Press to deregulate the production of anti-fanatical rhetoric. During the 1660s and 1670s, hundreds of pamphlets were produced – a handful of which have been considered already – which lambasted the ‘rebels’ and ‘usurpers’ of the revolution. While recent historiography has gone a long way in uncovering the wealth of such material in post-revolutionary Britain, its impact upon its readership has been overlooked. Historians have demonstrated the hunger for the press which

⁷⁸ Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, pp. 17-54.

⁷⁹ Andy Wood, *1549*, p. 238.

⁸⁰ Montañó, *Courting*, p. 203.

⁸¹ Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 174.

⁸² *KI*, 22-29 Jul. 1661, pp. 5-6.

existed in mid-century England and this did not wane at the Restoration.⁸³ After 1660, some of these consumers of print found themselves on the receiving end of the anti-fanatical invective on its pages. One such figure was Matthew Newcomen, a member of the anonymous 'Smectymnuus' group (providing the initials 'mn' therein) which had provided some of the strongest anti-episcopal polemic of the 1640s. After 1660, Smectymnuus were the targets of considerable derision in the press.⁸⁴ That Newcomen was aware that his role in the revolution had become a target of royalist attacks is reflected in an emotive letter which was written to the Presbyterian Richard Baxter in May 1661. In it he spoke of his concerns that 'wee are not onely Like to suffer but to suffer as Evill doers'.⁸⁵ There can be little doubt that Newcomen's sensitivity to the way in which the label of 'evil' had been cast upon him and his fellow churchmen made for an uncertain future. Indeed, the nonconformist Edward Bagshaw published his outrage at the kinds of anti-fanatical prejudices to which Baxter, on whose behalf he wrote, had been subjected. In 1662, he produced a response to the Bishop of Worcester's insinuation that nonconformists ought to make '*honourable amends ... by Confession and Recantation*'.⁸⁶ The response reiterated the importance of the Act of Oblivion, which was described as being 'so much forgotten',⁸⁷ and the Bishop was warned that nonconformists would 'resent this Malicious and Ill-grounded Fancy' and that it might 'make men Desperate, and thereby render the Peace of the Nation, and, in that, the prosperity and Welfare of His Majesty Insecure and Hazardous. For what can more enrage Men to take Wild and Forbidden Courses', asked Bagshaw, 'than to see even Preachers of the Gospel strive to widen their Wounds, and contrary to their own former Professions, to pull of that Plaister, which the Wisdom of our State Physicians had provided to heal our Distempers[?]'⁸⁸ Here, we might imagine that Bagshaw was speaking from experience when he referred to the 'rage'

⁸³ See Jason Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution* (Cambridge, 2013).

⁸⁴ Sir Roger L'Estrange referred to Smectymnuus in 1661 as 'the Sworn Patrons of the Cause' whose inclusion in the king's pardon might not serve them so well 'before the Great Tribunal' in Heaven, [L'Estrange], *A Caveat*, p. 27.

⁸⁵ Baxter, *Letters*, pp. 15-16.

⁸⁶ [Edward Bagshaw], *A Letter unto a Person of Honour and Quality, Containing some Animadversions Upon the Bishop of Worcester's Letter* (London, [1662]), p. 7.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

of those who were at the receiving end of royalist censure. Indeed, the more general ire which nonconformists experienced after 1660 is evident in the correspondence of a Mr Hooke to John Davenport, a founder of the New Haven colony in North America. Writing in March 1662, Hooke complained that 'the Presbiterians are in extreme contempt [and] there former forwardness to bring in the K[ing] not at all regarded'.⁸⁹

The continuation of the use of the press to propagate anti-fanaticism into the 1670s resulted in one of the strongest articulations of opposition to royalist censure. In 1672, Andrew Marvell used his satirical work *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* to fight back against Samuel Parker, a man whose *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1669) raised concerns that the toleration of nonconformists would lead to renewed civil war.⁹⁰ Responding to Parker, Marvell wrote a defence of both the Act of Oblivion and nonconformists, which is worth quoting in full:

But as to that [Mr Parker], which you still inculcate of the late War, and its horrid Catastrophe, which you will needs have to be upon a religious account: 'Tis four and twenty years ago, and after an *Act of Oblivion*; and for ought I can see, it had been as seasonable to have shown *Casars* bloody Coat, or *Thomas a Becket's* bloody Rochet. The chief of the offenders have long since made satisfaction to Justice; and the whole Nation hath been swept sufficiently of late years by those terrible scourges of Heaven: So that methinks you might in all this while have satiated your mischievous appetite. Whatsoever you suffered in those times, his Majesty who had much the greater loss, knowing that the memory of his Glorious Father will always be preserved, is the best Judge how long the revenge ought to be pursued. But if indeed out of your superlative care of his Majesty and your *Living*, you are afraid of some new disturbance of the same nature, let me so far satisfie you as I am satisfied. The Non-

⁸⁹ *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 8:4 (Boston, MA, 1868), p. 195.

⁹⁰ Greaves, *Enemies*, p. 151.

conformists say that they are bound in conscience to act as far as they can, and for the rest to suffer to the utmost.⁹¹

Here, Marvell reinforced his support for the Act of Oblivion, in which, as far as he was concerned, only those who brought about the Regicide ought to suffer.

In the evidence above, voices of dissent to royalists' attacks on oblivion are audible. It must be assumed, of course, that the individuals aforementioned were not alone in such views, but were merely the most vocal of a greater body of revolutionaries who looked on with disgust at an increasingly pervasive anti-fanaticism. Indeed, while the sorts of tracts produced by Samuel Parker would have been inaccessible for many of those who participated in the revolution, the deregulation of anti-fanaticism in print paralleled a deeper penetration of such invective. Other royalists, for example, produced anti-fanatical stage plays, the public performances of which could meet with resentment. In 1661, for example, the authors of *Mirabilis Annus* told of the acting out of a play in Ilminster (Somerset) in derision of what 'they call the Rump Parliament' or that which brought Charles I to trial. According to the authors, so hasty was one woman to go and see the play that she forgot to put out her fire, burning down her house and twenty-six others.⁹² Indeed, while David Bywaters has argued that the financial imperatives of dramaturgy after 1660 made neutrality more prudent than overt royalism, there were certainly a great many more plays during Charles II's reign in which revolutionaries were censured.⁹³ The words of the authors of *Mirabilis Annus* suggest that such plays were, as Bywaters has implied, in danger of offending those who had been involved in the revolution.⁹⁴

⁹¹ [Andrew Marvell], *The Rehearsal Transpos'd; Or, Animadversions Upon a late Book, Intituled, A Preface Shewing What Grounds there are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery* (London, 1672), p. 139.

⁹² [George Cockayne, Henry Danvers and Henry Jessey], *Mirabilis Annus, Or, The year of Prodigies and Wonders* ([London], 1661), p. [75].

⁹³ See David Bywaters, 'Representations of the Interregnum and Restoration in English Drama of the Early 1660s', *Review of English Studies*, 60:244 (2009), pp. 255-270.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

Another manifestation of the penetration of anti-fanaticism was the production of broadside ballads, the reception of which by a broad section of society has made the genre a growth area in histories of early modern popular culture.⁹⁵ As witnessed earlier, *The Cavaleers Letany* and *Here is some comfort for Poor Cavaleeres* were defined by opposition to oblivion and support for the propagation of critical versions of the recent past. Another ballad from the same period, entitled *The Joviall Crew*, followed this trend by constructing a 'model' royalist in opposition to a deviant fanatic. The ballad proclaimed that 'We raise no Rebellion, nor never talk treason' nor enter into a covenant 'With Shinkin ap Morgan, with Blew-Cap, or Tege' (derogatory terms for the Welsh, Scottish and Irish).⁹⁶ In other ballads, the retention of office by some of these 'rebels' was the source of anger. The author of *The Cavaleers Complaint* made the point that

... There are swarmes of Those;
 Who lately were our chiefest Foes,
 Of Pantaloons and Muffes;
 Whilst the Old rusty Cavaleer
 Retires, or dares not once appear
 For want of Coyne, and Cuffes.⁹⁷

Other ballads accused revolutionaries of changing their stripes at the Restoration and claiming public office as a result. In 1662, for example, *Your Humble Servant Madam* presumed to speak for revolutionaries in the line: 'The warrs are done, / And I must run, / A Course that may preserve me'.⁹⁸ In the same year, *The Cavaliers Comfort* was more explicit in its identification of

⁹⁵ Angela McShane, "'Ne sutor ultra crepidam": Political Cobblers and Broadside Ballads in Late Seventeenth Century England', Patricia Fumerton, Anita Guerrini and Kris McAbee (eds.) *Ballads and Broadsides in Britain, 1500-1800* (Farnham, 2010), p. 209; and Angela McShane 'Broadsides and Ballads from the beginnings of print to 1660', Joad Raymond (ed.), *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture: Volume 1, Britain and Ireland to 1660* (Oxford, 2011), p. 342.

⁹⁶ *The Joviall Crew, Or, Beggars-Bush* (London, [1661-1663]). McShane, *PBB*, no. 382.

⁹⁷ *The Cavaleers Complaint. To the Tune of, I tell Thee Dick, &c.* (London, 1661). McShane, *PBB*, no. 386.

⁹⁸ *Your humble Servant Madam: Being The flattering Courtier. Or, The Cheating Lover* (London, 1662). McShane, *PBB*, no. 393.

a 'true' royalist, against those who were accused of being mere 'dissembling Cavalier[s]'.⁹⁹ Some ballads were far more explicit in their attacks on revolutionaries. Marchamont Needham's ballad *The Cities Feast to the Lord Protector* (1661), for instance, made light of the City of London's allegiance to Oliver Cromwell during the 1650s.¹⁰⁰ In 1663, the popularity of ballads which accused revolutionaries of changing their coats at the Restoration experienced something of a boom.¹⁰¹

The authors of broadside ballads, then, were keen to define exactly who had and who had not been royalists, and this was often achieved through the depiction of the inherent rebelliousness and apostasy of English and Welsh revolutionaries. Indeed, such accounts continued beyond the 1660s. In 1674, for instance, two ballads were produced which identified the lingering threat of fanaticism which had disguised itself behind feigned loyalty to Charles II.¹⁰² One of these ballads, *The Geneva Ballad*, used its final verse to demonstrate how loyalty to the king (or lack thereof) continued to correlate with an individual's allegiances during the revolution. The author lamented that

[Nonconformists] cry, they love the King,
And make boast of their Innocence:
There cannot be so vile a thing,
But may be colour'd with Pretence.

⁹⁹ *The Cavaliers Comfort; Or, Long lookt for will come at last* (London, [1662]). McShane, *PBB*, no. 396.

¹⁰⁰ [Marchamont Needham], *The Cities Feast to the Lord Protector. To the Tune of Cooke Lorrell* (London, 1661). McShane, *PBB*, no. 389.

¹⁰¹ [Samuel Butler], *A Turn-Coat of the Times, Who doth by experience profess and protest, That of all his professions, a Turn-Coat's the best. Tune is, The King's Delight, Or, True Love is a Gift for a Queen* ([London, 1663]). McShane, *PBB*, no. 401X; [Samuel Butler], *Bloody News from Chelmsford: Or, A Proper New Ballad, Containing A true and perfect Relation of a most barbarous Murder committed upon the Body of a Country Curate, who died of a great Wound given him in the bottom of his Belly, by a most Cruel Country-fellow, for being too familiar with his Wife. To the Tune of Chevy Chase* (Oxford, 1663). McShane, *PBB*, no. 405; [Robert Wilde], *The Recantation of a Penitent Proteus, Or the Changling: As it was Acted with good Applause in St. Maries in Cambridge, and St. Pauls in London, 1663* (London, 1663). McShane, *PBB*, no. 407; *The nevv Projector Or the Privileged Cheat* (London, [1662]). McShane, *PBB*, no. 409.

¹⁰² [Samuel Butler], *The Geneva Ballad. To the Tune of 48* ([London], 1674). McShane, *PBB*, no. 474; [Samuel Butler], *Another Ballad: Called the Libertines Lampoone: Or, the Curvets of Conscience* (London, 1674). McShane, *PBB*, no. 476.

Yet when all's said, one thing I'll swear,
No Subject like th' old Cavalier,
No Traitor like Jack [Presbyter.]¹⁰³

It is important to stress, as Angela McShane has done, that these kinds of ballads 'could be heard or read, bought or memorised and were available at a small cost, or free as they were performed publicly at markets or fairs, on the street or in local hostelryes ... [and] pasted or pinned to the walls in homes, in alehouses and taverns or to posts in public spaces.'¹⁰⁴ Hence, it would have been very difficult for revolutionaries to avoid criticism for the events of the 1640s and 1650s. Moreover, that some of those who heard or read this ballad had resented its content is represented by the publication of a counter-ballad in 1674: *An Answer to the Geneva Ballad*. This ballad made a point of reiterating the important part which had been played by nonconformists in the Restoration and demanding that royalists 'Cease ... impertinently to Rant'. In contrast to royalists, the author showed how nonconformists did 'not *Recriminate* the case, / Nor make *boast* of our Loyalty, / But still with *thankful* hearts embrace, / Our Gracious *princes* clemency'.¹⁰⁵ In this evocative ballad, then, it is possible to see the strength of the feelings of nonconformists and revolutionaries about the persistent use of the past against them in spite of the Act of Oblivion. Indeed, considering the circulation enjoyed by ballad material, it might be argued that *An Answer to the Geneva Ballad* forms one of the most widely-received representations of opposition to anti-fanaticism from Charles II's reign.

Ballads do not solely reflect the words of an author, of course, but also words which would have echoed around innumerable coffeehouses, alehouses, inns and taverns. As such, broadside ballads supplemented a much wider *oral* culture through which anti-fanaticism was mediated. In June 1660, the degree to which society was penetrated by such prejudices was

¹⁰³ [Butler], *The Geneva Ballad*.

¹⁰⁴ Angela McShane Jones, 'Roaring Royalists and Ranting Brewers: The Politicisation of Drink and Drunkenness in Political Broadside Ballads from 1640 to 1689', Adam Smyth (ed.), *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 70.

¹⁰⁵ *An Answer to the Geneva Ballad* ([London], 1674).

amply demonstrated when one John White was provoked to censure two revolutionaries in his native Wiltshire. The first of these, one Robert Jefferies of Wootton Bassett, was referred to by White as 'an Annebaptist, a quaker & a rebbil against the King'. In other evidence, he was accused of saying at the election of the town's burgesses that Sir Walter St John of Liddiard Tragooze 'is not a man fit to be a Burgess for he is an Annabaptist a traytor and bore armes against the King at Wosterfight [i.e. the Battle of Worcester].'¹⁰⁶ Elsewhere, a Derbyshire man named James Hague was accused of saying similarly on 9 May 1661, that '[th]e Kinge was a foole and a knave if he made [the Act of Oblivion] not voyde, and hanged not upp all [th]e Roundeheads'.¹⁰⁷ In Hague's words, it is possible to witness not only the strength of anti-fanatical prejudices, but also the extent of royalist resentment about the comprehensiveness of the Act of Oblivion. What Hague's feelings about oblivion disguise, of course, is how ineffective the Act had actually proved to be. The abovementioned cases of the Wiltshire man John White represent a handful of allegations of breaches of the Act of Oblivion during Charles II's reign. In fact, Ronald Hutton has suggested that there was only one prosecution under the Act after 1660.¹⁰⁸ While Hutton has interpreted this statistic as evidence of the success of oblivion, it is probably a better reflection of the Act's *failure*. In other words, not only were royalists possessed of an authority to speak for the revolution, but those who were employed in local office could refuse to prosecute other royalists who breached the Act.

Since there are so few records of breaches of oblivion, the extent to which anti-fanatical language was an aspect of popular oral culture is often disguised. Nevertheless, it is possible to find evidence of such language in the accounts of those who were its *targets*. Accordingly, the reception of such language can be used as both a representation of its presence during the 1660s and 1670s and of its impact upon revolutionaries and

¹⁰⁶ B. Howard Cunnington (ed.), *Records of the County of Wilts, being extracts from the quarter sessions great rolls of the seventeenth century* (Devizes, 1932), pp. 235-236.

¹⁰⁷ J. Charles Cox, *Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals. As Illustrated by the Records of the Quarter Sessions of the County of Derby, From Queen Elizabeth to Queen Victoria* (London, 1890), ii, p. 68.

¹⁰⁸ Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 135.

nonconformists. One such example of the reception of this censorious oral culture comes from Buckinghamshire shortly before the Restoration, when the vicar of Upper Wichendon, Thomas Gilbert, who had taken his place during the revolution, complained that ‘tho’ I never carry’d incivilly in the least toward the cavalier party ... I am so much threatened by them, that I cannot (as they apprehend) by long safe among them.’¹⁰⁹ Indeed, Thomas Gilbert’s words appear to reflect that, as David Appleby has pointed out, recrimination could be physical, as well as verbal.¹¹⁰ Elsewhere, Samuel Smith, who was rector of Stanford Dingley in neighbouring Berkshire, lamented that ‘after the turn of the Times, he met with great unkindness from several of the Episcopal Party, whom he before had screen’d.’¹¹¹

One of the best records of the oral mediation of anti-fanatical prejudices and their impact upon revolutionaries is a rather surprising one. Between 1660 and 1662, George Cockayne, Henry Danvers and Henry Jessey produced the *Mirabilis Annus* tracts, which were intended both as a warning to the post-revolutionary regime and as succour for those who were experiencing its recriminatory policies.¹¹² As shall become evident in subsequent chapters, these tracts were often strongly sympathetic to the revolution, but they also included numerous references (many of which were likely to have been either fabricated or distorted) in which the mouthpieces of anti-fanaticism were confronted with disaster or untimely ends. In one instance, the authors related that a lady living near Charing Cross (London), having given ‘very bitter Invectives against the Parliament party’ to ‘A Gentleman of good quality’, was found to have died shortly afterwards.¹¹³ Another example related how a Mr Russell, an apothecary from the City of London, was heard to speak ‘most bitterly against Phanaticks’, and that many more of them should be hanged than had been at that point. When one of his audience responded that ‘he hoped that the blood which had been

¹⁰⁹ Quoted in *CR*, p. 221.

¹¹⁰ Appleby, ‘Veteran’, p. 329.

¹¹¹ *CR*, p. 448.

¹¹² Richard L. Greaves, ‘The Tangled Careers of Two Stuart Radicals: Henry and Robert Danvers’, *The Baptist Quarterly*, 29:1 (January 1981), pp. 34-35.

¹¹³ [George Cockayne, Henry Danvers and Henry Jessey], *Mirabilis Annus; Or, The Second Year Of Prodigies* ([London], 1661), p. [76].

lately spilt at *Charing-Crosses* and *Tyburn*, would satisfy him and rest of his Friends', Russell responded: 'no, we must have the blood of more of them yet, and so named divers persons who were formerly active for the Parliament, and if they might have the blood of those men he believed then they should be all satisfied, but not till then'. According to the authors, Russell, who perfectly summarised the royalists' beliefs about the breadth of guilt for the rebellion and usurpation, fell ill and died shortly afterwards.¹¹⁴

The authors also made a point of referring to the fates of those who had glorified in the deaths of the regicides executed between 1660 and 1662. In June 1662, for example, it was reported that 'a rude and debauched Person, who lived at the *Goat Tavern* in *Olaves Southwark*, did much rejoice at the death of Sir *Henry Vane*.' Deservingly, noted the authors, 'this man died vomitting up nothing but blood.'¹¹⁵ The glorification of the royalists' 'victory' could also lead to a sticky end. The third edition of *Mirabilis Annus* reported how a 'Prelatical Priest' from Derbyshire had died shortly after he had preached 'how the Episcopal Cause *had been dead and buried, yea, a seal had been set upon the Sepulchre, yet this Cause had a glorious Resurrection, &c.*'¹¹⁶ These were, of course, rather tall tales, but it must be taken into account that there was clearly a hunger for such literature. Indeed, for such material to have been profitable, at least some of its audience must have believed not just that anti-fanaticism might result in a grizzly death, but also that it held a mirror up to everyday life. The *Mirabilis Annus* tracts were not only a way of warning those who were responsible for censoring revolutionaries, of course, but also of reassuring those who experienced such censure that Providence was on their side.

The authors of the *Mirabilis Annus* tracts were not only conscious of the degree to which anti-fanaticism pervaded oral culture after the Restoration, but also of its manifestation in *ritual* culture. On 3 August 1662, for example, it was reported that an inhabitant of Bridgwater (Somerset) was 'extreamly

¹¹⁴ [George Cockayne, Henry Danvers and Henry Jessey], *Mirabilis Annus Secundus: Or, the Second Part Of the Second Years Prodigies* ([London], 1662), p. [77].

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. [40-41].

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. [41].

active in burning the Solemn League and Covenant, and was the Ring-leader of the Rabble that offered violence to it'. According to the authors, 'at night, this mans house was set on fire and consumed by it, and himself also burned in his bed; of which remarkable Providence and Judgment the whole Town hath taken great notice, and made their Observations upon it.'¹¹⁷ While historians have recognised the role which carnivalesque ritual played in government propaganda after 1660, it should not be assumed that it was merely foisted upon local communities. On the contrary, the burning of symbols of the revolution, such as the Covenant, was a common means of articulating anti-fanatical prejudices during Charles II's reign, particularly on the day of the king's coronation and on the anniversary of the Restoration. In Cambridge, for example, it was reported by the government's press that the town burned an effigy of Oliver Cromwell on coronation day.¹¹⁸ In a similar commemoration in Weymouth (Dorset), a flag which bore Cromwell's arms was burned.¹¹⁹ As part of their commemoration of the first anniversary of the Restoration, the people of Bury St Edmunds (Suffolk) took part in an elaborate ceremony in which an effigy of Hugh Peters, the revolutionary preacher, was dragged through the streets with a copy of the Covenant in one hand and the Presbyterian 'Directory of Worship' in the other. The effigy was later hung on a gibbet, together with a portrait of Oliver Cromwell and a list of the regicides. Atop the pile was a notice painted in capital letters which declared ironically 'THE COVENANT EXALTED', until 'All of which by a fire underneath, was burned to ashes, with the Shouts and Acclamations of a numerous multitude.'¹²⁰ The prominence of the Covenant in such displays was a result of the fact that, only a week earlier, Parliament had ordered for the document to be burned by the common hangman in public places throughout England and Wales.¹²¹ In York, a similar display involved the

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. [47].

¹¹⁸ *KI*, 28 Jan.-4 Feb. 1661, p. 72.

¹¹⁹ *KI*, 6-13 May 1661, p. 303.

¹²⁰ *KI*, 3-10 Jun. 1661, pp. 353-354.

¹²¹ Ronald Hutton has argued that these acts were resented by those who saw it as against the spirit of reconciliation, Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 155. In addition, similar orders were made relating to the acts for the establishment of Charles I's "High Court of Justice", for subscribing the Engagement to the Commonwealth and for the security of the Lord Protector's Person, *HPHC*, p. 38.

immolation of an effigy of John Bradshaw, Charles I's hanging judge and the first Lord President of the Commonwealth's Council of State.¹²²

These displays form part of a post-revolutionary carnivalesque culture through which anti-fanatical prejudices were mediated. In addition, they reflect quite how pervasive the censure of revolutionaries could be, dragging representations of the 'guilt' of revolutionaries into public spaces and making them almost impossible to ignore. That this was a troubling experience for revolutionaries is reflected in an interesting case from 29 May 1664, when eleven inhabitants of Towcester (Northamptonshire) complained of the actions of Thomas Jones, the town's constable, who had been 'formerly in actuall Armes against this present Government'. According to the information given against him, while the people of Towcester had been 'makeing of Bonfires & rejoycing according to our bounden duties', Jones 'together with his Tapster & [th]e rest of his family[,] violently together with his watch' went about 'Squenching [i.e. quenching] the fier[,] beateing[,] abuseing and haleing towards the Stockes these his Loyall Subjects.'¹²³ While the subtext of this information was Jones's disloyalty, which he strongly denied by arguing that two thatched roofs were endangered by the bonfire, it is of course possible that Jones had intended to extinguish a manifestation of the kinds of anti-fanatical prejudice which were experienced by revolutionaries on a regular basis.¹²⁴ Indeed, there is evidence which suggests that the desecration of the Covenant – an act which might have taken place in Towcester on 29 May 1664 – proved inflammatory for other revolutionaries. In September 1661, for example, one Mr Hobson was accused of saying that 'itt was a very rash act of the parli[a]m[en]t to burne the Covenant'.¹²⁵ Meanwhile, it was reported to the exiled regicide William Goffe that 'the Cov[enan]t was Burned in severall places of England, and carried in a disgracefull maner (fixed to Horse Tails) through the streets, with the effigies of the Protector, Hugh Peters, & others whom they had a mind to vilifie.'¹²⁶

¹²² *KI*, 3-10 Jun. 1661, pp. 353-355.

¹²³ TNA, SP 29/145/32 I.

¹²⁴ TNA, SP 29/145/32.

¹²⁵ TNA, SP 29/41/9.

¹²⁶ *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, p. 166.

Attacks on the revolution in public did not always involve bonfires, of course. Ralph Josselin, an Essex minister who was a vehement supporter of the revolution, came across, and indeed balked at, a rather different form of censure from those aforementioned. On 3 May 1661, he noted in his diary how, since his previous visit to London, a large 'triumphal arch' had been erected in honour of the king's coronation on 23 April.¹²⁷ Josselin was 'troubled' by the arch, noting its depiction of Charles I and his father, James I, in combination with the strikingly absolutist inscription: 'to the divine James, to the divine Charles, I give endless power'. In addition, Josselin noted other 'divers sad particulars on the face of the arch', including the Virgilian inscription 'En quo Discordia cives' ('Lo! [Into what miseries] hath discord brought the wretched citizens'), as well as the depiction of 'an effigie of stakes and fagots to burne people of the Heads of the regicides on poles. and warrelike Instruments broken.' Finding it difficult to ignore this symbolism, Josselin diarised his 'sad reflections on the vain flattery', praying that 'the lord [might] prevent villanous wickednes, but if surely it will not be sine fine [i.e. endless].'¹²⁸ Josselin was no staunch republican and welcomed the Restoration in 1660. Thus, it is necessary to view this troubled reaction as more than an expression of political opinion. Whatever Josselin's views about the returning king, his support for the English Revolution is well documented in his diary.¹²⁹ What is evident in his diary entry on 3 May 1661, then, is more consistent with a distressed response to the apparent use of the past as a stick with which to beat not only the regicides, but *all* of those whose role in the 'discord' of the previous decades was being gradually emphasised. In fact, Josselin's anxieties built steadily over the following fortnight until he was provoked to record his fears that 'the act of indemnity would bee unraveld'.¹³⁰

¹²⁷ See John Ogilby, *The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majestie Charles II, in His Passage through the City of London to his Coronation* (London, 1662), p. 21.

¹²⁸ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 479.

¹²⁹ On 24 September 1651, for example, Josselin wrote of having 'Kept a day of holy rejoycing to the conquering lamb', by which he was referring to parliament's victory at the Battle of Dunbar three weeks earlier, *ibid.*, p. 258.

¹³⁰ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 480.

Josselin's concerns about the king's triumphal arches paled in comparison to those of the Dorchester man Nathaniel Bond who was informed four months later that the body of his father, Denis, was to be disinterred from the vault in which it had been buried in Westminster Abbey and cast into an unmarked pit. His crime, Nathaniel was informed, was that his father, along with twenty others there buried, had supported the revolution. Although the order was written with 'his Majesties express pleasure and comand', it is likely that the disinterments were the brainchild of secretary of state, Sir Edward Nicholas, under whose hand the order was written.¹³¹ In order to support this theory it is necessary only to turn to Sir Edward's mawkish praise of the posthumous executions of Oliver Cromwell, John Bradshaw and Henry Ireton – all of whom were associated with the radical revolution of the later 1640s and 1650s – in the previous January. On 1 February, for example, Sir Edward wrote to his fellow royalist Sir Henry Vic that 'the arch-traitor Cromwell, and two of his choicest instruments ... finished the tragedy of their lives in a comic scene at Tyburn; a wonderful example of justice.'¹³² A week later, he gave a more detailed relation of events to Sir William Curtius, proclaiming to him that the posthumous executions had taken place 'in the view of thousands' who were 'attracted by so marvellous an act of justice.'¹³³ In the light of such evidence, the events of September 1661 might be interpreted as an attempt by Sir Edward to emulate the 'marvel' of the earlier exhumations. If this was the case, however, he appears to have been unable to secure an audience of 'thousands'. In fact, one of the most interesting aspects of the disinterments is that they do not seem to have attracted *any* attention from contemporaries and, as a consequence, modern historians.¹³⁴ Indeed, the episode did not find its way into the diaries of either Samuel Pepys or John Evelyn, both of whom had recorded witnessing the posthumous executions of January 1661. One way of explaining the lack of ceremony with which the exhumations took place would be that the government wished to divert attention from them. Sir

¹³¹ John Gough Nichols, *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica* (8 vols., London, 1843), viii, pp. 153-154.

¹³² *CSPD 1660-1661*, p. 500.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 506.

¹³⁴ For references to the event, see Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent*, p. 45. Achinstein describes the incident as 'an assault on cultural memory.'

Edward's desire to dig up the past would have been almost certainly regarded as an unnecessary provocation in a period when rumours of a revolutionary backlash to the Restoration were rife.¹³⁵ That Nathaniel Bond copied out Nicholas's order for the exhumations by hand is, no doubt, a haunting testimony of the effect that this event had upon him.¹³⁶

This evidence suggests that the authority to remember which the royalists secured from 1660 onwards had a huge impact upon those who supported the revolution. That the royalists' censure of revolutionaries found its way into preaching, print, song, everyday discourse, and other forms of public spectacle makes it possible to emphasise that it was an inescapable aspect of everyday life for those against whom it was targeted. That these royalist memories did not pass over the heads of revolutionaries is evident in the heartfelt reactions to anti-fanaticism in speech and writing. For some, like Nathaniel Bond, royalist censure took a particularly barbaric form. For others, however, remarks made at the local alehouse or in the street raked over the embers of the past. Nonetheless, all of these experiences – literal and metaphorical exhumations and posthumous executions of the revolution – were as vivid for those who had supported parliament in the early 1640s as those who had participated in the Regicide and the establishment of a Commonwealth. Control over the memories of the actions of revolutionaries, therefore, was one of the principal experiences of authority after 1660.

III

The evidence above demonstrates how far royalist memories constituted an experience of authority during the 1660s and 1670s. The royalists' interpretation of the revolution was not, however, transmitted solely as a means of demonstrating the dangers of fanaticism: it was also the ideological basis from which efforts to expurgate the threat of 'fanaticism' from society were legitimated. Hence, it can be argued that there was a second experience of authority after the Restoration: one which relied upon the recognition that the regime's attempts to secure religio-political uniformity in

¹³⁵ See Greaves, *Deliver*, pp. 65-70.

¹³⁶ Nichols, *Collectanea*, viii, p. 152.

the 1660s and 1670s were inextricable from royalist memories of the revolution. While this form of authority has pervaded hitherto all studies of memory in post-revolutionary Britain (see Introduction), the manner in which this authority was experienced have been overlooked. It is with such an analysis that this chapter will conclude.

In order to demonstrate how the authority which originated from royalist memories was experienced after 1660, it is first necessary to review the role which the past played in the regime's attempts to secure the Three Kingdoms from fanaticism. Within a year of its sitting, the Cavalier Parliament had passed an act which secured the ejection from parishes of those who had taken their places during the revolution and refused to conform to the Church of England. It is important to locate this act not only within attempts to ensure religious conformity, but also in the words of the Commons' Speaker, Sir Edward Turnour, to see it as a means of counteracting the effects of 'the late disputing Age', when 'some Men made it their Delight, to trample upon the Discipline and Government of the Church'.¹³⁷ Mark Kishlansky has described the Cavalier Parliament's legislation during the 1660s as its 'history lesson in the causes of the Civil War', and, when one reads this and other statutes from the period, it is easy to see why.¹³⁸ The Corporation Act of 1661, which provided an equivalent purge of political and religious dissent from corporate office, was similarly directed at the residual threats of 'the late Troubles'.¹³⁹ Meanwhile, in response to rumours of plotting against the government – which were often predicated on the 'seditious' practices of revolutionaries – parliament passed an act for the prohibition of the sorts of 'conventicles' within which such plots were supposed to have originated.¹⁴⁰ This act was renewed in 1670, partly in response to increasing anxieties that, in the words of one royalist, 'these unlawfull Asemblies looke ... too much like the forerunner of o[u]r Late sad

¹³⁷ *HPHC*, p. 54.

¹³⁸ Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (London, 1996), p. 229.

¹³⁹ Act of 13 Car. II, st. 2, c. 1 (1661). For an unrivalled analysis of the Act, see Halliday, *Dismembering*, pp. 90-105.

¹⁴⁰ Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, p. 135; Seaward, *Cavalier*, pp. 190-192.

rebellions'.¹⁴¹ The belief that such laws were intended to quash fanaticism is reflected as late as 1672, when a royalist implored the government (albeit unsuccessfully) to prevent a staunch opponent of Charles I from gaining a license to preach in the wake of the king's Declaration of Indulgence.¹⁴² Even before the passage of these penal laws, there is evidence to suggest more 'grassroots' efforts to ensure that those who had participated in the revolution would be purged from parochial office. In February 1661, therefore, attempts were made by the parishioners of both Winterborne Whitchurch (Dorset) and Newton Ferrers (Devon) to eject John Wesley and John Hill respectively. In order to do so, the parishioners informed the authorities that both of these men had justified the Regicide and applauded Oliver Cromwell before the Restoration.¹⁴³ The relative proximity of these cases, both chronological and geographical, as well as the similarity of the accusations made, could suggest that these attempts to discredit old revolutionaries were, in fact, co-ordinated.

In addition to this treatment of revolutionaries and nonconformists, the legislation of the Cavalier Parliament was wielded against forms of political participation. One of the earliest pieces of the parliament's legislation, for example, was an act which prohibited the 'tumultuous and disorderly preparing of Petitions' to parliament, which as 'sad experience' had taught 'have beene made use of to serve the ends of Factious & Seditious persons'.¹⁴⁴ Another, which is often referred to as the 'Sedition Act', spoke of the need to prevent the 'multitude of seditious Sermons[,] Pamphlets and Speeches dayly preached printed and published with a transcendent boldnes defaming the Person and Government of your Majestie and your Royall Father', which had resulted in 'the growth and increase of the late troubles & disorders'.¹⁴⁵ Shortly before Christmas 1661, Parliament's history lesson continued with the 'Licensing Act', which prohibited the sorts of 'heretical schismatical seditious and reasonable Bookes Pamphlets and Papers' which

¹⁴¹ TNA, SP 29/266/30.

¹⁴² TNA, SP 29/305/176.

¹⁴³ CR, p. 521; Greaves, *Deliver*, p. 25.

¹⁴⁴ On the relationship between this Act and royalist censure, see Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 129.

¹⁴⁵ Act of 13 Car. II. c. 1, sec. i (1661).

were again strongly associated with 'the general licentiousness of the late times'.¹⁴⁶ These three acts represent the extent of royalist fears, not merely of fanaticism, but also of the means through which its ideology had spread during the early 1640s.

In order to understand fully how royalist censure constituted experiences of authority, it is important to reflect on the fact that revolutionaries were conscious of the degree to which the legislative assault on dissent involved a critical interpretation of the revolution. Writing in what became his *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, for example, Richard Baxter complained of how common it had become for people 'to cast the Odium of Civil Broils upon Religion, and of other Mens Faults upon the innocent; so that there Interest will certainly lead them to call all those Rebels that swear not to their Words'.¹⁴⁷ His friend, William Bates, agreed, using his 'farewell sermon', prior to his ejection from his living at Tottenham (Middlesex) in 1662, to tell his parishioners how 'strange' it was

that when promises are made to bury all differences as rubbish under the foundation, that nevertheless the great work of many persons should be only to revive those former animosities, to make those exasperations fresh and keen upon their own spirits.

In Bates's view, this was all occurring

to promote divisions and disturbances amongst us, clothe their enemies with the livery of shame and reproach, that so they may be baited by their fury, that make it their design to represent that party which they think is dissonant from them, with the most odious appearances (you know this is the old art) and those showers of

¹⁴⁶ Act of 14 Car. II. c. 33, sec. i (1661).

¹⁴⁷ Baxter, *Reliquiae*, p. 217.

calumnies which are in the world, they usually precede the storm of persecution.¹⁴⁸

Languishing in Newgate gaol, the Quaker William Penn, whose father had been a prominent participant in the revolution, lamented the 1670 Conventicle Act in similar terms. 'We all hop'd', he argued, that 'the wisdom of our Rulers had long since laid aside, as what was fitter to be pass'd into an *Act of perpetual Oblivion*.'¹⁴⁹ Penn's words are significant for two reasons. Firstly, they reinforce the contention made earlier that the Act of Oblivion, or rather the efforts at reconciliation of which it formed the 'Corner-Stone', was viewed by some as being compatible with an extension of the Commonwealth's stance concerning religious toleration. Secondly, however, they suggest that Penn viewed the 'persecution' of nonconformists, of which the renewal of Conventicle Act was the most recent manifestation, as being inextricably tied to the *failure* of the policy of oblivion.

The pursuit of religious uniformity, then, was tied to the conception of nonconformity as the ideological predisposition for the renewal of rebellion and usurpation. Such prejudices also informed what might be described as 'extra-parliamentary' means of purging from the body politic those who had been in active service against the Stuarts during the 1640s and 1650s. In November 1661, for example, a proclamation was published 'for disarming the disbanded and cashier'd Officers and Soldiers, and to command them to depart twenty Miles from the City of London, for such time as his Majesty shall think fit.'¹⁵⁰ Such proclamations were common throughout the period, particularly in the wake of rumoured or anticipated threats to national security.¹⁵¹ The tentacles of such emergency orders appear to have extended beyond those who were in arms, since even Sir Bulstrode

¹⁴⁸ *Farewell Sermons of Some of the Most Eminent of the Nonconformist Ministers Delivered at the Period of their Ejection by the Act of Uniformity in the Year 1662* (London, 1816), p. 164.

¹⁴⁹ W[illiam] P[enn], *The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience Once more Debated & Defended* ([London], 1670), p. 9.

¹⁵⁰ *HPHC*, p. 48.

¹⁵¹ In the month following the passage of the Act of Uniformity in May 1662, for instance, the proclamation was renewed for a period which extended until Christmas Eve of the same year, see *CSPD 1661-1662*, p. 416.

Whitelocke, who had been ‘an Amb[assadou]r to the New Model Army’, was given reason to consider in 1670 ‘the safest way for him to forbear comming to London in Mich[aelmas] tearme upon the Proclamation.’¹⁵² The remnant of the New Model Army was often targeted by members of parliament who perceived them as the most serious threat to national security, despite the fact that these men had been promised government assistance in the societal reintegration of its members in September 1660.¹⁵³ David Appleby, for example, has illustrated how the government was able to dispense with several thousand revolutionaries by sending them on hazardous missions to the Iberian Peninsula and Tangiers during the 1660s, many of whom were to experience censure from their royalist officers.¹⁵⁴ In addition, he has revealed the manner in which the public purse was closed to those who had been wounded in action for parliament.¹⁵⁵ In what appears to have been a remarkably delayed act of retribution by the justices of Wiltshire, for example, two revolutionaries were struck off the county’s pension list in 1677 for having supported the revolution.¹⁵⁶

The resentment of revolutionaries about extra-parliamentary attacks on former officers is displayed in a passage from the diary of Samuel Pepys which related the famous diarist’s meeting with his friend and former servant of the Commonwealth, Robert Blackborne. Blackborne complained to Pepys that while the ‘Fanatiques’, as he called them, were generally ‘the most substantiall sort of people, and the soberest’, who went about their ‘green-apron’ professions in the capital ‘as if they never had done anything else’, the cavaliers went instead ‘with their belts and swords, swearing and cursing and stealing – running into people’s houses, by force oftentimes, to carry away something.’ Blackborne concluded that ‘the spirits of the old Parliament-soldier[s] are so quiet and contented with God’s providences, that the King is safer from any evil meant him by them, a thousand times more then from his

¹⁵² Whitelocke, *Diary*, pp. 759-770.

¹⁵³ This was called ‘An Act for enabling the Soldiers of the Army, now to be disbanded, to exercise Trades’, see Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 139.

¹⁵⁴ Appleby, ‘Veteran’, pp. 331-332.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 333-336; Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 130.

¹⁵⁶ Cunnington (ed.), *Records of the County of Wilts*, p. 259.

own discontented Cavalier[s].¹⁵⁷ For Blackborne, then, the use of the past to condemn those who had contributed to the Restoration and continued to keep the peace was grossly unfair. A year later, similar views were aired by another naval man, Captain Robert Williamson. In August 1664, Williamson, the commander of the naval vessel the *Harp*, expressed the ironic opinion that a probable future war with the Dutch would be ‘a fine warr’, since, in his view, the king had ‘given all his shipps to fooles and children and has layde all men aside that were fitt to comand because we were favoured by the late power’.¹⁵⁸ Williamson’s use of the word ‘we’, here – a slip of the tongue, perhaps – gave away his own service for the Commonwealth.¹⁵⁹

Part of the regime’s attempts to dispel the threat of fanaticism derived from its capacity to identify those who posed a threat.¹⁶⁰ In many instances, the regime’s identification of fanatics came from its knowledge of the comings and goings of revolutionaries after 1660. Throughout the state papers of Charles II’s reign, for example, it is possible to locate hundreds of references to the former ‘disloyalties’ of the king’s subjects: many more, in fact, than can be considered here in full. Following a rising in Berkshire against the repeal of the Triennial Act in 1664, for example, it was noted by Sir Thomas Doleman that the leader had ‘beene ‘A Rebell in [th]e Armies from his cradle’.¹⁶¹ At around the same time, Sir Philip Musgrave informed the government that one Robert Atkinson of Mallerstang (Westmorland), ‘was a Capt of horse in the tyme of Oliver & ... an active man for securing the kings freinds in that County when he had power’.¹⁶² The most prolific of these government agents was Richard Bower, a Great Yarmouth coffee-seller who spent much of the 1660s and 1670s informing Whitehall of local

¹⁵⁷ Pepys, iv, pp. 373-374.

¹⁵⁸ TNA, SP 29/101/74 I. For Williamson’s service, see John Charnock, *Biographia Navalis; Or, Impartial Memoirs of the Lives and Characters of Officers of the Navy of Great Britain. From the Year 1660 to the Present Time* (4 vols., London, 1794), i, p. 51.

¹⁵⁹ Pepys, i, p. 90.

¹⁶⁰ For the use of surveillance against revolutionaries, see; Tim Harris, ‘The problem of “popular political culture” in seventeenth-century London’, *History of European Ideas*, 10:1 (1989), pp. 146-147; Marshall, *Intelligence and Espionage*, passim.; Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 164; Appleby, ‘Veteran’, p. 333.

¹⁶¹ TNA, SP 29/96/129.

¹⁶² TNA, SP 29/95/111.

'fanatics' who sat on the town's corporation and frequented conventicles.¹⁶³ In one of Bower's most remarkable acts of prejudice, he sent to Whitehall a copy of the town's sympathetic address to Richard Cromwell in 1658, upon which he marked a 'P' (for 'Presbyterian') next to the names of those who remained 'at large' in the town.¹⁶⁴ Bower was not alone in the production of such lists. The painstaking efforts of the authorities in London, Staffordshire, Derbyshire and Hertfordshire provided the regime with lists of local revolutionaries.¹⁶⁵ Indeed, on some occasions royalists were provoked to make generalisations about the loyalties of entire towns. In Wrexham (Denbighshire) for example, two separate warnings were made in 1661 and 1662 about the town's infidelities during the revolution.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, in a bizarre attempt to dissuade the regime from favouring revolutionaries over royalists, the author of the second letter, Thomas Baskett, urged Whitehall to 'Trust Chavaleers', which, he claimed, was an anagram of his name.¹⁶⁷

As well as whole towns, the families of those who had been disloyal to the Stuarts during the revolution were subject to surveillance. In October 1665, for example, Sir Thomas Gower complained that William Sykes had been 'an Agent for [th]e Fanatiques, and disaffected party in Forraign partes, and is of their secret Councill' ever since 'his Maj[est]ies happy restauration'. Moreover, Gower saw fit to inform Lord Arlington that he was 'Brother to Rich. Sykes who maryed [th]e Traytor Tho[mas] Scots Daughter'.¹⁶⁸ That many royalists continued to see the Act of Oblivion as an obstacle to their prescription from public life of those who had been involved in the revolution was demonstrated perfectly in 1666 when an anonymous petitioner informed the king that the Act 'hinders their prosecuting their persecutors'.¹⁶⁹ Elsewhere, in his diary from the Restoration until his death in 1675, Sir

¹⁶³ See TNA, SP 29/212/74, 29/221/17; 29/235/86; SP 29/293/19, 101; 29/363/93; 29/379/46; 29/382/42, 42 I, 87; 29/383/74, 74 I; 29/400/19.

¹⁶⁴ TNA, SP 29/383/74, 74 I.

¹⁶⁵ TNA, SP 29/44/134; Ruth M. Kidson (ed.), 'Active Parliamentarians during the Civil Wars', Staffordshire Record Society (eds.), *Collections for a History of Staffordshire, Fourth Series, Vol. II* (Shrewsbury, 1958), pp. 43-70 (see also TNA SP 29/58/73); TNA SP, 29/66/35; 29/101/29 II; 29/143/138.

¹⁶⁶ TNA, SP, 29/41/2; 29/59/23.

¹⁶⁷ TNA, SP 29/59/23.

¹⁶⁸ TNA, SP 29/135/25.

¹⁶⁹ CSPD 1665-1666, pp. 477-478.

Bulstrode Whitelocke offers a rare glimpse into how such surveillance might have impacted on the lives of revolutionaries. Although Whitelocke had evaded attempts to except him from the king's pardon in 1660, much of the remaining fifteen years of his life were spent in anxiety about his association with fanaticism.¹⁷⁰ On 10 January 1661, for example, Whitelocke's house was searched in connection with the Fifth Monarchists' uprising of the previous week, for which Whitelocke wrote that he 'was sorry'.¹⁷¹ On another occasion, in May of the following year, Whitelocke was given a straightforward warning by the Earl of Clarendon that his association with the 'Phanatickes in the Citty ... might prove of ill consequence'.¹⁷² Clarendon's words were proven astute when in November 1663 suspicions of Whitelocke's involvement in the Farnley Wood plot, gave him 'much perplexity of thoughts'.¹⁷³

Not many revolutionaries were in such close proximity to the regime as Whitelocke after 1660, and it is likely that few of them were aware of the use of their names in the regime's bid to secure the Three Kingdoms. Nevertheless, it is known that the use of an individual's former 'disloyalties' to penalise them, and the loss of lives, liberties and estates which resulted, could have a much more visible impact on revolutionaries. In May 1666, for example, John Stent petitioned the king for his release from prison, telling him that he had been taken from his home in Surrey almost ten months beforehand and thrown into the Gatehouse prison in Westminster, only to be removed later to the Tower as a result of the spread of the plague. Stent told the king that, despite his support for parliament in the first civil war, he 'hath not acted or done anything prejudicial to yo[u]r Ma[jes]tie or Governm[en]t since yo[u]r gracious Act of Free and Generall Pardon', and that, without the king's assistance, 'hee and his Familie must inevitablie perish'.¹⁷⁴ Stent's words are especially important, because they represent how far he saw his being thrown into jail as a consequence of the regime's perception of

¹⁷⁰ Whitelocke, *Diary* pp. 600; 610.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 622-623.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 647.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 676.

¹⁷⁴ TNA, SP 29/157/33.

revolutionaries (of which he was one) as those who desired to stir up rebellion once more. Indeed, Stent saw himself as the sort of person who ought to have been protected from such abuses by the Act of Oblivion, which he cited. While Stent's fate is undocumented, it is possible that he became another victim of the regime's anti-fanaticism. For hundreds of revolutionaries who, like Stent, languished in gaols after 1660, the manifest institutionalisation of anti-fanaticism must have deemed experiences of persecution *indivisible* from experiences of recrimination.

Conclusion

As this evidence suggests, the flood of royalist censure after 1660 did not pass over the heads of revolutionaries. On the contrary, the royalist interpretation of the past reflects an authority to remember in the wake of the Restoration: one which had a demonstrable impact upon its targets. This experience of authority was not a natural consequence of the Restoration settlements, but derived from the fact that royalists were able to overthrow the Act of Oblivion and wrestle the authority to speak for the past from the hands of the king, who appears to have appreciated that peace relied upon a more thorough 'burial' of the past. In addition to this experience of authority, revolutionaries were well aware that the structural prejudice of anti-fanaticism, into which royalist interpretations of the past fed, was responsible for the ever tightening noose which the regime placed around the necks of nonconformists. Indeed, these experiences continued into, although had abated somewhat by, the mid-1670s. It was for this reason, no doubt, that Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury used his 1675 tract *Two Seasonable Discourses* to complain of those 'who to compass their Revenge, and repair their broken Fortunes, would hope to see the *Act of Oblivion* set aside, and this happy *Monarchy* turned into an *absolute, Arbitrary, Military Government*.¹⁷⁵ It is likely that similar concerns resulted in his belief that, as part of a long-running conspiracy to usurp parliaments, 'the High Episcopal Man, and the Old Cavalier' were 'tempted by the advantage

¹⁷⁵ [Anthony Ashley Cooper], *Two Seasonable Discourses Concerning this present Parliament* (Oxford, 1675), p. 10.

they may receive from overthrowing the *Act of Oblivion*'.¹⁷⁶ How far such a royalist conspiracy existed during Charles II's reign can be doubted. However, what is much less doubtful is that there were revolutionaries and nonconformists, like Shaftesbury, who resented the failure of a policy which was intended to disarm those who would weaponise the past against them. With these experiences of authority in mind, the full implications of the wealth of seditious memories which emerged in the wake of the Restoration might be considered.

¹⁷⁶ [Anthony Ashley Cooper], *A Letter From a Person of Quality, To His Friend In the Country* (1675), p. 1. Shaftesbury's authorship of this tract has been debated, see R. Milton, 'The Unscholastic Statesman: Locke and the Earl of Shaftesbury', Spurr (ed.), *Anthony Ashley Cooper*, pp. 165-166. Nonetheless, the similarity of the complaints about the overthrow of Oblivion in *Two Seasonable Discourses* could be taken to demonstrate that Shaftesbury was indeed the author of both.

2 – Seditious Memories: Re-imagining the Past, Present and Future, 1660-1678

The sufferings of nonconformists during the reign of Charles II have long interested historians of the later seventeenth century.¹ Since the mid-1980s, this persecution has been seen in terms of an ‘experience of defeat’, a concept which implies that the English Revolution comprised a series of ‘victories’ for nonconformists. Few of these experiences have captured the imagination of historians as much as those of the Quakers or the ‘Religious Society of Friends’.² Throughout the 1660s and 1670s, Quakers suffered criticism and punishment for refusing to conform to the Church of England, as well as an irreverence for traditional forms of authority. Moreover, Friends’ meetings were subjected to regular visits from ‘rude souldiers with naked swords, speares & halberts, & muskets cock’t’.³ One man whose experiences after the Restoration were typical of Quakers was George Taylor, who was thrown into gaol in 1667 for attending a meeting of Friends in Harwich (Essex), over two hundred miles away from his hometown of Kendal (Cumbria).⁴ Taylor’s troubles did not end here, however, as he was again to suffer, this time through distress of goods, for having attended a similar meeting at Kendal in 1684.⁵ Notwithstanding these episodes, it is important to acknowledge that Taylor’s experiences of authority were probably not limited to religious persecution. Indeed, together with the aforementioned Margaret Fell, Taylor had taken advantage of the religious freedoms of the 1650s by raising funds for itinerant Quakers in northern England, and, despite a short period of imprisonment in 1658, he served the Council of State a year before the return of Charles II.⁶ A conclusion which can be drawn from this additional information is that, as well as religious

¹ See Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers. Selections* (York, 2000).

² See Adams, ‘The experience of defeat’, pp. 249-268.

³ Elsa F. Glines (ed.), *Undaunted Zeal: The Letters of Margaret Fell* (Richmond, IN, 2003), p. 342. For the connection between Fell and Taylor, see *ibid.*, p. 89.

⁴ Greaves and Zaller, iii, p. 228.

⁵ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 228.

⁶ See *ibid.*, pp. 227-228; Glines, *Undaunted*, p. 89; Kate Peters, ‘Quakers and Print Culture in the 1650s’, Laura Lunger Knoppers (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 569-570.

persecution, Taylor also experienced the kinds of pervasive and persistent criticism for participation in the revolution which were outlined in chapter 1. Moreover, it is probable that Taylor was acutely conscious that the regime's persecution of the Quakers after 1660 was inextricable from the royalist interpretation of the revolution which fed into such criticism. It is likely, in other words, that Taylor, like thousands of revolutionaries, was cognisant of the royalist 'authority to remember' and the often punitive religio-political authority which this facilitated.

The purpose of speculating about George Taylor's experiences in the 1640s and 1650s is to comprehend something else which is known about him. On 9 April 1662, one George Taylor of Kendal was accused of articulating the following 'seditious' memories: 'it was a good day when the King's head was cutt off. There hath beene noe peace ... as ... in Oliver the Protector's time. It is a pitty but that all King's heads should bee cutt off'.⁷ While historians have used these kinds of views as evidence of 'political opinion' in the aftermath of the Restoration, the purpose of this chapter will be to argue that Taylor's memories, and those of dozens of other revolutionaries, can be given meaning in relation to common experiences of royalist attacks on the past. To this end, the chapter will consider several 'forms' of seditious memories – 're-imaginings' of the past, present and future – all of which will be regarded as facilitative of different *strategies* of contesting the meaning of the past and negotiating the experiences of authority to which royalist memories lent themselves. In the first part of the chapter, therefore, endeavours to *justify* the events of the past will be regarded as the means through which men and women legitimated participation in the revolution, and validated religio-political identities which were tied to experiences of the 1640s and 1650s. In doing so, it will be argued, revolutionaries were able to claw back the authority to remember which was lost from 1660 onwards. Thereafter, it will be suggested that the self-validation of 'revolutionary' identities led some individuals to continue to conceive of themselves long after the Restoration in relation to 'historic'

⁷ DCY, p. 94.

loyalties to Oliver Cromwell, the Solemn League and Covenant, the 'Good Old Cause', and so on. In part three, it will be argued that some revolutionaries, having legitimated participation in the revolution, were *nostalgic* for it in a manner which was solely *reflective*, and were thus able to 'reside' in an 'alternative reality' which was necessarily different from the present.

From this point onwards, the tack of the chapter will change from the *retrospective* to the *prospective* character of the act of remembering. In part four, therefore, the manner in which this nostalgia could be *restorative*, as well as merely *reflective*, will be investigated. Here, it will be argued that the construction of an image of the future from the ruins of the revolution enabled revolutionaries not merely to reclaim the authority to remember, but also to offer hope in the face of religio-political persecution. Throughout this chapter, an emphasis will be placed on how these processes were not the sole preserve of radicals, such as Taylor, but also those who had experienced a 'moderate' revolution: an adjective which will be used to signify support for parliament in the civil wars, but opposition to the Regicide, the establishment of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, as well as forms of religion which emerged or became popular during and immediately after the civil wars. Thereafter, the final section of this chapter will problematise the use of seditious memories as the basis upon which an individual's participation in a 'moderate' or a 'radical' revolution can be postulated.

I

The words for which George Taylor stood accused in April 1662 speak of his opinion that the radical revolution of the late 1640s, that which culminated in the trial and execution of Charles I in January 1649, had been *legitimate*. In the two years leading up to the expression of Taylor's seditious memories, similar views were heard throughout the Three Kingdoms. Most famously, the fourteen men who were executed between 1660 and 1662 for participation in the regicide of Charles I went to their deaths with a strong sense of the justice of the revolution. For example, the first of these regicides to suffer, Major-General Thomas Harrison, declared in his dying speech how

his revolution had been for 'the glory of God, and the good of his people, and the welfare of the whole Commonwealth' and that 'the Finger of God that hath been seen amongst us of late years.'⁸ Indeed, in the week which followed, several other regicides likewise refused to display remorse for the overthrow of Charles I. On 15 October 1660, for instance, when John Carew was dragged to the scaffold at Charing Cross, he was asked whether 'he had anything of conviction upon him as to what he was to suffer for?' Carew's blunt response was 'no' since, in his opinion 'the Lord hath and doth justifie' and 'the Lord hath justified it in the Field once already, in this Nation.'⁹ In the two days of bloodshed which followed, similar responses were uttered by the regicides John Cook (the king's chief prosecutor), Thomas Scot and Colonels Adrian Scroop, John Jones and Daniel Axtell.¹⁰ The last of these, speaking both for himself and Colonel Francis Hacker (who remained silent throughout), declared that 'I was fully convinced in my own conscience of the justness of the War, and thereupon engaged in the Parliament['s] Service, which (as I did and do believe) was the cause of the Lord.'¹¹ For the regime, of course, the refusal of these regicides to repent of the revolution in October 1660 compromised the purpose of this blood-letting, which, in the words of Howard Nenner, was to satisfy 'the kingdom's need to expiate its sin.'¹² When further punishment was meted out upon the regicides who were arrested in 1662, therefore, the regime took measures to prevent a repeat of the events at Charing Cross. Indeed, when the regicides John Barkstead and Colonel John Okey stood upon the scaffold at Tyburn in April 1662, the sheriff anticipated the inevitable by cautioning them separately 'not to ... speak anything in justification of that horrid Act.'¹³ Notwithstanding these efforts, Colonel Okey was as outspoken as his fellow regicides in his belief that the revolution had been 'for the glory of God, and good of his people; and had I had as many lives as hairs on my head, I would have adventured

⁸ *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the late King's Judges* ([London], 1660), pp. 7-8.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 28-36, 68-73, 74-76, 78-80, 88-96.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

¹² Nenner, 'The Trial', p. 23.

¹³ *The Speeches and Prayers of John Barkstead, John Okey, and Miles Corbet* (London, 1662), pp. 2-3.

them in that Cause ... I am satisfied as to the Cause.'¹⁴ Two months later, when Sir Henry Vane became the final regicide to endure the executioner's knife, his own justification of the revolution was drowned out by the blaring of trumpets.¹⁵ He too, however, remained convinced that the cause for which he suffered was that of God.¹⁶

The refusal of the regicides to show contrition on the scaffold is one of the enduring images of the early part of Charles II's reign; not least because defiance in last dying speeches was uncommon in early modern England and Wales.¹⁷ There is evidence to suggest, however, that revolutionaries who *had not* been involved in the events of January 1649 directly, such as the aforementioned George Taylor, felt the need to justify them nonetheless. In December 1660, for instance, Nehemiah Beaton, the rector of Little Horsted (East Sussex), was indicted for having justified the Regicide from the pulpit on the basis that Charles I had married '*that harlot and adulterous woman* (Henrietta Maria)'.¹⁸ Such views were indeed common in 1660. Elsewhere, for example, one Christopher Highton of Southampton said 'that King Charles the first ... was a Traytor.'¹⁹ Since treason was the principal indictment against Charles I in January 1649, the words for which Highton stood accused cannot be detached from a sense of the justice of the Regicide. These views were not confined to men, however. Less than a month after these two cases, for instance, Margaret Osmond of Ealing (Middlesex) was accused of evincing that '[the] Kinges Majestie [who] is dead was lawfully put to death'.²⁰ While the indictment of women for seditious words in the seventeenth century is unusual, the case of Margaret

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁵ *The Tryal of Sir Henry Vane, Kt. At the Kings Bench, Westminster, June the 2d. and 6th. 1662 ... Also his Speech and Prayer, &c. on the Scaffold (s. l., 1662)*, p. 88.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 88-92.

¹⁷ J. A. Sharpe, "Last Dying Speeches": Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in Seventeenth-Century England', *Past & Present*, 107 (May 1985), p. 155.

¹⁸ Nehemiah Beaton, *No Treason to Say, Kings are Gods Subjects* (London, 1661), p. [xi].

¹⁹ Sheila D. Thomson, *The Book of Examinations and Depositions before the Mayor and Justices of Southampton 1648-1663* (Southampton, 1994), p. 186.

²⁰ *MCR*, iii, pp. 304-305.

Osmond reflects the politicisation of women both during the English Revolution, *and* into the post-revolutionary era.²¹

In addition to this straightforward justification of the Regicide, there were other, more oblique, means by which individuals might legitimise the radical revolution of the 1640s and 1650s. Principal among these was a seventeenth-century equivalent of the 'myths of betrayal' which were formulated in the wake of the Confederacy's defeat in the American Civil War, and Germany's defeat in the First World War.²² Rather than incompetent officers or weak-willed politicians, however, the later seventeenth-century, 'revolutionary' myth of betrayal focused on those who, while evincing loyalties to the Commonwealth, had brought about the Restoration in 1660. The parliamentarian whose name became almost synonymous with this 'treachery' was General George Monck, later the Duke of Albemarle. Following a decade of service in the New Model Army, Monck brought about the defeat of both the radical and republican resurgence of 1659, and the restoration of Charles II a year later, actions for which he was bestowed with a dukedom by the king, and, in 1670, the most lavish state funeral since that of Oliver Cromwell.²³ For radicals such as Edmund Ludlow, however, Monck was undeserving of acclaim. Instead, he was 'a man voyd of all faith and honesty' who was responsible for 'so horrid a treachery and ... impiety as no age could parallel' and, most dramatically, 'that monster of mankind the devill's great instrument in this chandge.'²⁴ Notwithstanding this fierce criticism of Monck, resentment about the General was not confined to

²¹ For women and seditious words prosecutions, see Andy Wood, 'The queen is a goggyll eyed hoore': gender and seditious speech in early modern England', Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The English Revolution c. 1590-1720: Politics, Religion and Communities* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 81-94. For the politicisation of women during the English Revolution, see Keith Lindley, 'London and popular freedom in the 1640s', R. C. Richardson and G. M. Ridden (eds.), *Freedom and the English Revolution: Essays in history and literature* (Manchester, 1986), p. 139; and Dagmar Freist, *Governed by Opinion: Politics, Religion and the Dynamics of Communication in Stuart London, 1637-1645* (London, 1997), p. 178.

²² Gary W. Gallagher, 'Introduction' in Gary W. Gallagher and Alan T. Nolan (eds.), *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History* (Bloomington, IN, 2000), p. 1. For the notion of 'myths of betrayal', see Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery*, trans. by Jefferson Chase (London, 2003).

²³ See *London Gazette*, 28 Apr. 1670, pp. 1-2. For the beatification of Monck, see Appleby, 'Veteran Politics', p. 326.

²⁴ A. B. Worden (ed.), *Edmund Ludlow, A Voyce from the Watch Tower, Part Five: 1660-1662* (London, 1978), pp. 94, 115, 200.

those who were involved in the Regicide. In conversation with his friend Samuel Pepys, Robert Blackborne, sometime servant of the Commonwealth navy, remarked how Monck was 'a most perfidious man, that hath betrayed everybody'.²⁵ Elsewhere, in September 1661, one Major Willoughby, a prisoner at the Fleet, remarked bitterly that 'that Monck was a bloody man' and 'that hee broke his Oath to the Parliam[en]t'. Willoughby added that Monck's true intentions had been 'to make himselfe as greate as the Protector, but things hapning otherwise, hee was forc't to bring in the King'.²⁶

Monck, while a figure of loathing, was not the sole 'traitor' of the revolution, of course. Sir George Downing, who arrested the three regicides executed in April 1662, came in for similar criticism from revolutionaries. Ludlow, for instance, described him as a man who 'quits conscience, religion, morality, humanity and all obligations to God and good men, and treacherously embrews his hands in the blood of ... innocent persons'.²⁷ Other targets of these myths of betrayal were those who, in setting up the Protectorate in 1653, were regarded as having forestalled efforts at radical political and religious reform, thereby paving the way for the Restoration. Writing from prison at some point after 1663, for instance, Robert Overton advised his readers not to 'live ... licorish after chainge, for feare (as formerly) of beinge cheated.' Indeed, asked Overton, 'why may not future ages (as well as former) finde a Crumwell or a Munke to foole & unman them?'²⁸ The myth of betrayal was extended to a much wider group, and framed in firmly millenarian language, in a radical pamphlet of 1667, which decried those who had '*delivered us into the hands of beastly bloody men*'.²⁹

All of this evidence suggests that there were men and women who continued to feel, as the regicides had felt on the scaffold in October 1660,

²⁵ Quoted in Greaves, *Deliver*, p. 23.

²⁶ TNA, SP 29/49/18.

²⁷ Worden, *Voyce*, p. 297.

²⁸ Robert Overton, *Governments Gaine & Goodnesse &c*, p. 38, quoted in Barbara Taft, "'They that pursew perfection on earth...': the political progress of Robert Overton", Ian Gentles, John Morrill and Blair Worden (eds.), *Soldiers, writers and statesmen of the English Revolution* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 303.

²⁹ *The Saints freedom from tyranny vindicated, or, The power of pagan caesars and antichristian kings examined* (London, 1667), p. 34.

that the radical revolution of the 1640s and 1650s had been legitimate. In order to explain why these opinions were held, it is necessary to invoke the circumstances in which the supporters of this revolution found themselves after the Restoration. In reality, the regicides were not the only ones who were condemned for the trial and execution of Charles I. It is likely that the men and women aforementioned would have faced, directly or otherwise, the kinds of royalist censure to which the previous chapter referred. The decision which erstwhile radicals had to make after May 1660, therefore, was either to distance themselves from their revolution, or to justify it. This was not a straightforward choice, however. For those who supported the radical revolution in general, and particularly the events of January 1649, it had been essential to ascribe meanings to these experiences which legitimated them. Thus, as historians have demonstrated, it was common to interpret the Regicide and the establishment of the Commonwealth as the consequence of divine providence, or as lawful.³⁰ The result of this process was the creation of what could be described as a radical 'revolutionary' identity. In continuing to justify the revolution after the Restoration, therefore, men and women were re-ascribing these meanings to experiences of the past, and self-validating these radical revolutionary identities. This process responded to the fact that, in winning the authority to remember, royalists were challenging the meaning of the past. Hence, a sense of the legitimacy of participation in the revolution offered a crucial means by which this experience of authority could be negotiated. For the men who awaited brutal execution in October 1660, and were expectant of the judgment of God thereafter, this process of self-validation was imperative. Indeed, that memory could be powerful in this regard might help explain Major-General Thomas Harrison's well-known composure on the scaffold in October 1660, when he 'look[ed] as cheerful as any man could do in that condition.'³¹

³⁰ For the ways in which the Revolution was justified in relation to Providence and 'holy war', see Carlton, *Going to the Wars*, p. 62; Durston, "For the Better Humiliation", pp. 145-6; Edward Vallance, 'Preaching to the Converted: Religious Justifications for the English Civil War', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 65:3-4 (2002), pp. 395-6.

³¹ Pepys, i, p. 265.

Earlier, it was discovered that royalist censure was experienced by many more than those who had supported the Regicide. In fact, the vast majority of those who, despite opposing the radical revolution described above, participated in opposition to Charles I from 1625 to 1649 were tarred with the brush of 'rebellion', 'usurpation' and, above all, 'fanaticism'. Hence, some of these 'moderate' revolutionaries were also keen to legitimate participation in the revolution. Prominent amongst these was Richard Baxter, a puritan minister and vociferous supporter of parliament's opposition to Charles I, who later distanced himself from the radical revolution of the late 1640s. Indeed, Baxter was enthusiastic to establish that the 'true' revolution, of which he had been a supporter, had been *betrayed*. Unlike the myths of betrayal described above, however, Baxter blamed religious radicals – particularly those within the New Model Army – for derailing efforts at a godly 'reformation'. While Baxter was never accused of articulating 'seditious memories', he used his private memoirs as a means of lamenting that 'Never were such fair opportunities to sanctifie a Nation, lost and trodden under foot, as have been in this Land of late! Woe be to them that were the Causes of it.'³² Baxter recapitulated these views at the very end of his life when he wrote that it had been the religious radicals who had

*caused our former Confusions, and pull'd down after the King, the Parliaments of all sorts, the Protector and one another, till they set up their Quarters over the Gates, and pluckt up the Floodgates that have these Thirty years overwhelmed us, and hazarded all the Reformation.*³³

Baxter's justification of his parliamentarianism could be more direct than this, however, and he often cited his and the nation's terror in the wake of the Irish Rebellion of 1641, as well as his belief 'that the Church itself was deeply in

³² Baxter, *Reliquiae*, p. 97.

³³ Richard Baxter, *Church Concord* (London, 1691), p. [ix].

danger by *Persecution* and *Arminianism*.³⁴ More positively, Baxter remained convinced of 'Parliaments good endeavours for Reformation ... [which] much swayed my Judgment in the Matter of the Wars.'³⁵

Other moderate revolutionaries shared Baxter's views about the past. Lord General Thomas Fairfax, for example, the celebrated parliamentary commander of the first and second civil wars, wrote in similar terms in his *Short Memorials*. In relation to this autobiographical work, Andrew Hopper has argued recently that Fairfax's 'aim in writing the first memorial was to blame treacherous officers, agitators and a "levelling faction" for the purge of Parliament, the King's death and establishment of the republic.'³⁶ While this is undoubtedly true, that his transferral of guilt implied the *legitimacy* of his own involvement in the civil wars should not be overlooked. Indeed, the wars had been a time which, as Hopper has admitted, Fairfax recorded 'with a pride that his modesty struggled to suppress.'³⁷ Like Baxter, Fairfax was almost certainly embittered by how the 'true' revolution of the 1640s had been derailed by radicalism. Other moderate revolutionaries shared these opinions. One of these was the nonconformist minister, Richard Stretton, who, at Fairfax's funeral in 1671, justified the general's actions during the civil wars in relation 'to the will of God.'³⁸ Clearly, then, moderate revolutionaries were keen to point out how the true revolution of the 1640s had been derailed. Indeed, it is conceivable that these kinds of opinions were the basis of what became known as the 'Prynne Theory', or the historical narrative which cited the 'papists' as those responsible for hijacking the legitimate actions of the Long Parliament, and leading the Three Kingdoms into regicide. Named after William Prynne, whose rabid anti-Catholicism and complex relationship to his own involvement in the revolution coloured these claims, this theory was commonplace after the Restoration.³⁹ To take one

³⁴ Richard Baxter, *Catholick Theologie: Plan, Pure, Peaceable for Pacification Of the Dogmatical Word-Warriours* (London, 1675), p. [iii].

³⁵ Baxter, *Reliquiae*, p. 39.

³⁶ Hopper, 'Black Tom', pp. 225-226.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 225.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

³⁹ See Jeffrey Collins, 'Restoration Anti-Catholicism: A Prejudice in Motion', Charles W.A. Prior and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *England's Wars of Religion Revisited* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 302-302; For uses of the "Prynne Theory" during the Popish Plot of 1678, see Harris,

example, in 1662, the nonconformist pamphleteer Ralph Wallis described the overthrow of Charles I as 'a trick of the old Whore [i.e. Roman Catholicism] ... by taking away his prerogative-Royal, annihilating and making of no validity his Laws.'⁴⁰

Irrespective of the strength of the opinions of Richard Baxter and Thomas Fairfax, neither were willing to risk charges of sedition by publishing their memoirs during their lifetimes.⁴¹ That other moderates did fall afoul of the regime's interpretation of the justification of parliament's opposition to Charles I, suggests that this caution was not misplaced. In 1661, for example, Samuel Fox, a slater living in Staffordshire, was convicted for saying that 'the old King was the causer of the Irish Rebellion'.⁴² Elsewhere, other revolutionaries were accused of evoking the king's treachery in bringing about the fall of the moderate revolution. In June 1663, for example, Samuel Lewys, a merchant tailor living in London, said that 'wee were made to believe when the King came in That we should never pay any more taxes. If wee had thought he would have taxed us thus, hee should never have come in.'⁴³ In December 1662, John Elliot, a prisoner at Ilchester, Somerset, said likewise that 'the kinge made promises while hee was beyond [th]e seas & was ashamed of what hee had done.'⁴⁴ In both of these cases, the speaker identified with the revolution, but did so in such a way which implied support for the Restoration. Indeed, by suggesting that they had been 'betrayed' by the king's promises in the Declaration of Breda (1660), Lewys and Elliot were legitimating a moderate revolution with which the return of the monarchy had been entirely compatible.

A sense that the moderate revolution of the 1640s and 1650s had been legitimate was thus held deeply after the Restoration. Surprisingly, this was

London Crowds, p. 97; and John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England: 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 155-156.

⁴⁰ [Ralph Wallis], *Rome for good News, Or, Good News from Rome: In a Dialogue between a Seminary Priest, and a Supposed Protestant, at large* (London, [1662]), p. 22.

⁴¹ See Hopper, 'Black Tom', p. 227.

⁴² Quoted in Sharp, 'Popular political opinion', p. 17.

⁴³ Quoted in Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 61.

⁴⁴ TNA, SP 29/65/19.

most evident in the abovementioned scaffold speeches of the regicides, most of whom appear to have been as, if not more, keen to salvage parliament's cause from royalist rebuke than the trial and execution of Charles I. On 17 October 1660, for example, when Thomas Scot, a commissioner at Charles I's trial, came to the scaffold, he justified his support for parliament in terms of his perception that 'Liberties and Religion in the Nation' had been 'in great danger' from 'the approaches of Popery in a great measure.'⁴⁵ Two days later, the Officer of the Guard at Charles I's trial, Daniel Axtell, provided an account of his actions which went into greater detail, arguing that the 'Cause' for which he fought had been 'for common Right and Freedom, and against the Surplis and Common-prayer-book.'⁴⁶ The last person to be executed for the Regicide in June 1662, Sir Henry Vane, cited 'the Remonstrance of the House of Commons' and the Solemn League and Covenant as where 'the Cause ... did first shew it self.'⁴⁷ This evidence points to the fact that it was just as important for those who had participated in the revolution to justify the original opposition to Charles I as it was to justify the Regicide or the establishment of the republic. Once more, this ought to be understood in relation to the fact that the entirety of the revolution had involved efforts to ascribe certain meanings to unprecedented actions, particularly the Providence of parliament's victories from 1646 onwards and the 'reformation' of the parishes thereafter. Put differently, it was crucial for those who partook in the revolution to demonstrate to themselves, and others, that their Cause had received divine approbation. In other words, in order for moderate revolutionaries to validate their moderate revolutionary identities, it remained crucial for them to demonstrate the endurance of meanings which had been attached to the events of the revolution: particularly that a 'true' revolution had been derailed by religio-political radicalism after the first civil war. In the aftermath of the Restoration, and in the face of a broad-brushed attack on the revolution, this self-validation became crucial for moderates, enabling them to reclaim the authority to remember.

⁴⁵ *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the late King's Judges*, p. 68.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

⁴⁷ *The Substance of What Sr. Henry Vane Intended To have Spoken upon the Scaffold, on Tower-Hill, At the Time of Execution, Being the 14th. Of June, 1662* (London, 1662), p. 4.

II

Through their re-imagination of the revolution, those who had participated in it revived identities which the Restoration settlements of 1660 had sought to suppress. It is unsurprising, then, that some men and women disclosed continued identification with the revolution after 1660. The regicide Thomas Harrison, for example, did not merely justify what he called the 'Good Old Cause' in October of that year; he was able to clasp his hand to chest and to declare that it remained in his heart.⁴⁸ These kinds of beliefs were not uncommon after 1660, particularly in relation to the idea of the Good Old Cause, a term which was popularised in the mid- to late-1650s as a means of highlighting how the Protectorate in general, and Oliver Cromwell in particular, had wrecked any chances of establishing a godly commonwealth.⁴⁹ The exiled regicide Edmund Ludlow, for instance, made over a hundred references to the 'Cause' for which he was exiled in his memoirs after 1660, twice referring to a 'Good' or 'Good Old' Cause.⁵⁰ Elsewhere, in October 1664, George Smith, a prisoner for debt at York Castle, provided evidence in which two men – William Smithson and John Thackwray of South Stainley (North Yorkshire) – were accused of asking him whether 'he would be a Trumpetter' for 'the good ould cause'.⁵¹ It is probable that these references to the Good Old Cause connoted a specifically republican identity which was bound up with the Commonwealth of 1649-1660. Elsewhere, the expression of this identity was more explicit. Robert Danvers, for instance, the self-styled Viscount Purbeck, was accused of declaring towards the end of 1660 that 'he would be true to his former principles against his ma[jest]ie'.⁵² Others identified specifically with the Regicide, such as the Welshman Arthur Morris, who, amongst other seditious statements, spoke of his pride in being 'one of the threescore that had a hand in putting the late King to death'.⁵³ In another unusual case, John

⁴⁸ *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the late King's Judges*, pp. 6-7.

⁴⁹ See A. H. Woolrych, 'The Good Old Cause and the Fall of the Protectorate', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 13:2 (1957), pp. 133-161; Annabel Patterson, *Reading between the Lines* (London, 1993), pp. 210-275.

⁵⁰ Worden, *Voyce*, passim.

⁵¹ TNA, SP 29/103/124 II.

⁵² TNA, SP 29/28/80.

⁵³ TNA, SP 29/67/105.

Wilson, an officer of the excise, expressed his opinion that the king 'deserved to bee whipt from towne to towne for comeing to Worcester'. While there is no record that Charles travelled to Worcester in 1661, Clarendon told the Cavalier Parliament at its opening in May 1661 that such a visit had been intended.⁵⁴ Harking back to the reward which had been offered for the king's capture following the Battle of Worcester on 3 September 1651, Wilson declared that 'if hee could catch yo[u]r Ma[jes]ty hee would for [tha]t [£1000] pull yo[u]r skynn over yor eares'.⁵⁵ Clearly, then, Wilson was unwilling to lay to rest the notion of the king's 'treason' against a Commonwealth with which he continued to identify.

Besides the Good Old Cause and the Commonwealth, it was also common for revolutionaries to identify with their former leaders. The Londoner Henry Zouch, for instance, continued to identify with Oliver Cromwell, and claimed in August 1662 that 'if Oliver [Cromwell] were alive, I would fight for him before any man in England for money'.⁵⁶ Posthumous loyalties to Oliver were, in fact, among the most common manifestations of identification with the revolution. One Mr Gill, for example, a tucker from Wimborne (Dorset), spoke in April 1664 of his belief that Cromwell had been 'taken away for [th]e sinnes of [th]e people'.⁵⁷ One frequent manifestation of enduring loyalties to Oliver took the form of comparisons between him and Charles II. Before the quarter sessions held at Richmond (North Yorkshire) in July 1662, therefore, an anonymous yeoman from nearby Westhorpe was held to account for saying 'that Cromwell and Ireton was as good as the King'.⁵⁸ Here, the yeoman evoked the name of Oliver's son-in-law, the regicide Henry Ireton, suggesting perhaps that he had fought under him during the civil wars. Elsewhere, other revolutionaries identified with wartime leaders who, unlike Oliver Cromwell and Henry Ireton, had survived the Restoration. One of these was Oliver Cromwell's son, Richard, who had served as Lord Protector between his father's death in September 1658 and

⁵⁴ *HPHC*, p. 37.

⁵⁵ TNA, SP 29/47/76.

⁵⁶ *MCR*, iii, p. 326.

⁵⁷ TNA, SP 29/96/37.

⁵⁸ J. C. Atkinson (ed.), *Quarter Sessions Records [North Riding of Yorkshire]* (9 vols., London, 1888), vi, p. 58.

his resignation in May 1659.⁵⁹ It was more common, however, to state continued allegiance to General John Lambert, a potential successor to the Protectorate in the wake of Richard Cromwell's resignation, who was imprisoned after the Restoration. In May 1662, for example, a Somerset man named John Steevens threatened that 'if General Lambert were put to death', as the three captured regicides had been a month earlier, 'there would and should be bloody noses.'⁶⁰ One enigmatic figure, William Burman of Dartford (Kent), was heard to identify with neither the Cromwell family nor John Lambert, but with John Lilburne, the famous Leveller leader. In August 1678, therefore, he said in Sandwich (Kent) that 'I am for noe king in England nor for any head of [th]e church but Jesus Christ' and that 'I was formally [sic] acquainted with John Lilbourne, and was privy to all his affaires and undertakeings'.⁶¹

What these cases appear to suggest, therefore, is that revolutionaries continued to conceive of themselves as such after the Restoration. Further evidence implies that this self-perception could involve seeing *others* as possessive of royalist identities as well. Among the most common manifestations of this negative form of identification was the use of the term 'cavaliers', which stood for a raft of stereotypes,⁶² such as the contention that 'royalists were beggarly ne'er-do-wells, hoping to enrich themselves by the sword',⁶³ or the idea of the 'unEnglish' crypto-papists, who were susceptible to 'drunkenness, swearing and sexual excess'.⁶⁴ In November 1661, for example, William Ivey of Wincanton (Somerset) said that 'it would have been better for him if all the cavaliers had been hanged 7 years ago', implying thereby that many of these cavaliers still existed.⁶⁵ Elsewhere, over the county border in Bradford-on-Avon (Wiltshire), a seditious conversation

⁵⁹ See TNA, SP 29/150/5, 29/195/3.

⁶⁰ SRO, Q/SR/102/68.

⁶¹ TNA, SP 29/406/102.

⁶² Lloyd Bowen has argued that the badges of 'Roundhead' and 'Cavalier' 'carried a potential wealth of meanings in particular contexts and were important in constituting political group identities', Bowen, 'Seditious speech', p. 56.

⁶³ Ian Roy, 'Royalist reputations: The Cavalier ideal and the reality', Jason McElligott and David L. Smith, *Royalists and Royalism during Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), p. 91.

⁶⁴ Hughes, *Gender*, pp. 93, 95.

⁶⁵ SRO, Q/SR/101/33.

concerning 'bishops and cavaliers' was overheard a year earlier.⁶⁶ From these examples, the extent to which individuals continued to identify *with* the revolution and *against* its opponents can be witnessed.

Not all of those who identified with the revolution after the Restoration were radicals, however. Just as a sense of the legitimacy of radical actions in the past might lead one to conceive of oneself as a revolutionary, this was also the case for more moderate opposition to Charles I. Some, for instance, continued to identify with the Long Parliament which sat between 1640 and its purging in 1648, before a brief return between February and March 1660. Following his ejection in 1662 from Ambrosden (Oxfordshire), for instance, the Independent minister Edward Bagshaw invoked memories of the Long Parliament amidst a long tirade against the king as a man who 'only minded his mistresses', as well as 'the Queen and her cabal' who 'carried on the Government at Somerset House'. Bagshaw resolved that 'the Long Parliament was not yet dissolved, because they had passed an Act that they could not be dissolved save by themselves, so that government was absolutely in that Parliament; that the people would rather be governed by them than by these new upstarts.'⁶⁷ The Earl of Clarendon, in his own papers, recounted that Bagshaw's exact words had been 'that the nation would rather be governed by those old Physicians than the upstarts now in the saddle.'⁶⁸ Bagshaw's views were not unique, however, and found a louder mouthpiece in the 1660 tract *The Long Parliament Revived*, which argued that, since 'by an extraordinary grant of his late Majesty [in 1640], this Parliament was made a standing Court to sit constantly by a positive Law, till they should please to dissolve themselves' there was 'no legal capacity' with which the Long Parliament might actually be dissolved.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections* (8 vols., London, 1901-1913), i, p. 144.

⁶⁷ *CSPD, 1661-1662*, pp. 531-532.

⁶⁸ W. Dunn MacRay and F. J. Routledge (eds.), *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers preserved in the Bodleian Library* (5 vols., Oxford, 1872-1970), v, p. 279.

⁶⁹ *The Long Parliament Revived: Or, An Act for Continuation, and the Not Dissolving the Long Parliament (call'd by King Charles the First, in the Year 1640,) but by an Act of Parliament* (London, 1660), pp. 6-7. This tract is often misattributed to William Drake, see Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven, CT, 2000), pp. 253-254.

More common than enduring loyalties to the Long Parliament, however, were those to the pledges which parliamentarians had made in the early 1640s. In December 1660, for example, it was alleged that Thomas Philpott of Snow Hill, London, was accused of 'think[ing] it honorable for him to keepe' the Protestation oath of 1641 and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643.⁷⁰ Thomas Philpott was not alone in these views, and Edward Vallance has illustrated that 'many pleaded that Parliament was not able to take away the Solemn League and Covenant because it was a contract between man and God.'⁷¹ Elsewhere, Paul Halliday has argued that over 53 per cent of those who were ejected from English and Welsh corporations under the terms of the 1661 Corporation Act (which is equivalent to 263 people) had refused to take the oath to abjure the Covenant.⁷² If this remarkable statistic is true, then it reflects the degree to which, after the Restoration, those who took the Covenant in and after 1643 *continued* to identify with its mission to eradicate 'Popery, Prelacy ... superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness.'⁷³ To be sure, there is plenty of evidence to suggest that adherence to the Covenant endured after the Restoration. In January 1662, for instance, the regime was sent a petition containing the information that one Joseph Crabb, the vicar of Netherbury (Dorset) was 'disaffected' and 'still suppose[d] himselfe obliged by the Covenant'.⁷⁴ Elsewhere, in December 1666, a grocer in Chester was fined £100 for refusing to renounce the Covenant.⁷⁵ Indeed, there is a distinct flurry in concerns about the failure to abjure the Covenant in this month, since a 'Covenanter' rebellion in Scotland had taken place in the month beforehand.⁷⁶ Some individuals managed to slip through the net of the

⁷⁰ TNA, SP 29/24/105.

⁷¹ Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1553-1682* (Woodbridge, 2005), p. 183; see also, p. 187.

⁷² Halliday, *Dismembering*, p. 95.

⁷³ 'The Solemn League and Covenant', J. P. Kenyon (ed.), *The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge, 1966), p. 264.

⁷⁴ TNA, SP 29/49/115.

⁷⁵ TNA, SP 29/182/6.

⁷⁶ See TNA, SP 29/181/14, 14 I, 129.

Corporation Act. Indeed, it was suspected in 1668-69 that several members of the corporation of Yarmouth (Norfolk) had not renounced the Covenant.⁷⁷ There can be little doubt that the regime's attempts to loosen the bonds of the Covenant were not helped by the publication of a tract in 1663 entitled *A Short Survey of the Grand Case*, of which no copies exist, but from which notes were taken by one of the secretaries of state. According to these notes, pages 23 and 47 respectively argued against 'the [regime's] convincing demonstration that there lyes no obligation on me nor any other person from the oath commonly called the Solemn League and Covenant' and that, in direct contravention of the Corporation Act, 'we dare not, cannot, will not declare the Covenant doth not oblige me or any other person to endeavour our alteration of the Government in the Church.'⁷⁸ There can be little doubt that this pamphlet legitimised the decision to remain loyal to the Covenant. For many, of course, the fact that the Protestation and the Covenant oaths made explicit references to the sovereign's role in the defence of the 'true' reformed religion from 'popery', meant that identification with it was not overtly radical. Indeed, that obligations to the Covenant covered a much wider group than the hard-core who opposed the Restoration is evident in the diary of Philip Henry, a Presbyterian minister who had welcomed the king's return. In November 1661, he spoke of the hesitation of 'many' at the passage of the Seditious Practices Act in 1661 'wherein [th]e Covenant is declar'd an unlawful Oath & [th]e Cause of [th]e long Parliam[en]t nullifyd'. Indeed, in an uncharacteristically resistive remark, Henry wrote in his diary 'lord, break snares.'⁷⁹

As a result of remarkably widespread adherence to the Covenant, it was common after the Restoration for moderate revolutionaries to rebuke sharply those who had taken the decision to 'break' this contract. Arguably the most venomous of these attacks took the form of the 1665 tract *Covenant-Renouncers, Desperate-Apostates*, which included letters written to one William Gurnall of Lavenham (Suffolk) two years earlier. Gurnall had

⁷⁷ TNA, SP 29/250/70, 96; TNA, SP 29/258/181.

⁷⁸ TNA, SP 29/88/75.

⁷⁹ Henry, *Diary*, p. 99.

been a vociferous supporter of the religious revolution of the 1640s and 1650s, yet he conformed to the Church of England after 1662. Hence, Gurnall was denounced by the author of the pamphlet in the strongest terms, as having forsaken ‘your Colours, face about, and change[d] your course; to *lose the things you had wrought*’. Moreover, it was argued that Gurnall had ‘turn[ed] *Renegado* from those Truths of *Christ* which you had professed at so high a rate of zeal and fervency’, serving thereby ‘to pull down and destroy, as with both hands, what formerly you had been labouring so many years to build up and plant.’⁸⁰ Elsewhere, the term ‘turn coat’, possessive of military connotations, was used to refer to those who had conformed to the Church of England after August 1662.⁸¹ In April 1664, for instance, Joseph Sayer, the rector of St Nicolas’ Newbury administered the Eucharist to three hundred of the town’s ‘loyal people’ on Easter Sunday. During the election of churchwardens in the church vestry, however – a ceremony in which Sayer was involved – rioters broke in and ‘reproached their opponents as turn coats.’⁸² Elsewhere, in 1667, the Quakers George Fox and Ellis Hookes reiterated such criticism, attacking those priests whose coats had *literally* turned, choosing to ‘preach in a Surplice, or a Fools Coat, rather than the Gospel should not be preached.’ In a damning conclusion, they wrote that ‘*Here you may see the Turn-Coat Priests, which minded more their Benefice, than the Gospel.*’⁸³ In lambasting others as turn coats, these individuals were thus able to validate further the identities of which the meaning of the revolution was paramount.

Remarkably, then, the individuals abovementioned continued to conceive of themselves as the supporters of the revolution, its leaders, and its founding principles. These convictions revolved around a powerful belief that the revolution had been legitimate, as well as the capacity to extend beyond the Restoration the positive meanings which had been ascribed to opposition to the Stuarts. Thus, it remained crucial to imagine that the

⁸⁰ *Covenant-Renouncers, Desperate-Apostates* ([London], 1665), pp. 9-10.

⁸¹ For uses of this term during the Revolution, see Andrew Hopper, *Turncoats and Renegadoes: Changing Sides during the English Civil Wars* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 8-9.

⁸² *CSPD 1663-1664*, p. 556.

⁸³ G[eorge] F[ox] and E[llis] H[ookes], *The Arraignment of Popery* (London, 1667), p. 81.

'Cause' of which Oliver Cromwell had been a spokesperson, and the Covenant and Protestation oaths had been the blueprint, remained relevant. Moreover, others continued to identify against 'cavaliers' or 'turn coats' in order to reinforce these identities. The events of the early 1640s in particular were central to this process of identification, demonstrating that it was not only those who believed in a 'Good Old Cause' of republicanism who continued to conceive of themselves in relation to the tumultuous events of the English Revolution. This evidence speaks of the fact that, much like the Confederates of the United States after 1865 and Germans in the 1920s and 1930s, it was difficult for some revolutionaries to shake off the often bellicose identities which had been forged during the earth-shattering decades of the 1640s and 1650s.

III

Widespread identification with the revolution illustrates the surprisingly common belief that the actions of the opponents of the Stuarts and the founders of the Commonwealth were justified. However, this mental state appears to have led some into a wistful longing for those decades. Historians have often spoken of the frequency of 'nostalgia' in popular discourse in early modern England, and the period following the Restoration was no different.⁸⁴ In a fascinating rant on Christmas Eve 1663, for example, Charles Browne of Wickham Market (Suffolk), said that 'there was a better government in England by Olivers Dayes then is now', as well as that 'there were now but a Company of whores & Rogues now belonging to Whitehall & that formerly he could have eaten & drunke at Whitehall but now ... there would start up a pimping Rogue & say ["]sirra pull of your hatt & say God save the King["]'.⁸⁵ By comparing the immorality of Charles II's court with the virtuousness of 'Olivers Dayes', in fact, Browne partook in a surprisingly common form of nostalgia. Two years later, for example, his sentiments were echoed by one Edward Paige, a barber surgeon living in the parish of St Katherine's (London) who said that 'Cromwells government was farr better

⁸⁴ For nostalgia in early modern England, see Monod, *Jacobitism*, p. 261; David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640-1642*, (Oxford, 2006), p. 14; Hughes, *Gender*, p. 69; Wood, *Memory of the People*, passim.

⁸⁵ TNA, SP 29/90/88 I.

than this present is' since 'there was like to be good government when [th]e King keeps other mens wyfes and make [th]e[m] in concubynes.'⁸⁶ In both of these cases, references to the half-decade of Oliver's reign brought the sexual licentiousness of Charles II's court, real or imagined, into sharp contrast. These kinds of nostalgia increased during the crisis years of the mid-1660s, and particularly during the second Anglo-Dutch War of 1665-67, which culminated in the calamitous raid on the River Medway in Kent in June 1667. Indeed, in that month, reports came into Whitehall that the people of the town of Hull had been heard to murmur that 'things were better ordered in Cromwells time, for then seamen had all their pay, and were not permitted to swere but were clapped in [th]e bilboes [and] if [th]e Officers did they were turned out [and] then God gave a blessing.'⁸⁷ During the same period, a yeoman living in Tottenham (Middlesex) was accused, although later cleared, of making the more specific complaint that 'Soldiers were better paid in the days of Oliver'.⁸⁸ Elsewhere, the former Oliverian excise official, a Mr Ashty, who lived on the Suffolk coast and therefore close to naval engagements with the Dutch, made a slightly different comparison in December 1666 wherein '[th]e King was as much an usurper, as Cromwell.'⁸⁹ While his words could be taken to imply that he thought Cromwell was a 'usurper', it is perhaps more likely, especially given his previous employment, that he felt that if Cromwell had indeed been a usurper, then surely Charles II was one *as well*. Elias Pledger, the rector of St Antholin's (London) appears to have agreed in June 1662 when he preached 'that the wise ones now were ruled not by Jesus Christ, but by [Machiavelli]'.⁹⁰

Other revolutionaries brought perceptions of a general decline in godliness after 1660 into contrast with a nostalgic view of the religious revolution of the 1640s and 1650s. The anonymous author of *A Treatise of the Execution of Justice*, for example, informed his readers in 1663 of the 'dreadful and tremendous Judgment! that ever such a Nation as this, which

⁸⁶ TNA, SP 29/159/7.

⁸⁷ TNA, SP 29/205/128.

⁸⁸ *MCR*, iv, pp. 2-3.

⁸⁹ TNA, SP 29/180/6.

⁹⁰ *CR*, p. 392.

hath for twenty years together drank of the pure and Crystal streams of living Waters, I mean the pure Worship of God; should at last be compelled to drink of the Whores Poyson!’⁹¹ Indeed, for members of the generation who experienced it, there would never be an era of ‘reformation’ to compare with that of the revolution. In 1663, Abel Warren made this view abundantly clear when, condemned for involvement in the Dublin plot of that year, he spoke upon the executioner’s scaffold of his wonder that ‘not long since [God’s government] made the Mountaines of the Earth to tremble and terribly shooke the Cedars of Lebanon.’⁹² Not all of these nostalgic reflections on the godliness of the revolution emanated from radicals, however. Richard Baxter was prone to making sentimental remarks about his efforts at reformation in the darkest corners of Worcestershire.⁹³ In the farewell sermon which he had intended to preach on his ejection from Kidderminster in August 1662, therefore, Baxter thanked God ‘that I have not laboured among you in vain, and that he opened the Hearts of so great a number of yours, to receive his Word with a teachable and willing mind.’⁹⁴ A fellow nonconformist, John Shawe, held similar views about the revolution. Like Baxter, Shawe was no apologist for the radicalism of the later 1640s and 1650s. Nonetheless, Shawe provided a remarkably sympathetic account of the revolution in a memoir which he prepared for his young son. Shawe was keen, for example, to refer to the Long Parliament of 1640 to 1648 as ‘the wonder-working parliament’, while his service for parliament and the church over the next twenty years were looked upon with palpable fondness.⁹⁵ Indeed, for Shawe, there was a strong sense of the glory of parliament’s victories in the civil wars and he was provoked to describe the Battle of Naseby in June 1645 as ‘that great victory in that Pharsalian feild’ after which parliament secured the ‘most remarkable victorys in all parts of the land.’⁹⁶ Another Presbyterian, Andrew Parsons, minister at Wem (Shropshire), told his congregation in May

⁹¹ *A Treatise of the Execution of Justice* (s. l., 1663), p. 17.

⁹² Quoted in Greaves, *Deliver*, pp. 148-149.

⁹³ See Baxter, *Letters*, pp. 69-71.

⁹⁴ Richard Baxter, *Farewel Sermon, Prepared to have been Preached to his Hearers at Kidderminster At his departure, but forbidden* (London, 1683), p. 35.

⁹⁵ Jackson, C. (ed.), *Yorkshire Diaries and Autobiographies in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (2 vols., Durham, 1877), i, p. 133.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

1661 that 'there was more Sin committed now in England in a Month, than was heretofore in seven Years: And that there had been more and better Preaching in England for twenty Years past, than was ever since the Apostles Days.'⁹⁷

While these revolutionaries harked back to the religious fervour of the revolutionary era, others reflected on the relative freedom to worship without the fear of prosecution. Looking back over twelve years of anti-fanatical persecution in 1672, for example, the West County Baptist Edward Terrill emphasised how different the 1650s had been. The final days of the revolution, 'dureing all which time we had peace', therefore, were followed by the coming of an era when 'Sathan stirred up adversaryes against us, and our *Trouble* or *Persecution* began.'⁹⁸ For Terrill, the period following parliament's victory in the civil wars, was, for his congregation at Broadmead (Gloucestershire) at least, 'Halcyon days of Prosperity, liberty, and Peace' when 'it Pleased [the] Lord to breake forth more primitive light and purity in Reformation of worship, to bring [the] Church to a more Exact keepeing to [the] Holy Scripture.'⁹⁹ That 1660 was perceived by nonconformists to have been a watershed of their experiences of the seventeenth century is reflected in how a number of chronicles of their 'sufferings' begin with this date.¹⁰⁰ Indeed, it is likely that 'an ould rebellious soldier' living in Staffordshire was harking back to the contrasting religious freedoms of the 1650s when he bid Oliver Cromwell 'fare well' in May 1663, saying that 'in his Days wee had good Lawes better then now'.¹⁰¹

For those who continued to identify with the revolution, then, the iniquities of the present were brought into sharp contrast with the virtues of the past. What revolutionaries perceived, in other words, was the common

⁹⁷ White Kennet, *A Register and Chronicle, Ecclesiastical and Civil* (London, 1728), p. 543.

⁹⁸ Roger Hayden (ed.), *The Records of a Church of Christ in Bristol, 1640-1687* (Gateshead, 1974), p. 115.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

¹⁰⁰ See, for example, Jeremiah White's unpublished 'Collection of the Sufferings of Dissenters' which began in 1660. *CR*, p. 525.

¹⁰¹ TNA, SP 29/74/48.

historical narrative of *decline*.¹⁰² As such, these opinions could be interpreted as similar to what memory scholar Svetlana Boym has referred to as 'reflective' nostalgia or that which 'thrives on *algia*, (the longing itself) and delays the homecoming – wilfully, ironically, desperately'.¹⁰³ Quite simply, all of these words could well speak of a hidden process in which revolutionaries received pleasure from retrospection. For those who experienced persecution and censorship after the Restoration, in fact, this process must have been like inhabiting a quite different world of godliness, liberty and peace. The Northumberland man Henry Ashton, for example, appears to have found a rather morbid kind of pleasure in 1664 as he reflected on a time when he had 'killed twenty-five cavaliers in a day, and he thought it as pleasant to hime as killing of bukes or does.'¹⁰⁴ That this was 'pleasant' for Ashton must have offered him, as it did others, some kind of respite from the pervasive and persistent anti-fanatical persecution of the 1660s and 1670s. Indeed, in residing in an alternative reality which was built in the image of the past, those who had participated in the revolution were able not only to negotiate the royalists' authority to remember, but also the exclusive religio-political settlements to which royalist memories had lent themselves.

IV

Nostalgia could be wistful, reflective, and, as Boym has argued, 'wilful' in delaying a 'return' to the past. In an atmosphere where challenges to the monarchy and the established church were hazardous, this passive use of the past is, of course, very understandable. Nonetheless, there is evidence to suggest that there was another form of nostalgia: one which was 'restorative' or which, in Boym's phrasing, 'stresse[d] *nostos* (home) and attempt[ed] a transhistorical reconstruction of the lost home.'¹⁰⁵ In other words, when some revolutionaries invoked the idea of decline, this informed the *prospective* opinion that a re-realisation of a better time was possible. Put differently, this was a form of remembering which, as James Fentress and

¹⁰² For the idea of historical decline, see Randolph Starn, 'Meaning-Levels in the Theme of Historical Decline', *History and Theory*, 14:1 (February, 1975), pp. 1-31.

¹⁰³ Boym, 'Nostalgia', p. 13.

¹⁰⁴ *DCY*, p. 130.

¹⁰⁵ Boym, 'Nostalgia', p. 13.

Chris Wickham have argued, 'provide[d] a perspective for interpreting ... experiences in the present and for foreseeing those that lie ahead.'¹⁰⁶ Thomas Larkham, for instance, was an Independent minister from Tavistock (Devon), who was prone to reminiscing about, but also praying for the return of, the revolution in which he had taken part. Like thousands of other nonconformist ministers, Larkham found himself after the Restoration amidst what he called 'great joy [&c] manifestations of it by ridinge[,] running[,] ringing among superstitious[,] ignorant[,] prophane people'.¹⁰⁷ These experiences lay heavily upon Larkham, and he wrote in his private diary of his prayers for God to 'once againe restore the glory of England. Amen[,] Amen[,] Amen.'¹⁰⁸ On another occasion, he wrote similarly that

The Light's puffd out
(deare Lord) that shin'd so bright
And now in England tis a pitteous night
Descend (our Joshua) with all thy Might
And set thy churches and cause now at right.¹⁰⁹

Almost three years later, Larkham persevered in his prayers for the restitution of better times by asking

O Christ which of the Church art the true Head
Raise up thy slaine witnesses from the dead.
Do thou Restore the nation Lord wee Cry
we pray we weepe we waite for a reply.¹¹⁰

These verses demonstrate, then, that Larkham's strong identification with his work during the revolution transformed into an even stronger desire for the *restoration* of those times.

¹⁰⁶ Fentress and Wickham, p. 51.

¹⁰⁷ Susan Hardman Moore (ed.), *The Diary of Thomas Larkham, 1647-1669* (Woodbridge, 2011), p. 244.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 248.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 284.

While Thomas Larkham's uses of the past were obviously nostalgic, other revolutionaries appear to have made more direct claims about the future which were based upon the kinds of identification to which the second part of this chapter referred. Among the most common of these uses of the past involved the so-called 'Good Old Cause'. In June 1664, for instance, a Staffordshire man named John Cocklofe said that there was 'some thing soon to bee done for the ould cause' and that he might 'stand up for it.'¹¹¹ A month later, John Casbeard of Bristol was accused of saying with others that they 'wear minded for to [adventure] all thay had, to bringe about that Cause for which the saints laityly laid down their Blood.'¹¹² Casbeard was not only identifying with the Good Old Cause, but also with the 'the Saints', a term which was very strongly tied to the events of the revolution, and which signified much more than merely the 'invisible church' to which it had originally referred.¹¹³ On another occasion, in December 1663, Sir Henry Bennet, secretary of state, was informed of dissidents around the country who possessed 'hopes for a resurrection of the [Good Old Cause].'¹¹⁴ Indeed, quite how widespread references to the Good Old Cause were after the Restoration is suggested by a piece of evidence from later in Charles's reign. In August 1666, it was alleged of the brother of one Colonel Buffett, a renowned and, in some communities, celebrated New Model Army officer (see chapter 3), that he had said 'that the good ould C[au]se will be the C[au]se agayne before a yeare is about'. It was added that these sentiments were shared by Major Samuel Serle of Honiton (Devon), Colonel Robert Bennett of Hexworthy (Devon), Major John Cowborne of Wellington (Somerset), and Major John Blackmore of Exeter (Devon).¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ TNA, SP 29/75/54 I.

¹¹² TNA, SP 29/77/75.

¹¹³ See, for example, *A Narrative of the Apprehending, Commitment, Arraignment, Condemnation, and Execution of John James, Who Suffered at Tiburne, Novemb. the 26th, 1661* (London, 1662), p. 12.

¹¹⁴ TNA, SP 29/85/31.

¹¹⁵ TNA, SP 29/167/68. For Serle, referred to as 'Sarell' in the evidence, see M. W. Helms and J. P. Ferris, 'Serle, Samuel (1620-83), of Hale, Honiton, Devon', B. D. Henning (ed.), *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons, 1660-1690* (3 vols., London, 1983), iii, pp. 410-411; for Bennett, see John Morrill, 'Bennett, Robert (1605-1683)', *ODNB*, v, pp. 150-152; for Cowbourne, referred to as 'Cobbren' in the evidence, see chapter 3 of this thesis; for Blackmore, see *Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714* (4 vols., Oxford and London, 1891), i, pp. 133.

The Good Old Cause, then, appears to have been a common means by which revolutionaries re-imagined the future after the Restoration. Some of the publicity of the 'Good Old Cause' during the 1660s may have derived from the publication of *The Wheel of Time turning Round to the Good Old VVay; Or, The Good Old Cause Vindicated*, a poem which, amid concerns about the liturgy and forms of worship of the restored church, yearned for a return to erstwhile efforts to extirpate 'popery'.¹¹⁶ However, the title of this poem suggests another widespread means by which revolutionaries conjured alternative images of the future: references to 'the wheel of time'. This use of the past relied upon the notion of the circularity of time, making a restoration of the revolutionary era a certainty. In 1667, for instance, Nicholas Haines, a hosier from Gloucestershire, was accused of arguing that one half of MPs '[were] feathermen and the other half of them were whoremasters and drunkards ... and that the times would turn and honest men would rule again.'¹¹⁷ More common than uses of the 'wheel of time' narrative were those which were drawn from the bible. Prominent amongst these were apocalyptic hermeneutics (particularly of the books of Daniel and Revelation), which had become popular during the turbulent decades of the 1640s and 1650s.¹¹⁸ In the words of Warren Johnston, a scholar of seventeenth-century apocalypticism, 'as opponents and supporters of the restored church and monarchy sought to understand the changed political and religious circumstances after 1660, apocalyptic prophecy remained one of the ways in which they did so.'¹¹⁹ In late 1663, for instance, George Thorne and Christopher Lawrence cited the 'time, times and half a time' (i.e. three and a half years) mentioned in the books of Daniel and Revelation to predict 'that the 3 yeares & 1/2 of [th]e slayings 393 witness is come nere ... & then the people of God ... & the ould [cause]' would 'live'.¹²⁰

The Good Old Cause, the wheel of time, and biblical narratives offered revolutionaries grounds to imagine an alternative future reality. For others,

¹¹⁶ *The Wheel of Time turning Round to the Good Old VVay; Or, The Good Old Cause Vindicated* ([London], 1661).

¹¹⁷ Quoted in Bardle, *The Literary Underground*, p. 122.

¹¹⁸ Johnston, *Revelation restored*, pp. 15-16.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹²⁰ TNA, SP 29/80/17.

however, it was sufficient to recall the 'ease' with which the Stuarts had been overthrown during the 1640s. In many cases, this involved imagining that the king would come to the same end as his father had done in January 1649. Less than a fortnight after the Restoration, for example, Thomas Lunn, a labourer from Bootham (West Yorkshire) was lucky to escape punishment for saying that 'the King shall never bee crowned, and, if hee is crowned, hee shall never live long. His father's head was taken [off] with an axe, but a bill [i.e. a billhook] shall serve to take of his.'¹²¹ In March 1663, Samuel Bagley, the parson of Haslebech (Northamptonshire), declared likewise that 'wee will serve [the king] as wee did his father' and 'wee will cutt off his head'.¹²² Elsewhere, three years later, while discussing the recent Great Fire of London, William Duncke of Hawkhurst (Kent) was accused of declaring at the height of the second Anglo-Dutch War that '[the king that] now is will not leave oppressing of Quakers [until] hee [the king] is served as his father was served.'¹²³ Finally, in 1668, and presumably as a reaction to the government's failure against the Dutch Republic, Richard Marsingill, a mariner from Stacksby (Stakesby, North Yorkshire) complained that 'if our Kinge had been right hee would not have imployed such rogues to have beene souldiers. The land is badly ruled, and the King may come to make the same end his father made.'¹²⁴

Other revolutionaries, while still using the past in order to imagine an alternative future reality, did not cite the Regicide, but the more general overthrow of the 'cavaliers'. In June 1662, therefore, a dyer from Somerset, was accused of saying 'that the Cavaliers would not reign for long', a charge which he denied.¹²⁵ Elsewhere, nine months later, the aforementioned parson of Haslebech, Samuel Bagley, spoke of concerns that 'if Lambert did not ryse & take downe [th]e Cavalieres[,] there would bee noe dealing w[i]th them'.¹²⁶ Indeed, it was common for revolutionaries to pin hopes to those

¹²¹ DCY, p. 85.

¹²² TNA, SP 29/88/44.

¹²³ J. S. Cockburn (ed.), *Calendar of Assize Records: Kent Indictments, Charles II, 1660-1675* (London, 1995), p. 176.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 124.

¹²⁵ SRO, Q/SR/103/8.

¹²⁶ TNA, SP 29/88/44.

men who led the revolution in the 1640s and 1650s, particularly General John Lambert. On the eve of the Restoration, for example, William Cox from Middlesex was accused of having said that 'my Lord Lambert deserved the Crowne and to bee King better then King Charles the Second.'¹²⁷ The remarkably similar sentiments of a Halifax man named Richard Smith were heard in the following August. Smith believed that 'the King is a bastard, and the sonne of a whore. I hope to see Lord Lambert King.'¹²⁸ Elsewhere, in 1662, Thomas Hebert, a weaver from the North East, expressed his disbelief that 'Lambert's armye' had 'been destroyed within three yeares', but remained hopeful that before 'three yeares goe about he would see an alteration in this government.'¹²⁹ Interestingly, despite his death in 1658, Oliver Cromwell was also invoked in these restorative uses of the past. In November 1663, for instance, a yeoman from Rothwell (West Yorkshire) said with tangible emotion that 'I served Oliver seaven yeares as a souldier, and if any one will put up the finger on the accompt that Oliver did ingage, I will doe as much as I have done. As for the Kinge I am not beholdinge to him. I care not a fart for him.'¹³⁰ Not all of these visions of the future involved the most famous leaders of the revolution, however. In 1662, an unnamed individual was examined by Sir Geoffrey Shakerley, the royalist governor of Chester, for having said that 'within few years all would ... bee on ... Coll. Croxtons syde or hee would bee hanged for it.'¹³¹ The officer to whom the examinant referred was Colonel Thomas Croxton, one of Shakerley's predecessors as commander of the Chester Castle, who was most famous for having defended the stronghold from Sir George Booth during his unsuccessful rising against the Commonwealth in the summer of 1659.¹³²

On other occasions, imagining the return of revolution involved reflections upon the violence of the civil wars. On 13 October 1661, for example, the day that Major-General Thomas Harrison was executed at Charing Cross, Captain Laurence Moyer of Low Leighton (Leyton, Essex), a

¹²⁷ MCR, iii, p. 304.

¹²⁸ Hopper, 'Farnley Wood', p. 292-293.

¹²⁹ DCY, p. 93.

¹³⁰ DCY, pp. 115-116.

¹³¹ TNA, SP 29/90/23.

¹³² See J. H. Hanshall, *The history of the county palatine of Chester* (s. l., 1823), p. 569.

member of the Corporation of Trinity House in Dartford (Kent), was heard to say ‘that the longest sword would carry it’; words which a witness, William Batten Jr., described as ‘aggravating’.¹³³ Following a proclamation for all former New Model soldiers to leave London a month later (see chapter 1), Richard Major was heard to say similarly that ‘they would be able to doe more mischeife against the King then they would doe at hoame; for though the Cittie of [London] had cried them downe, yet the Cittie would crie them upp as fast againe.’¹³⁴ In the following July, Michael Whevell from Taunton (Somerset), said that ‘he had scoured up a Rapier w[hi]ch had lyen a long time rusty and hoped speedily to have use for him.’¹³⁵ In October of the same year, Francis Cruse of Shoreditch, Middlesex, a former soldier in Colonel John Okey’s regiment, said that ‘the Booke of Common Prayer is nothing but Blasphemie & Poperie ... and iff their ever make a s[wor]ld drawn againe he wuld give no q[ua]rter too man wuman or chyld that wold adhere to itt.’¹³⁶ In this case there is an evident sense that, if presented with the opportunity, revolutionaries would enact a more *decisive* victory against the royalists than had hitherto been possible. This was what has been referred to by one scholar of memory as ‘uchronia’ or ‘an alternative present, a sort of parallel universe in which the different unfolding of an historical event had radically altered the universe as we know it’.¹³⁷ Uchronia was also evident in the language of the radical minister John James when he preached before his Whitechapel (London) congregation in November 1661 that ‘*when they [i.e. the revolutionaries] had Power again they should do the work most thorowly.*’¹³⁸ The case of John James is an important one, since it formed the first instance when an individual was convicted of treason for seditious words, leading to his brutal execution a week later.¹³⁹

¹³³ TNA, SP 29/31/51 I.

¹³⁴ MCR, iii, p. 317.

¹³⁵ TNA, SP 29/57/42 I. Threats to use old ‘rusty’ swords appear to have been rather common from old soldiers. As David Cressy has shown: one William Fenn of St Martin-in-the-Fields ‘said “that he hoped to wash his hands in the king’s blood” and offered to thrust “an old rusty sword ... up to the hilt in his heart”, Cressy, *Dangerous Talk*, p. 206.

¹³⁶ TNA, SP 29/61/1.

¹³⁷ Alessandro Portelli, ‘Uchronic Dreams: Working Class Memory and Possible Worlds’, *Oral History*, 16:2 (Autumn 1988), pp. 46.

¹³⁸ *A Narrative of the Apprehending ... John James*, p. 16.

¹³⁹ Joseph Keble, *Reports in the Court of the Kings Bench at Westminster from the XII to the XXX Year of the Reign of our Late Sovereign Lord King Charles II* (London, 1685), p. 180.

Other revolutionaries used more specific events from which to construct images of the future. In October 1664, for example, William Rock, a 'petty chapman' from Scotland incurred the wrath of the Cheshire authorities for saying that 'had he the power, he would have a gallows at every league's end to hang the English; that he had been once into the kingdom with a great army, and hoped within five years to come with a greater; that he would seat himself in the middle of the kingdom, and fight the Earls of Northumberland'.¹⁴⁰ The specific event to which Rock's statement referred was the Covenanter invasion of England in 1640, when the Earl of Northumberland had commanded the English response. The envisioning of a Scottish invasion which would be comparable to that of 1640 occurred again in December 1666, when Ralph Egg, a man notorious in the North West for having proclaimed the Charles I 'traitor' in 1651, responded to news of rebellion in Scotland with the words that 'the Covinant was now goeing up, & it should goe up.'¹⁴¹ Other revolutionaries were even more parochial in their uses of the past in order to imagine an alternative future reality. According to the evidence of John Roulston of Etwall (Derbyshire), for example, he had heard Henry Alsibrooke (the elder) of nearby Church Broughton, say that he '[wished that]t [th]e bon[d] meadow were full of souldiers and he amongst [the]m' and '[tha]t he should never be light at heart till [the]n [tha]t they may pull downe [th]e higher powers (meaninge [th]e Kinge) and [tha]t if there were any riseinge if he had noe horse of his owne he would take [th]e best horse he could light on and hoped to be at [th]e dealinge.'¹⁴² When Alsibrooke referred to '[th]e bon[d] meadow' it seems likely that he was referring to a nearby plot of land on the banks of the River Dove.¹⁴³ According to contemporary accounts, the fields in this area (Egginton Heath) had witnessed the slaughter of dozens of royalist troops during the first civil war.¹⁴⁴ It is thus conceivable that this was the event to which Alsibrooke was

¹⁴⁰ TNA, SP 29/103/147

¹⁴¹ TNA, SP 29/181/14.

¹⁴² Cox, *Quarter Sessions ... Derby*, ii, p. 68.

¹⁴³ See 'Tithe Map & Apportionment of Egginton, Derbyshire' (1849), TNA, IR 30/8/87.

¹⁴⁴ Stephen Glover and Thomas Noble (eds.), *The History of the County of Derby* (2 vols., Derby, 1829), i, [appendix,] p. 66.

referring when he hoped that '[th]e bon[d] meadow were full of souldiers and he amongst [the]m'.

Remarkably, then, revolutionaries imagined radical futures in relation to a past in which radicalism, and indeed violence, had prevailed. This kind of language could well be regarded in relation to a 'brutalisation' of politics in the wake of the civil wars on a level which George L. Mosse has referred to in relation to Germany after 1918.¹⁴⁵ Mosse has argued further that one invidious consequence of the First World War was that some German soldiers continue to 'use of descriptive adjectives to characterize men and movements which seemed to menace society', prejudices which originated in a 'cast of mind which craved the clear and unambiguous wartime distinctions between friend and foe.'¹⁴⁶ When one reflects upon the extent to which the 'cavalier' enemy was re-imagined after 1660, the similarities between the object of Mosse's research and English and Welsh revolutionaries is even clearer.

Notwithstanding these brutal re-imaginings of the future, it is worth pointing out that constructing images of the future from the ruins of the past was not the sole preserve of radical revolutionaries. Thomas Case's farewell sermon to his London congregation on 17 August 1662, for example, seems to have been intended to remind his parishioners of what England had once been like and, by extension, what it might be like again. The sermon began by affirming that 'many can remember when England hath been much better than it is.' Indeed, from this point onwards Case listed at great length the areas in which England's Protestants had been more conscientious during the 1640s and 1650s, citing doctrine, discipline, Sabbath-keeping, communication, profession, conversion, education, charity, anti-popery, toleration and respect. Moreover, Case made it clear that his warmest memory of the revolution was how England's men and women 'did more

¹⁴⁵ George L. Mosse, *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (New York, NY, 1990), pp. 159-164.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 179.

earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints.¹⁴⁷ Case was a particularly impassioned opponent of the king in the early 1640s and there can be little doubt that he looked back fondly to the spirit of godliness in the early 1640s.¹⁴⁸ In addition to the content of Case's sermons, it is worth returning to the nostalgia for the 'reformation' of the 1640s and 1650s to which nonconformists like Richard Baxter and John Shawe clung after 1660. While reminiscing on the past allowed these men to escape contemporary realities, the idea that a 'reformation' had swept through the Three Kingdoms during the 1640s and 1650s must have offered them hope for the future. Indeed, such arguments testify to historians' notions of a *long* Reformation which continued beyond the Tudor era.¹⁴⁹ In many respects, these kinds of views were teleologies, in which a utopian *telos* was envisaged in the future, anticipating thereby the modern notion of 'progress' of which the post-Enlightenment era is most famous.¹⁵⁰ For Baxter and others, memories of the 1650s provided a comparable *telos* which remained realisable after 1660.

It is important to highlight the fact that, since many who had opposed the Stuarts during the 1640s had balked at the 'radical' revolution, references to involvement in the civil wars did not entail the desire to see the demise of the monarchy or the established church. Some, for instance, hoped for the re-establishment of the Long Parliament, which, as aforementioned, was held by a minority to have been *de jure* indissoluble. In 1666, therefore, 'a great dispute' was caused when one John Davies told Benjamin Walsh, an ensign, that 'he hoped to see the Long Parliament sitt againe.'¹⁵¹ Others used language which connoted the earliest rallying cries of the parliamentary movement. In January 1661, for example, Daniel

¹⁴⁷ *Farewell Sermons*, pp. 56-57.

¹⁴⁸ Cressy, *England on Edge*, p. 14

¹⁴⁹ See Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations* (Oxford, 1993), passim.; Eamon Duffy, 'The Long Reformation: Catholicism, Protestantism and the multitude', Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *England's Long Reformation, 1500-1800* (London, 1998), pp. pp. 33-70; Peter Marshall, '(Re)defining the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies*, 48:3 (2009), pp. 564-586.

¹⁵⁰ For the idea of progress and Christianity, see Ernest Lee Tuveson, *Millennium and Utopia: A Study in the Background of the Idea of Progress* (Berkeley, CA, 1949); W. Warren Wagar, 'Modern Views of the Origins of the Idea of Progress', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 28:1 (Jan.-Mar., 1967), pp. 55-70; David Spadafora, *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New Haven, CT, 1990).

¹⁵¹ TNA, SP 29/187/169.

Winston, the barman of a Portsmouth alehouse, might not have known that he was in the presence of two of servants of the king, who was then escorting his mother and adolescent sister to the town, when he said that 'he served the King, but if the King did call a Parliament he would serve the King and Parliament again'.¹⁵² Here, Winston employed the old claim that those who had fought for parliament during the revolution had done so out of 'true' loyalty to the king, suggesting that he did not desire to see a return to the Commonwealth. In two other cases, it was the language of opposition to the Stuarts *before* the outbreak of civil war which enabled re-imaginings of the future. In 1661, therefore, when London's regiments of horse, trained bands and auxiliaries addressed a 'remonstrance' to the king, one Thomas Chapman, a Post Office employee, proclaimed that 'he had seen as great a Remonstrance as that come to nothinge'.¹⁵³ Here, Chapman was almost certainly referring to the 'Grand Remonstrance' of December 1641, which outlined parliament's numerous grievances with Charles I.¹⁵⁴ The subtext of Chapman's statement was that Charles II would respond as lukewarmly to the City's remonstrance as his father had done to that of the Long Parliament. Elsewhere, in May 1664, Henry Phillips of Paddington (Middlesex) was accused of responding to news of an amendment to the Hearth Tax with the following words: 'the King that now is did take the same waies that his father did to be ill beloved, and that the Chimnie-monie would prove a worse burden than formerly the Ship-monie was'.¹⁵⁵ In additional evidence, there are a number of references to extirpating forms of authority, particularly that of the bishops, 'root and branch'.¹⁵⁶ It is unlikely that this expression can have been used without invoking the City of London's anti-episcopal 'Root and Branch Petition' of December 1640.

¹⁵² Margaret J. Hoad and Robert P. Grime (eds.), *Portsmouth Record Series: Borough Sessions Papers, 1653-1688: A Calendar* (Chichester, 1971), pp. 20-21.

¹⁵³ TNA, SP 29/40/10.

¹⁵⁴ See *The City's Remonstrance and Adresse to the King's Most Excellent Majesty* (London, 1661).

¹⁵⁵ MCR, iii, pp. 338-339.

¹⁵⁶ SP 29/125/98 (Petition of Wm. Herd to the King, June 1665); Greaves, *Enemies*, p. 222 (case of Nicholas Warne).

Other evidence implies an even softer form of this prospective remembering in which, if anything, the intention was to warn the king of the dangers of pursuing his father's course. In November 1662, for instance, Thomas Robinson, a royalist-turned-Cromwellian soldier, was alleged to have said that 'hee thought the n[atio]n would goe together by [th]e eares againe.' Being asked why, Robinson responded that, as in 1642, 'there was a difference betweene the King and his Parliam[en]t or between the King and this Nation.'¹⁵⁷ It seems that Robinson's sentiments were somewhat misinterpreted by his accusers, who appear to have inferred his support for a rising against the regime. Indeed, Thomas Dugard, the minister at Barford (Warwickshire) seems to have fallen victim to a similar misconstrual of his words. In December 1663, therefore, Dugard was examined for asserting in relation to the king's recent declaration concerning the observation of the Sabbath, that the 'Book of Sports' of 1633 'was the cause of all the bloodshed since, and that if this King grant the same liberty, we may say "Farewell England."¹⁵⁸ While neither Robinson nor Dugard appear to have desired a return to revolution, the likelihood is that their failure to lay the blame for the civil wars squarely at the doors of parliament's supporters got them into trouble. What these cases reinforce, then, is the degree to which the royalists' interpretation of the recent past, in which opposition to Charles I from his accession in 1625 to his death in 1649 were regarded as continuous, had become literally indisputable.

The evidence above speaks of the degree to which revolutionaries framed the future in relation to the seditious past. For some, this involved imagining a future in which the Good Old Cause returned, the cavaliers were overthrown and, as a consequence of the death of Charles II, power could be re-distributed into the deserving hands of those who had participated in the English Revolution. Others, however, were keen to restore the virtuousness and the godliness of the revolutionary era: one in which reformation had been pursued. Again, the seditious past was not the preserve of those who had experienced a radical revolution during the 1640s and 1650s. That these

¹⁵⁷ TNA, SP 29/67/15.

¹⁵⁸ *CSPD 1663-1664*, p. 375.

prospective uses of the past were utilised by such a broad swathe of those who participated in the revolution is surely testament only to their *power*. Earlier, it was explained that revolutionaries sought solace in a bygone age of courage and godliness: one which might be revisited in times of hardship. For others, of course, this alternative reality was something which could be *restored*, and literally re-inhabited. On a psychological level, there can be little doubt of the massive importance of the capacity to view a future in which the persecution of the post-revolutionary era was abated. Indeed, the extent to which the individuals abovementioned spoke of their 'hopes' to see the repeat of certain events demonstrates the importance of holding onto the seditious past after 1660. While all of these uses of the past suggest that individuals had been successful in reclaiming the authority to remember, negotiating thereby the invidious experiences which had resulted after 1660, their *restorative* nature represents a different strategy. In re-imagining the future, in other words, revolutionaries were able to strike at the very heart of the authority over the *future* to which royalist memories of the past lent themselves.

V

Throughout this chapter, an emphasis has been placed upon the 'moderate' and 'radical' revolutions of the 1640s and 1650s. Broadly speaking, the memories of these two groups reflect the fact that participation in the revolution was driven by a wide array of motivations, the incompatibility of which crystallised in the wake of the first civil war when the adherents of internal factions scrambled for ascendancy.¹⁵⁹ While historians of the revolution have demonstrated that the coalition of moderates and radicals was by no means fixed, and there was plenty of room for manoeuvre across a spectrum, the evidence above would seem to imply that, *with hindsight*, the paths followed during the 1640s and 1650s appeared much straighter. Put differently, the natural tendency for memories to become simplified permitted revolutionaries to speak of more monolithic movements than had really

¹⁵⁹ See Hughes, 'A "Lunatick"', p. 195.

existed during the 1640s and 1650s.¹⁶⁰ Hence, while some spoke of the 'reformation' which was pursued by the Long Parliament and came into fruition in the wake of the Regicide, others declared enduring allegiance to Oliver Cromwell and the 'Good Old Cause'. In doing so, the almost infinite varieties of support for the revolution were shrunk into a far simpler narrative.

Much like the royalists' conflation of the actions of their enemies, then, revolutionaries were guilty of simplifying their own pasts. What is surprising, however, is how common it was for *moderate* revolutionaries to say things which, if one was unaware of who was responsible for speaking the words, could be regarded as *radical*. The 'myth of betrayal' which surrounded George Monck, Duke of Albemarle, for instance, does not appear to have been the preserve of those radicals who balked at his negotiations with the exiled monarchy in the spring of 1660. Indeed, while Monck was celebrated by some of the staunchest supporters of the Stuarts, former revolutionaries such as Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke, who distanced themselves from opposition to the government after 1660, were able to write in 1670 that 'the Duke of Albemarle dyed, unlamented by many.'¹⁶¹ Elsewhere, Philip Henry, a Presbyterian supporter of the Restoration, copied into his diary the following mock epitaph for Monck:

Here lyes Monk
Who dy'd Drunk
And left his Trunk
To his old Punk [i.e. Prostitute].¹⁶²

In both of these examples, the mocking of Monck could well have derived from the fact that both Whitelocke and Henry, while broadly supportive of the Restoration, felt betrayed by the way in which the post-revolutionary settlements, of which Monck remained symbolic until his death in 1670, had been overturned. It is possible that a similar kind of resentment was held for

¹⁶⁰ See Guy Beiner, *Remembering the Year of the French: Irish Folk History and Social Memory* (Madison, WI, 2007), p. 24.

¹⁶¹ Whitelocke, *Diary*, p. 750.

¹⁶² Henry, *Diary*, p. 220.

George Downing, a revolutionary who was later instrumental in the capturing of the exiled regicides in Holland, who was described by Samuel Pepys as ‘a perfidious rogue.’¹⁶³ Other cases of seditious remembering suggest that distinctively revolutionary identities were framed in ways which belied the moderation of an individual. In a letter to Richard Baxter, for example, Josiah Whiston, the Presbyterian minister of Hoggs Norton (Leicestershire), implored the revolutionary to ‘stop the mouthes of [cavaliers] against that sweet way of Holynesse which you so eminently hold forth.’¹⁶⁴ Elsewhere, and pondering ‘strang libels cast about in London against the King’ in October 1663, an unusually unrestrained Ralph Josselin noted likewise that Charles II was ‘a good natured prince but sadly yoked with followers’, or those ‘Cavaliers’ who were ‘very sadly [debauched].’¹⁶⁵ Here, then, individuals who supported the Restoration used language which, as witnessed earlier, was often employed by the more belligerent veterans of the 1640s.

Among the most interesting cases of a moderate revolutionary having identified with a ‘radical’ past occurred one November evening in 1677, when Oliver Heywood wrote the following, autobiographical passage:

my dear parents presented me to the Lord in ordinance of Baptism, devoted me then and therby doubtles prayed for me and offered me a pious and liberal education, yet little did they or such as presented me imagin that the stepping down and preventing that ceremonious rite of the crosse that it was a presage of my being a N[on] C[onformist] minister to bear my testimony ag[ains]t those superstitious usages, and preaching and suffering so much for the good old cause of puritanism and Nonconformity, and as little could it be thought that I should li[v]e abo[v]e 60 years to see such changes in Civils and

¹⁶³ Pepys, iii, p. 45.

¹⁶⁴ Baxter, *Letters*, p. 94.

¹⁶⁵ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 501.

Ecclesiasticks, as I ha[v]e done since 1640, B[isho]ps up, then down, then up again.¹⁶⁶

Although Heywood had supported the Restoration, the religious nonconformity for which he and his parents had suffered from the 1630s until the present day was deemed to be part of a 'Good Old Cause' with which he clearly identified. Later in this thesis, it will become apparent that Heywood would almost certainly have avoided using this expression in the years that followed, when it began to be associated with the radical 'Whigs' of the early 1680s. Nonetheless, his decision to use this term suggests that there was considerable drift in its usage since the 1650s and early 1660s.

Elsewhere, one particular radical of the English Revolution appears to have become something of a figurehead for more moderate individuals. By the mid-1660s, a number of well-wishers to the monarchy complained of a growth of unfavourable comparisons between Charles and Oliver Cromwell. Indeed, so prominent was Oliver's name after 1660 that Samuel Pepys was provoked to write in his diary on one occasion of how 'strange' it was that

everybody doth nowadays reflect upon Oliver and commend him, so brave things he did and made all the neighbour princes fear him; while here a prince, come in with all the love and prayers and good liking of his people, and have given greater signs of loyalty and willingness to serve him with their estates then ever was done by any people, hath lost all so soon, that it is a miracle what way a man could devise to lose so much in so little time.¹⁶⁷

Another concerned onlooker informed the government in June 1666 that 'the common people ... Curs the King and wish for Crumwell'.¹⁶⁸ Elsewhere, in a letter to exiled regicide William Goffe from May 1662, John Davenport wrote of seamen in Bristol and London who had fallen out of love with the king, and

¹⁶⁶ J. Horsfall Turner (ed.), *The Rev. Oliver Heywood, B.A., 1630-1702; His Autobiography, Diaries, Anecdote and Event Books* (4 vols., Bingley, 1883), iii, p. 297.

¹⁶⁷ Pepys, viii, p. 332.

¹⁶⁸ TNA, SP 29/160/104.

who 'wish for another Cromwell.' According to Davenport, therefore, recent emigrants bound for Virginia 'doe generally complaine of there greate Taxes, & say that Cromwell sought the good of the Land, &c.'¹⁶⁹ Here, then, Davenport's emphasis was on the fact that support for the Stuarts had waned: a notion which presupposes the existence of some degree of affection for Charles II in the first place. Indeed, even Richard Baxter, who had spoken out in opposition to Oliver during the 1650s, wrote that the later Lord Protector had actually intended 'to do good in the main, and to promote the Gospel and the Interest of Godliness, more than any had done before him.'¹⁷⁰

Other 'moderate' individuals employed even more radical-sounding language to envisage an alternative future reality. Earlier, the popular notion that time was a turning 'wheel' was encountered. While this was comforting to radicals, who saw the Restoration as the furthest movement of the wheel away from the Commonwealth, much less radical men and women appear to have espoused the same idea. Hence, the historian David Appleby has cited how Richard Alleine, a Presbyterian who suffered religious persecution in silence after 1661, reminded his flock a year later 'that there was behind everything one great wheel still turning, and that one aspect of Providence was that God transformed kingdoms and governments, and removed and set up kings.'¹⁷¹ Indeed, Appleby has demonstrated elsewhere that radical and violent language could be used by those who were considerably more moderate in their opinions after 1660. When Thomas Manton, again no radical, gave his 'farewell sermon' in August 1662, for example, he told his congregation to 'recover from thy falls, renew thy combat, as Israel, when they were overcome in battle, they would try it again and again, Judg. xx. 28. Take heed of ceasing for the present, for though enemy seems to prevail, though the flesh seems to prevail against the spirit in the battle, yet thou

¹⁶⁹ *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, p. 200.

¹⁷⁰ Baxter, *Reliquiae*, p. 71.

¹⁷¹ Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day*, p. 98.

shalt have the best of it in the war; by the power of grace thou shalt have the victory.'¹⁷²

It is possible, therefore, that the recent pasts of moderates and radicals, while simplified, had *blurred* somewhat in the wake of the Restoration. As a result, moderates might evoke the enduring enemy of the 'cavaliers', the villainy of Monck and the virtuousness of Oliver Cromwell, or even loyalty to the Good Old Cause. One way of explaining this blurring of the past could be in relation to the fact that pervasive and persistent anti-fanaticism had itself blurred the pasts of moderate and radical revolutionaries. Several historians have pointed out that, after 1660, nebulous communities of religious dissenters were able to coalesce around the 'nonconformist' identity which had been foisted upon them by a persecutory state.¹⁷³ While it is difficult to imagine that a moderate Presbyterian like Oliver Heywood would have taken up arms for the 'Good Old Cause', it is conceivable that, as a consequence of the degree to which his own past was conflated with those of radical revolutionaries, this terminology provided a way in which he and others were able to negotiate experiences of authority in which few distinctions were drawn between enemies of the state. The significance of this conclusion is that, when one comes across references to the past which appear 'radical', and which are often used to speak of desires to overthrow the post-revolutionary regime, this will not always be accurate. To be sure, no one would make such a claim about Oliver Heywood, despite his belief that he had supported the 'Good Old Cause'.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the extent to which the act of remembering was powerful has been acknowledged. Firstly, justifying the revolution enabled those who had participated in it to validate religio-political identities of which the meaning of the past remained crucial. In doing so, it was argued, revolutionaries

¹⁷² Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁷³ See Greaves, *Enemies*, pp. 1-2; Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed*, p. 234; John Spurr, 'Later Stuart Puritanism', John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008), p. 90.

continued to conceive of themselves in relation to the divisions of the 1640s and 1650s. It was then put forward that this process enabled revolutionaries both to reside in, and to imagine the restoration of, a past which was compared favourably with the present. Moreover, it was discovered, that these processes were available to both radical *and* moderate revolutionaries, but also that the simplified pasts to which people from across this spectrum referred could blur. Indeed, it was argued that it is thus problematic to ascribe to an individual the label of 'radicalism' simply for possessing seditious memories.

The broader implication of this chapter is that the royalists did not possess the *total* authority to remember the revolution which was sought. Of those who participated in the revolution, there were still many for whom those earth-shattering events possessed powerful meanings. Moreover, in striking at the heart of royalist claims about the past, men and women were also in a position to negotiate the regime's attempts to lay claim to the future of the Three Kingdoms. Indeed, it is tempting to conclude that royalists were well aware of the fact that, despite their best efforts, a seditious view of the revolution could never be subdued. This is not to say, of course, that every participant in the revolution wanted to resurrect the civil wars, the Regicide and the republic. To be sure, the failure of republicans to revive the Commonwealth is surely testament to how few wanted to turn the world upside down once more. But recantation should not be mistaken for *repentance*. As the evidence above suggests, there were men and women throughout the Three Kingdoms who continued to look back upon the revolution with fondness.

There is a further conclusion which can be drawn from this examination of seditious memories. What none of these historians have appreciated, however, is the centrality of the Good Old Cause to this process of negotiation. What this chapter has found, in other words, is that the past was itself a source of empowerment after the Restoration, because it enabled the mental inhabitation of a world which existed beyond the strict confines of the exclusively Anglican royalist state: one which was defined in relation to the

fact that it was not the government of the 1640s and 1650s. In order to reach these conclusions, of course, this chapter has focused on remembering as an *internal* process of *re-imagining* the past, present and future. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to elide the degree to which much of the material to which this chapter has referred was written or spoken with the intention of reaching an audience. It is to the *social* manifestations of seditious memories, and how empowering these could be, that this thesis will now turn.

3 – Communities of Seditious Memories, 1660-1678

On 24 August 1660, seven men and women sheltered under a hedge from a sudden summer downpour on the flat expanse of Portsea Island in Hampshire. At some point during the shower, or so it was later reported to a jury at the borough's quarter sessions, one of those present said that 'I heare that there are seaven mens heads to be cutt off this weeke', and added that 'wee cutt off their side againe and they cutt off our heads of this side, and ere long they'l cutt off their side againe and soe we shall have cutting off of heads againe as long as I live.' One of the informants, Sarah Pitter (Peter), who had been 'reaping wheat' on the fields before the shower, told the court the man responsible for these words was John Cleverley, a local box-maker and possible Quaker who 'had been in the time of the wars an informer about the country and had undone many a gentleman'.¹ Indeed, considering the date, the likelihood is that when Cleverley spoke of the 'seaven mens heads to be cutt off' he was referring (with some inaccuracy) to the Bill of Indemnity and Oblivion which had been tabled in the House of Commons that month, and from which thirty-three men had been excepted. If this was the case, then Cleverley's words entailed a strikingly casual reference to the bloodshed of the civil wars when 'wee cutt off their side'. Indeed, his use of the pronoun 'we' would suggest that he continued to identify with the 'Cause' of the 1640s and 1650s in which, if Pitter's information was accurate, he had played an active role as an informant. Moreover, the off-handedness of his reflection upon the 'cutting off of heads' implies that, unlike others, he had chosen not to distance himself from the actions of radical revolutionaries during the 1640s and 1650s, but continued to endorse them. Furthermore, since he expected the 'cutting off of heads' to continue, Cleverley's opinions about the revolution appear to have informed an equally radical image of a future.

The words for which John Cleverley was indicted reinforce the notion that revolutionaries re-imagined the past, present and future after the

¹ Hoad and Grime, *Portsmouth ... Borough Sessions Papers*, p. 17.

Restoration. There is, however, additional significance to Cleverley's words. From the evidence above, it is clear that his words were not uttered alone, but were in fact articulated to those with whom he shared shelter. In other words, it is possible that Cleverley had intended to secure *consensus* with those beneath the hedge, and, considering that not all of those who were then present provided evidence against him and another two individuals were accused of speaking other seditious words, it is conceivable that this endeavour had been partially successful.² The previous chapter demonstrated how the act of remembering enabled men and women to legitimate the meaning of experiences against which royalist censure was levelled. In doing so, it was argued, these men and women were able to validate religio-political identities, and to negotiate an experience of the authority to remember. Moreover, it was argued that the possession of a seditious past enabled revolutionaries to reflect upon, as well as to imagine the restoration of, an alternative reality. This process, it was proposed, made possible the negotiation of other experiences of authority which originated in the royalists' interpretation of the past. This chapter will use evidence of consensus, such as that after which John Cleverley endeavoured on Portsea Island, in order to demonstrate that these processes were *social* as well as personal. To this end, it will be argued that the 'socialness' of remembering was a consequence of the fact that the meanings which had been attached to experiences of the revolution, and upon which certain religio-political identities had been constructed, were *shared*. In doing so, it will be possible to argue that participants in the revolution belonged to 'communities of memory' after the Restoration, and that these communities made possible crucial senses of solidarity. Furthermore, in the second part of the chapter it will be suggested that these communities mediated 'collective identities', as well as sociability, among revolutionaries. Finally, the chapter will propose that the communication of restorative uses of the past enabled some revolutionaries to facilitate hope, and forms of radical, as well as moderate, political action.

² See *ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

In pursuing this exploration of ‘communities of seditious memories’, this chapter will shed light on the notion of community in post-revolutionary England and Wales, an area in which studies, particularly those which incorporate uses of the past, are still sparse.³ One of the few historians to engage with the relationship between memory and community is Sharon Achinstein, who has written of the manner in which, after 1660, nonconformists shaped an image of their past in order ‘to express, and to experience collective identities’ and, in doing so, to negotiate an ‘experience of defeat’.⁴ Nonetheless, the past with which Achinstein’s nonconformists constructed an identity was rooted in experiences of suffering *after* the Restoration of 1660. Where this analysis will differ, then, will be in emphasising the collective possession of *seditious memories* concerning the English Revolution, which, through the process of communication, mediated solidarity in relation to the past, as well as hopes and plans for the present and future. In order to do so, this chapter will take advantage of a fresh methodology in which evidence of *consensus* about often dangerous opinions is sought. To this end, it will be vital to pursue the seminal argument of Natalie Zemon Davis that evidence of the narratives which ‘everyday’ men and women constructed in court, while not necessarily representative of the ‘reality’ of certain events, can offer a window through which the meaning of ‘truth’ to these individuals can be explored.⁵ Hence, in relation to numerous cases of seditious and treasonable words from later seventeenth-century England and Wales, this chapter will demonstrate that the *social contexts* within which these opinions were articulated can provide historians with a rare opportunity to illustrate *consensus*, or the social construction of this ‘truth’, in the archive. Moreover, it will be argued that it is from this evidence of consensus that it can become possible to construe sociability as one method through which contemporaries negotiated experiences of authority during the 1660s and 1670s. It is with an examination of consensus about

³ For a study of community in post-revolutionary England, see Ian W. Archer, ‘Social networks in Restoration London: the evidence of Samuel Pepys’s diary’, Alexandra Shepard and Phil Withington (eds.), *Communities in early modern England: Networks, place, rhetoric* (Manchester, 2000), pp. 76-94.

⁴ Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent*, p. 57.

⁵ Natalie Zemon Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 3.

the meaning of the past, and where it might be located within the archive, that this chapter will begin.

I

The majority of the seditious memories which were considered in the previous chapter came with little information about the immediate contexts in which the articulation of such opinions took place. As such, it was only possible to draw conclusions about what the memories meant to those who articulated them. However, other evidence suggests that *consensus* about the meaning of the past was endeavoured, and indeed accomplished, by those who articulated seditious memories. In order to indict more than one person for seditious words, for example, allegations or written charges of seditious remembering could include explicit references to consensus by emphasising the dialogic nature of seditious remembering. One fascinating, and unusually detailed example of this came in the wake of an incident aboard the navy's flagship, the *Royal Charles*.⁶ In mid-April 1661, the vessel was moored off the coast of Lisbon during which time several depositions were given regarding a conversation between Matthew Hall, the ship's commander, and Thomas Wood, the 'master's mate'. The depositions included the information of Jacob Reynolds, the commander of another ship (the *Saint Luis*) who was aboard at the time. According to Reynolds, he overheard Hall and Wood exchanging a number of seditious words in the ship's cabin, including a conversation about the regicides, who, six months earlier, had been 'inhumanly put to death without having liberty to speake for themselves, w[hi]ch if they could have had, they would have made all theyre accusers asham-ed, Cleareringe themselves befor God and [th]e Congregation.' In additional information, which was provided by the ship's surgeon, Wood was accused of arguing further 'that it was injustice in the kinge to put those men to death w[hi]ch have suffered since his cominge into

⁶ The *Royal Charles* was in many ways reflective of attempts at oblivion, since its name had been changed from the *Naseby* at the Restoration, see J. J. Colledge, *Ships of the Royal Navy* (2 vols., London, 1969), i, p. 238.

England, as [Major-General Thomas] Harreson and [th]e rest for [tha]t they had cleared themselves and theyre Conscience befor God.⁷

The nature of the evidence which was provided against Hall and Wood suggests that these revolutionaries *consented* to each other's views regarding the Regicide.⁸ However, the allegations made against these two sailors suggest other means by which consensus about the past can be witnessed. Much of the conversation between the two men related to the execution of the regicides in October 1660. Hence, their memories of the Regicide as a justifiable action were refracted through those of the regicides themselves. In this sense, the sentiments of Hall and Wood are not representative merely of consensus about the meaning of the Regicide with each another, but also *with the regicides*. Indeed, it is possible, if perhaps improbable, that the views of Hall and Wood about the Regicide imply that at least one of them was present at Charing Cross in October 1660, when several of the regicides chose to justify the act for which the executioner's scaffold had beckoned (chapter 2). If this was the case, then the consensus of which the conversation between Hall and Wood in April 1661 was illustrative connotes a broader consensus which was mediated by the scaffold speeches of the regicides. It would be possible, in fact, to infer from the discussion between Hall and Wood that, in contrast to the claims of historians, the early modern 'dying speech' was not always a means through which authority was reproduced.⁹ Instead, when subverted, these speeches appear to have reproduced opinions which ran contrary to this authority.

While it is unclear how many of those who witnessed the executions of the regicides in October 1660 consented to the opinions which were espoused from the scaffold, further evidence implies consensus among at least some of those who were present. On the Sunday after the execution of Major-General Thomas Harrison, for example, the minister John Sympson

⁷ TNA, SP 89/5/11.

⁸ Despite this information, Hatherly denied that he had heard Hall speak any of these words. Two additional witnesses from the *Royal Charles*, Joseph Cracknell, the 'Boatswains mate', and Christopher Watson, the 'Carpinters Mate', denied that either Hall or Wood had spoken any seditious words, TNA, SP 89/5/11.

⁹ Wood, *1549*, p. 238.

held forth before his congregation at Bishopsgate (London) that ‘though the unjust Judges now condemned the Saints to death, yet they were justified before God: and that what they had don their Consciences did beare them witnesse that it was just and right.’¹⁰ It is possible, of course, that Sympson was here acting as a mediator between the regicides who had spoken on the scaffold and members of his congregation who were, for whatever reason, unable to attend the executions. Indeed, it is not inconceivable that the sailors Matthew Hall and Thomas Wood, the former of which appears to have been a resident of nearby Whitechapel,¹¹ were present during Sympson’s sermon, or one much like it, and that it had been the transmission of the speeches of the regicides via someone who had been present, which informed the opinions that the men would later express aboard the *Royal Charles* in April 1661. In order to strengthen this conclusion, it is worth highlighting that sermons were a medium through which consensus about the meaning of the English Revolution was common after the Restoration. In fact, one of the earliest examples of seditious remembering originates from a sermon which was preached at Darfield (South Yorkshire) on 13 May 1660, the day after the declaration of the king’s return in the county.¹² Here, John Botts, the local minister, broadcast his view that ‘an earthly King ... will tend to the imbroileing of us againe in blood’, an argument which echoed the charge of the regicides that Charles I was marked as a ‘man of blood’ for causing the second civil war.¹³ While not all of the parishioners of Darfield church would have shared in Botts’ views, it would be reasonable to suggest that at least some of those present – fellow participants in the revolution, perhaps – *had* done so. Indeed, several of the cases which were used as evidence in chapter 2 were recorded because seditious memories had been expressed during sermons. That these opinions were thus common

¹⁰ Quoted in Greaves, *Deliver*, p. 32.

¹¹ See TNA, SP 89/5/11.

¹² From Beverley (East Yorkshire) on 12 May 1660: ‘the bells of both our great churches rang loud and clear today announcing that once again we have a King in England. For today, Charles II, on his thirtieth birthday, is to enter London’, Pamela Hopkins (ed.), *The Diary of John Jackson: Sometime Macebearer in Seventeenth Century Beverley* (Beverley, 1991), p. 61.

¹³ DCY, p. 83.

throughout England and Wales after 1660 speaks of the potential scale of a counter-memory of the revolution.

The use of sermons to communicate seditious memories, such as those concerning the trial and execution of Charles I, would have entailed the creation of some level of consensus. While it is possible that the attendance at such a sermon had informed the opinions of Matthew Hall and Thomas Wood, a more reasonable explanation is that at least one of them had read *the transcript* of the speeches of the regicides which had been published as *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the late King's Judges* in December 1660. Matthew Jenkinson has suggested that at least 3,000 copies of the *Speeches and Prayers* made it to print:¹⁴ enough for the royalist surveyor of the press, Sir Roger L'Estrange, to condemn this pamphlet as 'discouraging Loyalty to Future Generations, by transmitting the whole Party of the Royalists ... to Posterity, for a prostitute Rabble of Villeins, and Traytors.'¹⁵ The reception of the *Speeches and Prayers* was indeed wide and Edmund Ludlow, himself an exiled regicide, transcribed the speech of Thomas Harrison in full.¹⁶ There is little doubt, in fact, that Ludlow, and at least a percentage of the thousands who read or heard the text of the *Speeches and Prayers* were in agreement with its content. Perhaps the strongest indication of the kinds of consensus to which the production of printed matter was conducive was the rising of the Fifth Monarchy men in the opening days of the following January (see chapter 1).¹⁷ This rising, which entailed several days of violence in London and the surrounding area, was a direct response to the execution of the regicides, and those involved could be heard to cry for 'King Jesus, and the heads upon the gates'.¹⁸ That this rising occurred over two months after the executions of the regicides could suggest that those involved had been spurred on by the publication of the *Speeches and*

¹⁴ Matthew Jenkinson, *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II, 1660-1685* (Woodbridge, 2010), p. 39.

¹⁵ Roger L'Estrange, *Considerations and Proposals In Order to the Regulation of the Press: Together with Diverse Instances of Treasonous, and Seditious Pamphlets, Proving the Necessity thereof* (London, 1663), p. 9.

¹⁶ Worden, *Voyce*, pp. 215-216.

¹⁷ See Greaves, *Deliver*, pp. 50, 53.

¹⁸ Pepys, ii, p. 11.

Prayers a month earlier. Indeed, the declaration of the rebels, *A Door of Hope*, was pervaded with seditious memories of the recent past, including the claim that it had been ‘this beginning of Reformation’ when ‘the honest Party engaged in this Quarrel, (however by far the less number) God did abundantly own, and witness too from heaven, by opening his Salvation, and making bare his own Arm, against the late King, who was justly cut off as a Murtherer.’¹⁹ These words were a clear echo of the sentiments of the regicides who had spoken from the scaffold at Charing Cross in October and might reflect how far consensus over the meaning of the past was mediated by the transcription of such speeches. Of course, in disseminating ideas about the legitimacy of the trial and execution of Charles I, *A Door of Hope*, contributed to the circulation of material from which consensus about the seditious past was possible.

While little substantive evidence survives of how the *Speeches and Prayers* were received, the scaffold speeches of the four regicides who were executed in April and June 1662 gives a flavour of the reception of texts that included accounts of seditious memories: something which is difficult when examining the early modern era.²⁰ When Ralph Josselin read the speeches of the three regicides who were executed in April 1662, for example, he singularly failed to condemn them. On the contrary, Josselin took heed of Colonel John Okey’s warning about the future, writing that ‘indeed man knows not to morrow[,] its not for us to prophesy. [B]ut when our sins deserve a curse[,] its wisdom to heare, feare and repent.’²¹ Likewise, when Samuel Pepys obtained the scaffold speech of Sir Henry Vane in June 1662, he was struck by the old republican’s dying words, describing the publication as ‘a very excellent thing, worth reading and [Vane] to have been a very wise man.’²² Considering the extent to which Vane was keen to justify his support for the revolution on the scaffold (see chapter 2), it is conceivable that Pepys found opinions in Vane’s dying speech which chimed with his own ambiguous memories (see below). Indeed, while Josselin and Pepys were

¹⁹ *A Door of Hope*, p. 1.

²⁰ Southcombe and Tapsell, *Restoration*, p. 142.

²¹ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 489.

²² Quoted in Richard Ollard, *Pepys, A Biography* (London, 1974), p. 36.

prudent to avoid referring to the regicides' seditious views about the recent past, the fact that neither of these men balked at the content of the pamphlets leaves room for the possibility of consensus which is otherwise hidden.

Beyond the scaffold speeches of the regicides, other evidence offers a more detailed image of the reception of seditious memories which were fixed in print. Between 1661 and 1662, three volumes of the *Mirabilis Annus* pamphlets were produced, which listed, and explained the meaning of, dozens of 'prodigious' events.²³ Both Ralph Josselin and Samuel Pepys recorded having read the works, but only Philip Henry, the Presbyterian minister at Worthenbury (Flintshire) appears to have taken its content to heart. Indeed, on 12 December 1661, Henry wrote of having

read a book cald *Annus mirabilis* contayning a narrative of several strange Appearances of the great God this last year in all the Elements, chiefly witnessing ag[ains]t. Prophanes & persecution, lord, when thy hand is lifted up, men will not see, but they shall see, true and holy are thy wayes, just and righteous are thy judgements, thou King of Saints.²⁴

Not long afterwards, Henry was provoked to inform his neighbour that the revolution had been 'in general the Cause of God & Religion, and will in due time bee made so to appear' (see chapter 6).²⁵ It is possible, therefore, that Henry, who had supported the Restoration in 1660, had arrived at some degree of consensus about the meanings of the past which were contained on the pages of the *Mirabilis Annus* tracts.

Consensus about seditious memories can be witnessed therefore in the nature of records of everyday speech, sermons and scaffold speeches. Yet, the memories hitherto considered have been representative of the opinions

²³ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 482; Henry, *Diary*, pp. 101, 104.

²⁴ Henry, *Diary*, p. 101.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

of men and women who had supported the most radical manifestation of opposition to the Stuarts: the Regicide. This should not be taken to mean, however, that more 'moderate' revolutionaries did not search for, and indeed accomplish, consensus about the meaning of the recent past. In December 1660, for example, Nathaniel Jones, the rector of Westmeston (East Sussex) was accused (although later cleared) of saying that 'the King had broken the Covenant and made the people to break it.'²⁶ Meanwhile, a true bill was found against Christopher Marshall for airing similar remarks during a sermon at Horbury (West Yorkshire) on 1 August 1666. Marshall had preached, according to one witness, that 'those who had taken the *Protestation* ... and afterwards attended their parish churches were perjured persons.'²⁷ Both of these perspectives, which legitimated subscription to the Protestation oath (1641) and the Solemn League and Covenant (1643), referred to rather different pasts from the pro-regicidal comments which other ministers had made. Indeed, similar sympathies for the religious revolution of the 1640s and 1650s were held by the well-known nonconformist minister Richard Baxter, whose letter to John Eliot, a colonial missionary, in January 1669 included his convictions that the radicals had scuppered his efforts at 'reformation' in Worcestershire.²⁸ Indeed, it is possible that the receipt of Baxter's letter by Elliot, who shared Baxter's views on some matters of religious doctrine, offers yet another window through which consensus about the meaning of the English Revolution might be observed.²⁹

The evidence above suggests that the construction of consensus was one of the principal objects, and the direct consequence, of the articulation of seditious memories between those who supported the English Revolution. In order to understand *why* it was important for revolutionaries to share the past in this way, as opposed to merely internalising it, it is necessary to return to the conclusions which were drawn in chapter 2. Hitherto it has been argued that the articulation of seditious memories served to legitimate participation in, and to validate identities which were tied to, the English Revolution.

²⁶ *CR*, p. 302.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 340.

²⁸ Baxter, *Letters*, pp. 70-71.

²⁹ See *ibid.*, pp. 84, 117-188.

Those who participated in the revolution, of course, did not do so alone. On the contrary, the religio-political identities to which the events of the 1640s and 1650s gave rise – Presbyterian, Independent, Baptist, parliamentarian, republican, Leveller, and so on – were *social*, and relied upon *consensus* about the meanings of *shared* experiences. When consensus about the meaning of the revolution was sought out or accomplished *after* the Restoration, therefore, these identities were validated *socially*, as well as personally. In doing so, revolutionaries did not merely experience a sense of self-validation, but also *solidarity*. One way of conceiving of this process would be to describe those who shared these interpretations of the past as ‘communities of memory’: communities within which, as one scholar of memory has put it, ‘a great deal of our daily interaction takes place’ and which ‘[allow] us the comfort of feeling at home with people we are with [and] ... a sense of belonging we all seem to need.’³⁰ By returning to the case of Matthew Hall and Thomas Wood, for example, it is likely that the ‘community of (seditious) memory’ of which both men became fellows was the direct result for the need for solidarity in a particular environment – the post-1660 navy – in which censure for participation in the revolution was common (see chapter 1). In all of the cases considered so far, therefore, the articulation of seditious memories can be regarded as a means through which solidarity was mediated. Indeed, in forming these communities, revolutionaries negotiated experiences of the royalists’ authority to remember *together*, rather than alone. In fact, these communities of memory could be conceptualised as what Michael Warner calls ‘counterpublics’ or those which ‘maintain[ed] at some level, conscious or not, an awareness of [their] subordinate status’ and which ‘remain distinct from authority and can have a critical relation to power’.³¹

Yet, there are elements to the evidence available which suggest that these communities of memory were not only created and strengthened through the process of sharing seditious memories, but also *imagined*. If one casts a glance back through the evidence used so far in this thesis, including

³⁰ Irwin-Zarecka, *Frames of Remembrance*, p. 54

³¹ Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (New York, NY, 2002), p. 56.

the case of John Cleverley with which this chapter opened, the frequency with which individuals used the first person *plural* pronoun 'we' when articulating memories is evident. The historian of memory Guy Beiner has argued, in relation to aftermath of the 1798 rebellion in Ireland, that the use of the word 'we' demonstrates that 'personal accounts' are grounded 'in a collective, community-based experience'.³² While this is true, it is possible to go further and to argue that the 'physical' solidarity aforementioned – the consequence of constructing consensus – was conducive also to an 'imagined' solidarity. In other words, revolutionaries did not need to be immersed in communities of memory in order to experience social self-validation. Instead, an imagined community, such as that to which Benedict Anderson famously referred, might be compassed.³³ In a particularly interesting case of seditious remembering from July 1676, it is possible to get a sense of how this imagined solidarity might have influenced the worldviews of those who had participated in the revolution. In extensive evidence given against one Harrington, a second cousin of Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, it was alleged that, during the king's long prorogation of the Cavalier Parliament, he had said the following: 'the governm[en]t was in the 3 estates and that the takeing upp armes unlesse against all three was noe Rebellion.' In response to this declaration, one of those present asked whether Harrington would thus accept that 'those hanged at Charing Crosse [i.e. the regicides] was not for Rebellion.' Harrington's fatal response was 'pish ... that was [only] the Opinion of 12 men' and that 'this King did bugger this parliam[en]t much like buggering of an old woman'.³⁴ Thus, Harrington's view, while perhaps exaggerated for the purposes of making his point, implied his belief that only a minority held the Regicide to have been criminal. His views, in other words, might demonstrate how membership of a community of memory enabled the opinion of more widespread consensus than actually existed.

³² Guy Beiner, *Remembering the Year of the French: Irish Folk History and Social Memory* (Madison, WI, 2007), p. 23.

³³ See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1991).

³⁴ TNA, SP 29/392/13, SP 29/392/14.

II

In chapter 2, it was argued that the process of self-validation meant that some revolutionaries continued to conceive of themselves in relation to religio-political identities which had been forged during the English Revolution. Those who participated in the revolution, in other words, continued to regard themselves as Covenanters, the loyal soldiers of Oliver Cromwell and John Lambert, or the enemies of 'cavaliers' and 'turn coats'. If, as the previous section suggested, these processes of self-validation were *social* then it follows that those who held onto these identities continued to conceive of *others* as having shared them. This phenomenon can be observed if we return once more to the episode aboard the *Royal Charles* in April 1661. In addition to allegations of having justified the Regicide, Thomas Wood was accused of arguing with a deep sense of 'uchronia' that the revolutionaries 'had been fooles to rise so soone as they did, because if they had stayed longer they might have had more, and that all they that had suffered lately for the late rebellion dyed for [th]e Cause of God.'³⁵ Whether Wood was here referring to a radical uprising before or after the Restoration (i.e. the Fifth Monarchists' rebellion in January 1661) is unclear. Nonetheless, this evidence suggests a distinct sense of the continued *collective* identification with '[th]e Cause of God'.

That revolutionaries continued to conceive of each other as such after the Restoration, offers a fresh insight into community and sociability in later seventeenth-century England and Wales. Recently, historians of the period have argued that community 'was a process of symbolic production: the means by which relationships, actions, artefacts, events and representations were invested with meaning.'³⁶ Additional evidence would appear to suggest that relationships among revolutionaries after 1660 were, in some cases, invested with, and reliant upon, the meaning of *the past*. One intriguing example of this comes from the correspondence of John Davenport, a founder of the New Haven colony in North American, and William Goffe, an

³⁵ TNA, SP 89/5/11.

³⁶ Phil Withington and Alexandra Shepard, 'Introduction: communities in early modern England', Shepard and Withington (eds.), *Communities*, p. 8.

exiled regicide living in the Massachusetts colony. In a letter from May 1662, Davenport related that the king and the Duke of York had attended Woolwich Dockyard (Kent), and directed the seamen there to 'take an Oath to be subject to the K[ing] & B[isho]ps'. Remarkably, the seamen responded – with a single voice – that, through 'they were willing to ser[v]e him [i.e. the king]' they 'refused to subscribe to the B[isho]ps, & did expect to be free from them, for they had formerly fought against them.' As the king and duke considered firm measures with which to ensure obedience, the seamen responded that 'they and there [sic] relations had cause to curse the day in which they brought him & his relations into the land, or that they wished the curse of God vpon themsel[v]es for bringing them in'. Ominously, Davenport's letter concluded with the remark 'some men were killed'.³⁷ This episode demonstrates how individuals continued to identify *collectively* with the revolution, but it also suggests once more that, since the seamen 'were willing to ser[v]e' the king, identification with the revolution did not entail republicanism.

The case of the Woolwich seamen could speak of a more general tendency for individuals in that employment, some of whom would have served the Commonwealth, to possess enduring 'revolutionary' identities. Indeed, additional evidence suggests that, at around the same time, a community of seditious memories existed further up the Thames at Wapping (Middlesex). On 25 November, four men were ordered to provide evidence against William Hammond for having said publicly 'that Oliver was as good a man as King Charles was, and that he had lent Oliver a thousand pounds, and that King Charles was as very a knave as Oliver was.'³⁸ Exactly a week later, the same court ordered another man from the area to give evidence against one George Appleby, for saying that 'the Lord Protector was as good a man as the King.'³⁹ Although the Middlesex justices recorded only the names and speeches of the accused, they gave the places of origin and occupations of those who informed against them. The four men instructed to

³⁷ *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, pp. 200-201.

³⁸ *MCR*, iii, pp. 315-316.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 316.

give evidence against Hammond originated in the Hermitage and Wapping areas of Whitechapel and Stepney. Likewise, Appleby's informant originated in Stepney. All of Hammond's witnesses, bar one, were victuallers, while Appleby's witness was listed as being a labourer. On this basis, it would be reasonable to suggest that Hammond's witnesses were employed in victualling the numerous ships using the docks at Hermitage, Wapping, Shadwell and Ratcliff. While less detail is given about the accused, there exist two probate records from the late-seventeenth century belonging to men called William Hammond and George Appleby, both of whom belonged to the parish of Stepney. William Hammond of Ratcliff, and George Appleby of St Paul, Shadwell, registered their wills in June 1688 and December 1695 respectively and both referred to themselves as 'mariners'.⁴⁰ Considering the origins and professions of the informants, it seems plausible that these are the wills of the accused. Consequently, it is possible to make the significant assumption that Hammond and Appleby, men living within approximately a single square-mile and belonging to the same profession, were acquainted with each other or, at the very least, moved in the same professional circles. Hence, the seditious memories which these men shared could speak of their *mutual* identification as supporters of Oliver Cromwell.

The cases above represent the fact that professional associations enabled revolutionary identities to endure beyond 1660. Further evidence suggests that other sites of sociability enabled this kind of collective identification. It has been suggested, for example, that old parliamentary soldiers from West Yorkshire continued to congregate at an inn called 'the Lord Brook's' (named after the parliamentarian Robert Greville, Baron Brooke) which was adjacent to Adwalton Moor (West Yorkshire), the scene of a civil war battle on 30 June 1643. While Andrew Hopper has argued that 'the choice of his name for the inn suggests something of the religious and political culture of the district', it is possible to go even further than this. That these old soldiers chose to meet at this pub was almost certainly a consequence of, and consequential to, the collective identity of these men as

⁴⁰ TNA, PROB 11/409/282; TNA, PROB 11/453/292.

revolutionaries.⁴¹ It is possible, of course, that this inn was not only the meeting place of old parliamentarians, but also *exclusive* to them: what James C. Scott has referred to as a 'sequestered site' which, in John Walter's formulation, 'offered a breathing space within the cultural hegemony that otherwise constrained such open expressions'.⁴² Indeed, the kinds of discussions which might have been broached at the sequestered site of Lord Brook's inn could be inferred from the record of an incident which occurred at another drinking establishment in Egton (North Yorkshire), where one William Kirke declared before his fellow drinkers that 'I say never a cavalier shall weare a sword.'⁴³ Here, a sense of who those in the alehouse *were not*, 'cavaliers', helped to reproduce their sense of a *collective* identity.⁴⁴

In additional evidence from September 1661, the idea that alehouses, inns and taverns mediated the construction of collective identities is reinforced. On 16 September, news arrived at the George Inn, Bridport (Dorset) 'that there were forces to bee sent towards Scotland & that the County troopes were like to goe.' In response to the rumour, one Lieutenant Wadden, speculated that 'the people of God' might thus have an opportunity to 'hang all turne-coates rogues, meaning such as having formerly byn in rebellion [but] did now serve his [Majesty].' Meanwhile, grimaced Wadden, 'another course' would be taken with 'those of the Kings party'. One of those present, Richard Muston, appears to have sensed that these words were directed at him, and decided to broach the fact that Wadden, while supporting parliament in the civil wars, had refused to serve Oliver Cromwell, and was thus also guilty of turning his coat. Unperturbed, Wadden responded 'noe, for hee disowned that power as much as hee did this, & would as soone fight against it.' In response to these words, Muston, who appears to have served the regime as a soldier, told Wadden 'that hee could not conceale such words as those, but that hee would informe his Captaine.' Apparently provoked by this statement, one Colefox, another patron of the

⁴¹ Hopper, 'Farnley Wood', p. 285.

⁴² Walter, 'Public transcripts', p. 145. For the inn as a place in which boundaries were drawn between social actors, see Phil Withington, 'Company and sociability in early modern England', *Social History*, 32:3 (August 2007), p. 301.

⁴³ *DCY*, p. 147.

⁴⁴ Bowen, 'Seditious speech', p. 56.

inn, 'said, that hee hoped to see a change of the Governm[en]t; & that in a short tyme ... such honest men as hee would be lookt upon againe, & not such Turne-coate rogues as [Muston].'⁴⁵ In this fascinating case, then, Wadden was able to demonstrate to himself, as well as to Muston, that the revolution of which he had been a supporter was the 'true' one, since he had supported parliament and the Commonwealth, but had 'disowned' the power of Oliver Cromwell. In doing so, Wadden validated a revolutionary identity through which he differentiated himself from Muston, a 'turne-coat'. Most significantly, however, Colefox evinced his consent to Wadden's words, validating thereby a *collective* identity, and excluding Muston from it as a consequence. It is possible, in fact, that the George Inn in Bridport was yet another sequestered space within which those who continued to identify as revolutionaries sought refuge from their detractors.

Collective identification in relation to the recent past was not confined to the alehouse, of course. One example of collective identification suggests, in fact, that the later seventeenth century prison also operated as a sequestered site. In December 1662, it was reported from Ivelchester (Ilchester, Somerset) that John Elliot, an inmate, had told two of his fellow prisoners William Ferris and Francis Rogers that a rising against the regime was soon to take place and 'a part of horse would speedily com & breake up the prison'. Intriguingly, Elliot added that, while 'all [th]e prisoners' would be let out, Richard Alder and one Peter (whose surname is obscured) would be left behind bars 'because they are Cavaliers'.⁴⁶ Here, Elliot's supposition of collective identification *against* the two cavaliers within the gaol at Ilchester appears to have informed an expectation that Ferris and Rogers would join him in the rising.

⁴⁵ TNA, SP 29/42/1. As Muston was the only witness who was willing to testify against him, Wadden appears to have been lucky to escape the charge of treason for these words, see TNA, SP 29/43/1. A letter of 1 October 1661 from Secretary Nicholas implored Lord Holles to bring Wadden before the next assizes, by which point more witnesses might be found against him. Nicholas also mentioned that Colefox's absconding 'implies ... a confession of guilt', TNA, SP 29/43/1a.

⁴⁶ TNA, SP 29/65/19.

The cases aforementioned illustrate how the accomplishment of consensus mediated collective identification among revolutionaries. In other cases, however, it appears that the misapprehension of consensus could result in conflict. In September 1671, for example, William Gough and his son, Sampson, came to the house of Robert Greene, a gentleman of Pencombe (Herefordshire), where the pair were employed 'in making of Charcoale'. According to the Goughs, who later offered information of this conversation to the authorities, Greene engaged the men in a 'discourse concerning the late rebellious wars' at which point 'the said Robert Greene told [them] ... that there was none but rouges that were of the Kings party'.⁴⁷ Since there is no indication that Greene's words were directed towards the Goughs, it appears likely that, for reasons which are unclear, he expected consensus about the meaning of the English Revolution where there was in fact none. As such, Gough thought that it was appropriate to identify *against* the royalists, to whom he referred as 'rouges'.

The case of Robert Greene demonstrates that the misapprehension of consensus after the Restoration was dangerous. Indeed, in many of the aforementioned cases, the fact that the seditious memories were recorded at all was a consequence of such misapprehension. To take another, particularly colourful example from Cornwall in December 1663, one revolutionary's misconstrual of his audience resulted in what appears to have been a rather awkward situation. According to information from three members of the Vignes family of Liskeard, one James Harris, a 'journeyman' fuller of Pelynt over eight miles away, entered the family's house with Margaret Allen, the twenty-eight year old daughter of his master, John (or George) Allen. During his stay, Harris was heard by the owner of the property, Samuel Vignes, and his children, William and Jane, to say that 'hee had bine a souldier in Cromwells Army And that hee did see the last Kinge Charles beheaded att London, and that hee was beheaded for goeing from his Parliament and for poisoning of his father.' Significantly, it

⁴⁷ TNA, SP 29/293/164.

seems, ‘suddenly after this discourse about [seven] of the Clocke att night’ Harris absconded ‘to the howse of one John Hoblyn in Liskerd ... where one Grace Allen brought [him] some meate & drinke.’⁴⁸ Harris’s words are interesting enough for the particular form which his justification of the Regicide took. Indeed, the view that Charles I had poisoned his father, James I, was a long-standing justification of his trial and execution. The idea had currency from the early 1640s, when the allegations of James’ physician Dr George Eglisam, were republished as *The Forerunner of Revenge*.⁴⁹ These allegations then found a new audience in January 1649, when John Cook included them in his pamphlet, *King Charls his case*.⁵⁰ As a soldier under Cromwell, Fuller might have had access to Cook’s defence of the Regicide after 1649, or have heard his comrades make references to it.⁵¹ Beyond the nature of Harris’s speech, however, his decision to articulate these seditious memories is significant. A stranger to the Vignes household, it seems unlikely that Harris made a reference to the Regicide in order to antagonise his hosts. On the contrary, Harris was probably expecting the sort of consensus which he appears to have received from the Allen family, a member of which, in stark contrast to the horrified responses of the Vignes, was more than happy to treat Harris to ‘some meate [and] drinke.’

Revolutionaries, then, were always in danger of assuming that consensus existed where there was none at all. One example of seditious remembering suggests that, in response to this danger, measures were taken to ensure that the spaces within which seditious memories were articulated really were ‘sequestered’. In July 1662, therefore, when a group

⁴⁸ See TNA, SP 29/86/22 I, II.

⁴⁹ Thomas Cogswell, ‘The Return of the “Deade Alive”: The Earl of Bristol and Dr Eglisam in the Parliament of 1626 and in Caroline Political Culture’, *The English Historical Review*, 128:532 (June, 2013), pp. 560, 562.

⁵⁰ John Cook[e], *King Charls his Case: Or, an Appeal To all Rational Men, Concerning His Tryal at the High Court of Justice* (London, 1649), p. 12, quoted in Cogswell, ‘The Return of the “Dead Alive”’, p. 566.

⁵¹ In fact, Harris was not alone in referring to the alleged poisoning of James I. In March 1660, shortly before the Restoration, John Careuth of Tynemouth, hundreds of miles away from Liskerd, was heard to say ‘the King was the son of a whore, and that the late King was a son of a whore, and that the late King Charles poison’d his father’, *DCY*, p. 84. This is probably the ‘John Carruth’ listed as a member of the Baptist church in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, see Edward Bean Underhill (ed.), *Records of the Churches of Christ gathered at Fenstanton, Warboys, and Hexham. 1644-1720* (London, 1854), p. 372.

of Somerset men raised a toast to the notable local revolutionary Colonel Richard Buffett (see chapter 2), they ensured secrecy by doing so ‘in a certaine chamber in the house of one Andrew Sesse.’⁵² When the toast was raised, however, one of those present, Thomas Hill, refused. Identified by his fellows as a threat, he ‘was instantly beaten and abused by the said p[er]sons ... [who] tolde him [tha]t olde Dick [Cromwell] should be old Dick still: and that they would bee for the old Olivers Creation’.⁵³ In a strikingly similar example, again from Taunton, one Samuel Potter senior was threatened in June 1663 for not drinking ‘a health to old Cromwell and Lambert and the rest of his friends’.⁵⁴ That two cases exist of the drinking of healths to revolutionaries in Taunton after the Restoration could reflect its staunch loyalties to parliament during the civil wars. Here, it seems, healths remained a good way for revolutionaries to discover who was willing to identify strongly with the past through the transgression of the convention of drinking healths to the king.⁵⁵ In both of these cases, it seems, the refusal of one person to join in the health provoked the rest of the company to take action in order to ensure their ‘sequestration’.

Those who sought consensus, then, did so at the risk of being informed against by hostile interlopers. We could argue, in fact, that seditious remembering was a variety of what James C. Scott calls the ‘hidden transcript’. In order to understand this notion, it is necessary first to appreciate the existence of what Scott calls ‘public transcripts’ or ‘the public performance of the subordinate will’ encouraged by ‘prudence, fear, and the desire to curry favor’ and ‘shaped to appeal to the expectations of the powerful.’⁵⁶ In post-revolutionary England and Wales, the public transcript was the royalists’ authority to remember. In opposition to these public transcripts, argues Scott, there are always ‘hidden’ ones, which ‘consists of those offstage speeches, gestures, and practices that confirm, contradict, or

⁵² TNA, SP 29/57/123.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ SRO, Q/SR/103/38.

⁵⁵ For similar displays of health-drinking among Royalists during the 1650s, see Marika Keblusek, ‘Wine for Comfort: Drinking and the Royalist Experience’, 1642-1660, Smyth (ed.), *A Pleasing Sinne*, p. 63; Bowen, ‘Seditious speech’, p. 57.

⁵⁶ Scott, *Domination*, p. 2.

inflect what appears in the public transcript.⁵⁷ Communities of seditious remembering exemplify Scott's notion of the hidden transcript, because, as has been evident throughout this chapter, the members of these communities were aware of the need to conceal seditious memories in order to avoid any transgression of the authority to remember. The implications of describing communities of seditious remembering as the locations for the construction of hidden transcripts, of course, is that more of them existed than can be deduced from the available evidence: a suggestion which has been made in relation to seditious opinions by several historians.⁵⁸ Indeed, the tendency has been to stumble across communities of seditious memory only when revolutionaries mistook the nature of their company or, in some cases, when there was someone present who was in the service of the regime (see below).

When seditious memories are understood as a hidden transcript, it becomes possible to infer that those who participated in the revolution, and are known to have continued to associate with each other, did so out of a sense of collective identity as revolutionaries.⁵⁹ A brief scan over the pages of *Calamy Revised*, for example, reveals how far the ejected nonconformist ministers, of which the book is a record, continued to be patronised by revolutionaries.⁶⁰ One such individual was Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke, who remained friendly with George Cockayne, the London minister whose role in the production of the *Mirabilis Annus* tracts of 1661 and 1662 was mentioned in chapter 2.⁶¹ It is intriguing that, while Whitelocke shied away from articulating memories which might be deemed seditious (see chapter 2), Cockayne categorically *did not*. In May 1663, Cockayne visited his family's seat in Cople (Bedfordshire) where, among other familial duties, he led a

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁵⁸ Hill, *Some Intellectual Consequences*, p. 15; Greaves, *Secrets*, p. 15; Wood, *1549*, p. 255; and Bowen, 'Seditious speech', p. 60.

⁵⁹ For accounts of the continued association of revolutionaries, see Philip Jenkins, "'The Old Leaven': the Welsh Roundheads after 1660", *The Historical Journal*, 24:4 (1981), p. 813; Greaves, *Enemies*, p. 128; Ann Hughes, 'Men, the "public" and the "private" in the English Revolution' Lake and Pincus, *Public sphere*, p. 204; and Jason Peacey, "'The good old cause for which I suffer": The Life of a Regicide in Exile', Philip Major (ed.), *Literatures of exile in the English Revolution and its aftermath, 1640-1690* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 175-176.

⁶⁰ *CR*, pp. 15, 19-20, 499, 516, 543.

⁶¹ Whitelocke, *Diary*, *passim*.

conventicle. According to the information of a hostile interloper, Cockayne had also engaged in a 'discourse' with members of his family during his visit, and had asserted 'that the old [King] did deserve to be beheaded, & why should he not be beheaded as well as another'.⁶² Although these were strikingly reckless sentiments for a man who was known to the authorities, Cockayne's subsequent evasion of arrest compounded his guilt.⁶³ Cockayne was, of course, among the strongest supporters of the Regicide. On 29 November 1648, Cockayne, then a fresh-faced minister, had preached his debut sermon before the House of Commons,⁶⁴ commanding MPs to delay not in meting out justice against those 'who are the Lords and the Peoples known Enemies.'⁶⁵ The use of the words 'discourse' by the man who provided the regime with evidence of Cockayne's words in 1663 could imply, of course, that his family *consented* to his views about the Regicide. What this evidence suggests is that, while no detailed evidence of discussions between Whitlocke and Cockayne exist, it is plausible that at least some of them turned to the past. Once more, then, the impression is given that there were more communities of seditious memories than have left a mark on the historical record.

III

For the men and women who continued to identify as revolutionaries, of course, it was not merely the royalists' authority to remember which formed a common grievance, but, as chapters 1 and 2 illustrated, their efforts to use this authority in order to influence the present and the future. Thus, communities of seditious memories were not merely the locations for the validation of social identities, but also of forging an image of alternative realities. Indeed, a diary entry by the Lancastrian mercer Roger Lowe offers a fascinating glimpse into how revolutionaries used a collective revolutionary identity as an excuse to indulge in what might be called 'social nostalgia'. On 16 August 1664, therefore, Lowe wrote of how he was in the company of James Woods, a local nonconformist minister, and William Hasleden, when

⁶² TNA, SP 29/91/22.

⁶³ Whitlocke, *Diary*, p. 679.

⁶⁴ Tai Liu, 'Cokayn, George (bap. 1620, d. 1691)', *ODNB*, xii, p. 443.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, xii, p. 443.

'discourse was concerninge wars and troubles that he and old William had beene in together so att far in night I came me way.'⁶⁶ While Lowe speaks as if he had not himself experienced these 'wars and troubles', it is possible that Hasleden and Wood had fought for parliament in the civil wars. It is also conceivable, then, that Lowe chose not to disclose the fact that the men had been sharing nostalgic tales about the revolution that summer evening. Other evidence gives a clearer impression of social nostalgia among nonconformist communities. In 1675, for instance, at the funeral of the Presbyterian minister Lazarus Seaman, William Jenkyn used his funeral sermon as a roll call of the 'now blessed Worthies', including Edmund Calamy, Simeon Ashe and Jeremiah Burroughs, all of whom had been involved in the moderate (and in some cases radical) revolution of the 1640s and 1650s.⁶⁷

Not all nostalgia was reflective, of course. In some cases, nostalgia made possible visions of *the future*. The memories of the sailors Matthew Hall and Thomas Wood, for instance, were *restorative*, as well as merely reflective. By the end of their conversation aboard the *Royal Charles*, in fact, the men had claimed that '[Th]e kinge of England would not Reyne one yeare to an end, be-cause [th]e former government keepte the subiects more in subiection then he doth, and that [th]e kinge is a greate favorer of Papists'.⁶⁸ The post-revolutionary era, then, could not last, since experiences of the Commonwealth were preferable. In remarkably similar circumstances to these, one Captain Owen Cox assured a fellow officer aboard the *Raphael of Sweden*, Captain William Pestell, that if the king continued to except revolutionaries from his pardon, then he 'must expect to goe the same way his Father ... went.'⁶⁹ Unfortunately for Cox, he was unaware that Pestell

⁶⁶ Ian G. Winstanley (ed.), *The Diary of Roger Lowe of Ashton-in-Makerfield, Lancashire. 1663-1678* (Ashton-in-Makerfield, 1994), p. 32.

⁶⁷ William Jenkyn, *Exodus, Or, The Decease of Holy Men and Ministers, Consider'd in The Nature, Certainty, Causes, and Improvement thereof: A Sermon Preach't Sept. 12. 1675: By occasion of the much lamented Death of that Learned and Reverend Minister of Christ, Dr. Lazarus Seaman, Late Pastor of Alhallows-Bread-Street, London* (London, 1675), pp. 38-40. With thanks to Dr Elliot Vernon for this reference.

⁶⁸ TNA, SP 89/5/11.

⁶⁹ TNA, SP 29/46/5 I.

was at this time working as an agent for the regime.⁷⁰ Elsewhere, nonconformist ministers summoned hope among their congregations by invoking the Providence of the revolutionaries' cause. In September 1660, for example, Thomas Lamb beseeched God before his congregation that 'as thou hast struck one stroke already in that family strike another.'⁷¹ Elsewhere, these prospective uses of the past were common among communities of seditious memories which inhabited alehouses, taverns and inns. In August 1662, for example, William Springe, a husbandman living in Somerset, described to the county's justices how he had entered the house of William Goddard – presumably an alehouse – where he soon found himself 'accidentallie in the companie of one Jeremy Cole of Curland in the said county.' During his stay, Springe heard Cole say 'lett this younge rogue take heed that his head be not cutt of as his fathers was.'⁷² Meanwhile Thomas Mayson of Thorne (South Yorkshire) found himself out of town in Gainsborough (Lincolnshire) in 1663, where he appears to have assumed (mistakenly) that his company would have been buoyed by his belief 'that there would be warres shortly againe in England, and that there would be fouer for one against the cavaliers.'⁷³

That collective identification with the revolution was perceived as a way of sharing *hope* is reflected in other cases for which the desperate circumstances of the revolutionaries involved is manifest. Over the winter of 1664-65, for example, two inmates of the Fleet prison (London), Edward Parrott and James Browne became acquainted. According to Parrott, in information which he provided before the King's Bench the following April, Browne had asked him 'if Hee had been a soldier, or not.' In an attempt to 'to insinuate Him selfe with Browne, and to find His intents', Parrott answered that 'he had bene a soldier in the Parliament Armye; although (in truth) Hee never was.' When Parrott and Browne met a fortnight later, conversation turned quickly to 'the present times' at which point 'Browne complained ...

⁷⁰ See Bernard Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Millenarianism* (London, 1972), pp. 205, 207.

⁷¹ Quoted in Greaves, *Deliver*, p. 32.

⁷² TNA, SP 29/58/17.

⁷³ DCY, pp. 98-99.

saying, men were growne more wicked and more suffice to appeare soe, then they were before the Kinge came in; But Hee did believe, and Hope the wheele would turne about and then Hee doubted not but things woulde grow better.⁷⁴ This case is a significant one, because it appears to suggest that Browne was only in a position to share his hopes having confirmed that each of these prisoners had participated in the revolution. While Parrott later denied that he had fought for parliament at all, it is possible that this was intended to assist the release from prison to which his evidence against Browne was almost certainly geared.

In another example, a sense of collective hope appears to have alleviated even more specific grievances. In February 1664, one Simon Urlin summoned the wiredrawers of London to a crisis meeting at Jewin Street, near St Giles Cripplegate, where the king's decision to grant a patent to one John Garill was to be discussed.⁷⁵ As the meeting progressed, it appears to have become more boisterous and Urlin was provoked into holding forth that 'the Granting such Patents was [the] Cause (for ought hee knew) that the last king lost his head.'⁷⁶ These words, then, were intended by Urlin to make use of what might have been the wiredrawers' sense of a shared past in opposition to Charles I's granting of patents during his period of Personal Rule in order to inform a shared expectation that Charles II could not get away with doing the same. Moreover, this case implies once more that communities of seditious remembering might have converged on other *professional* communities; an implication which is supported by another case from December 1660 when a Marshall Baxter of Newbury (Berkshire), once 'an Agent for Cornett Joyce' (the soldier famous for seizing Charles I from parliament's custody in June 1647), told fellow employees of the Post Office there that 'now the Army was disbanded, wee shall see good sport as ever was, swords drawne againe', and who also complained 'that now the

⁷⁴ TNA, SP 29/118/10.

⁷⁵ See Horace Stewart, *History of the Worshipful Company of Gold and Silver Wyre-Drawers: and of the Origin and Development of the Industry which the Company Represents* (London, 1891), pp. 49-50

⁷⁶ TNA, SP 29/93/60.

Souldiers could say themselves, how they were foold.⁷⁷ Considering the degree to which the Post Office was associated after 1660 with political and religious radicalism, it is perhaps understandable that Cantell assumed that there existed the kind of consensus which was required to share such hopes for the future.⁷⁸

Surprising evidence from March 1663 demonstrates that women also came together in communities of seditious remembering, and that these might facilitate hopeful solidarity. In March 1663, Katharine Gregory, the wife of a former Cromwellian soldier, Captain John Gregory, was accused of having entered the bedchamber of an anonymous gentlewoman to reassure her that her husband had 'bid her not to feare' for 'though he was taken for he should quickly come out for they had in readinesse ... 500 sword men ... to kill the King and as for that false villaine Moncke he should be put in an Iron Cage and sett upon Paules Church and [tha]t they will not give quarter to any of the Kings party not so much as to their wives and children.'⁷⁹ As well as the interesting allusion to the punishment of the leaders of the Münster Rebellion in 1535, whose corpses were suspended in cages from one of the city's churches, Gregory's seditious memories represent an exclusively female use of existing consensus. Indeed, very few communities of seditious memories contained both men and women, reflecting the extent to which political discourse in post-revolutionary society was segregated in terms of gender. In the words of Ann Hughes, while women were not excluded from politics in early modern England, 'their presence in male social and political spaces was precarious, open to ridicule and challenge.'⁸⁰ Interestingly, however, Gregory's case implies that communities of seditious memories might well have transcended *socio-economic* boundaries in ways which were not possible with gender boundaries. Although we do not know her name, the person with whom Gregory confided was a gentlewoman, while Gregory herself was the wife of the Cromwellian soldier John Gregory.

⁷⁷ TNA, SP 29/23/71 II.

⁷⁸ See TNA, SP 29/40/8, 8 I.

⁷⁹ TNA, SP 29/69/48. These words were denied by Katharine Gregory, *CSPD 1663-1664*, p. 74.

⁸⁰ Hughes, 'Men', p. 206.

John was cashiered as a quartermaster in 1655 before rising through the ranks to become a captain in time for John Lambert's rising in April 1660.⁸¹ By trade, Gregory seems to have been 'a leather dresser and dyer in Five Foot Alley, Bermondsey.'⁸² Here, therefore, communities of seditious remembering bridged class boundaries, reflecting how, as various historians have suggested, there appears to have been ample opportunity for political discourse to travel vertically as well as horizontally in post-revolutionary England.⁸³

The case of Katharine Gregory, of course, implies that she misapprehended consensus with the anonymous gentlewoman to whom she uttered hopes of the future. On other occasions, however, the fact that more than one person was accused for having articulated prospective uses of the seditious past illustrates that this kind of solidarity was achieved. Shortly before the king's return in May 1660, for example, Edward and Alice Jones from St Martin-in-the-Fields (Westminster) were indicted for saying together that 'it was the King's time now to raigne, but it was upon sufferance for a little time, and it would be theres agine before itt be long.'⁸⁴ In a similar fashion eight months later, one Enoch Hinton appeared before the Essex justices for saying in relation to the executions of the regicides and those involved in the Fifth Monarchists' rising of January 1661, 'that many man were putt to death and that the same axe that cutt off the old King's head doth hang over this King's head.' Rather than being accused for these words in isolation, however, Enoch's relative, John Hinton, was indicted for joining in as well, implying that the pair had reached consensus over the meaning of the past.⁸⁵

For revolutionaries, then, sharing hopes and expectations about the future was the consequence of fellowship of communities of seditious remembering. Nonetheless, the aforementioned examples tend to imply that,

⁸¹ See Firth and Davies, i, pp. 151, 155-6, 160, 163.

⁸² *CSPD 1661-1662*, p. 606.

⁸³ John Miller, 'Public Opinion in Charles II's England', *History*, 80:260 (1995), p. 360. Harris, "Popular political culture", p. 52.

⁸⁴ *MCR*, iii, p. 304.

⁸⁵ *ERO*, Q/SR 387/51, 52.

however empowering, many of these hopes and expectations were bluster and there had been little intention to rise against the regime. There are, however, examples which suggest that communities of seditious remembering did in fact facilitate, or that their members had intended to facilitate, radical action. On St Valentine's Day, 1665, for example, Edward James entered the Cambridgeshire home of one Cornet Graves, sometime officer in the regiment of the regicide Colonel Francis Hacker. In evidence which James provided to the regime, he spoke of his welcome by Graves who, for reasons unknown, believed that his guest had also taken part in the revolution. Somewhat quick to let down his guard, Graves told James that he was currently on the run for some words which he had spoken against the government. Apparently unaware that he was about to make the same mistake again, Graves bade James 'good cheer for once [again] we shall eat roast meat for I have comanded 60 men that are now in the towne of old Olivers boyes and ... we shall have a day for it for all this.' After James had sidled off to bed, he reported having heard another former officer arriving at Grave's house, at which point he decided to leave the following morning.⁸⁶ Graves's misapprehension of consensus about the meaning of the past, then, permitted him to offer James hope that, in some halcyon future, the men would regain the material wealth – the 'roast meat', in fact – which had been lost since 1660. However, behind the sense of *hope* were Graves's intentions to bring this alternative reality about through active resistance, which was implied by the (real or imagined) network of 'old Olivers boyes' in the town.

In a similar case from October 1660, one William Sharpe approached Edward Kater, a ropemaker from Soham (Cambridgeshire), a town not far from the house of the aforementioned Graves, and asked him 'if he were free to goe alonge wth him.' Expanding on exactly what it was in which Kater was expected to participate – a plot against the government – Sharpe explained that, since Kater 'had beene abroad in these troubles' (i.e. as a parliamentarian soldier), he thought him the ideal man to ask. Unfortunately

⁸⁶ TNA, SP 29/113/40.

for Sharpe, not only did Kater refuse, but he informed the authorities about Sharpe's words.⁸⁷ In another similar case, one George Bateman (alias 'Grisle Pate'),⁸⁸ a former Cromwellian officer, confided in another man that 'hee did not doubt but there would bee good appearance for the good old cause; & hoped Aprill showers might produce something.' Perhaps in response to a dig at his age, Bateman declared that 'tho hee seem'd to bee old, hee feared not but to bee able to ride an horse as well as ever, & to doe good service.' Bateman qualified his remarks by saying 'itt was not good to provide [a horse] too soone, for [tha]t [th]e Cavaliers were jealous of [th]e Quakers & others [tha]t had good horses.'⁸⁹ In this instance, in using terms such as 'the good old cause' and 'Cavalers', Bateman appears to have misapprehended consensus from a man who, unknown to him, was a hostile agent acting in the service of the local landowner, Christopher Sanderson.⁹⁰

Other evidence suggests how common it was to refer to the Good Old Cause when an individual wished to facilitate radical action. In January 1668, for instance, Captain Nicholas Cordey, sometime officer in the regiment of the regicide Colonel John Barkstead, solicited a man to carry a letter to his comrade, Lieutenant-Colonel John Miller.⁹¹ In order to conscript the man, Cordey told him that 'they had a Plot in hand, [th]e good old cause & something that would doe them good', words which Cordey later denied.⁹² Elsewhere, in August 1664, one Captain Lockyer, another old officer, was accused of saying to his apprentice, Thomas Caulton, that there was a rising in Yorkshire which he planned to join on account of '[th]e olde cause.'⁹³ On another occasion, in April 1666, John Goodman, an Exeter man, provided information against John Cowborne, a former major of foot under the Colonel Buffett (see above). Goodman related that he had entered Cowborne's

⁸⁷ TNA, SP 29/21/16, 17.

⁸⁸ Bateman was also governor of Sinclair Castle, Caithness, in 1659, Firth and Davies, ii, pp. 513-4, 515.

⁸⁹ TNA, SP 29/114/22.

⁹⁰ Christopher Sanderson was also a diarist; see John Crawford Hodgson (ed.), *Six North Country Diaries* (Durham, 1910), pp. 35-42.

⁹¹ Cullum was asked to carry the letter to the home of Lieutenant-Colonel John Miller in Bigglesworth (Biggleswade), Bedfordshire, TNA, SP 29/233/102. See also Firth and Davies, ii, p. 346

⁹² Firth and Davies, ii, pp. 345-346. TNA, SP 29/233/103.

⁹³ TNA, SP 29/101/29 I, 29/101/34 I.

house in Wellington (Somerset) where he was asked to speak 'in privet' with Goodman. 'In a room together', Cowborne told Goodman that a plot was at hand, and that 'the first ryseing will bee in London as soone as ever the [General] is gon to sea w[hi]ch will bee before witsontide[. The] worde will bee tumble downe Dick [i.e. Richard Cromwell's nickname], they will declare for a comon wealth but som had a mynde to declare for Richard.'⁹⁴ That Cowborne's sentiments were serious is suggested in his involvement in the Monmouth Rebellion of 1685.⁹⁵ In this instance, Cowborne looked to ensure Goodman's confidence by telling him that he 'would kill him if betrayed.' In response to this, Goodman gave Cowborne reason to believe his integrity by drawing his sword and saying that 'hee would make that sworde doe as good service as ever it did.'⁹⁶ It is possible, of course, that Goodman had uttered these words with sincerity, only to get cold feet at a later date. Otherwise, it is possible that, intimidated by Cowborne, he decided to do his best impression of a bloodthirsty revolutionary.

In some cases, the degree to which fellowship of communities of seditious remembering was regarded as facilitative of resistance is evident in its use in the written declarations of radical political movements. Earlier, for example, it was mentioned that the Fifth Monarchists who rose in London in January 1661 came together as a result of the sense of a shared past. Indeed the declaration made clear that it was 'a call and opportunity' to those 'whoso hath a heart to rise up for God against the Pope, his Bishops, and Hierarchy, and against these Cavaliers, whose wickedness it is not fit to name, who have already polluted the Land as venemous and unclean Creatures.'⁹⁷ To encourage supporters, the proclamation asked of its potential adherents, 'well then, it is but an old conquered Enemy; he has been beaten in the Field times often: of whom now shall we be afraid? of a broken serpent? of a spiritless Enemy?'⁹⁸ As this passage suggests, therefore, it is impossible to separate the uprising of January 1661 from the

⁹⁴ TNA, SP 29/153/46.

⁹⁵ See entry for 'COLBORNE, John, of Wellington' in Wigfield, *The Monmouth Rebels* (Gloucester, 1985), p. 36.

⁹⁶ TNA, SP 29/153/46.

⁹⁷ *A Door of Hope*, p. 4.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

radical revolutionary identities of those involved. In evidence from November 1661, Peregrine Corney, a Leeds man, provided information that one John Atkins had approached him with a similar 'Declaration in Characters' which set out the grievances of the local population, and how 'they had a good Cause which was never lost by the Sword, But that Treacherus Dealers had Delt Treacherusly as George Munke by Swearing and forswearing brought in Charles the second Whoe accordingly did Nurish the same with foode Suteable to its nature.'⁹⁹ If Atkins was the author of this declaration, therefore, it was his view that a shared perception of the *betrayal*, as opposed to the natural demise, of the Good Old Cause might conjure the kinds of hope from which participation in radical resistance be might fuelled. While Peregrine Corney provided the evidence from which Atkins became known to the authorities, he was later involved in the Farnley Wood plot of October 1663, which produced its own declaration. Its author, Dr Edward Richardson, emphasised that those who supported the plot were 'of a ready mind (when the Lord shall form and call us out thereby) to hazard our lives and all that is or may be dear or near unto us, for the Reviving of the *Good Old Cause*.'¹⁰⁰ Richardson made clear his own views about the revolution's meaning, telling of '*the swarming-in of Jesuites, Priests, and outlandish Papists, to infect the minds of our Neighbours, and in time to cut our throats ... so invading our Country with such Idolatry as cost the Nation so much Blood and Treasure to extirpate*.'¹⁰¹

The enduring relevance of the English Revolution to communities of former radicals in facilitating future action was displayed as late as November 1672, when the sometime Cromwellian soldier and Warwickshire man Thomas Walcott was accused by his former comrade in arms, Captain Thomas Cullen, of coming into his house with a declaration which was similar to those aforementioned. Entering his garden, Walcott began to lament the state of the Three Kingdoms, and warned him that Ireland was

⁹⁹ TNA, SP 29/84/70.

¹⁰⁰ [Edward Richardson], 'A Door of Hope opened in the Valley of Achor, for the Mourners of Sion out of the North', Evan Price, *Eye-salve for England, Or, The Grand Trappan Detected* (London, 1667), p. 6.

¹⁰¹ *A Door of Hope*, p. 5.

likely to witness another massacre on the scale of 1641.¹⁰² Soon afterwards, Walcott 'drew out a paper of at least two sheets, all written, which the said Walcott holding read to him, and the substance thereof ... was mentioning many grievances, occasioned by several Ministers of State ... and demanding first that the perpetual [i.e. the Long] Parliament should be re-established ... and that Popery and Prelacy should be put down and Presbytery established'.¹⁰³ That Walcott's sentiments were not bluster is implied by his suspected involvement in the Rye House plot for which he was executed in 1683.¹⁰⁴

While the seditious past made it possible to imagine circumstances which differed from those of the post-revolutionary era, it also appears to have been employed by some revolutionaries in order to demonstrate to others that, if they summoned the courage of those years, the revolution could be restored. It was for this reason, no doubt, that Caleb Trenchfield, the ejected rector of Chipstead (Surrey), was keen to make his congregation at Lee (Kent) aware in September 1660 'that you are not so willing to ingage and to suffer for the Cause of God as you were at first you' and that '[you] must be willing to suffer for the Cause of God'.¹⁰⁵ These kinds of calls to arms were not confined to the pulpit, however. Thomas Tillam, a radical Baptist living in the northern counties of England, used his 1660 tract *The Temple of Lively Stones* in order to encourage the Saints '(like Daniel) TO DO AS AFORETIME'.¹⁰⁶ Likewise, Roger Jones, a parliamentarian veteran and a staunch opponent of Monck's activities in 1659-60, encouraged the readers of his famous 1663 tract *Mene Tekel* to 'be wiser for time to come, make choice of a better Pilot and Mariners for thy next Voyage'.¹⁰⁷ Underpinning Jones's argument was a clear 'myth of betrayal' in which the 'pilots' and 'mariners' of the last voyage – George Monck among them, no doubt – had thrown the revolution off course.

¹⁰² Greaves, *Enemies*, p. 108.

¹⁰³ TNA, 29/332/39, 39 I-II.

¹⁰⁴ Richard L. Greaves, 'Walcott, Thomas (c.1625–1683)', *ODNB*, lvi, p. 763.

¹⁰⁵ See *CR*, p. 492; Quoted in Greaves, *Deliver*, p. 63.

¹⁰⁶ Thomas Tillam, *The Temple Of Lively Stones* (London, 1660), p. [iii].

¹⁰⁷ [Roger Jones], *Mene Tekel; Or, The Downfal of Tyranny* (s. l., 1663), p. 15.

This evidence speaks of the extent to which seditious memories might facilitate or motivate radical political action. Indeed, the facilitative nature of sharing of opinions about *the past*, ought to be added to the spatial categories, such as taverns and coffee-houses, which, in the words of John Miller, mediated the conversion of 'knowledge and opinion ... into action' after 1660.¹⁰⁸ Those who had experienced the 'moderate' revolutions of mid-century, however, also used seditious versions of the past in order to imagine, and to facilitate, more *moderate* change: a fact which is observable on numerous occasions throughout the diary of Samuel Pepys. Throughout the decade following the Restoration, Pepys made many diary entries in which he dwelt on how those with whom he associated – servants of the regime and businessmen – made unfavourable comparisons between the present times and the revolution, much of which related to grievances about the way in which the regime was managing affairs. In November 1663, for example, Pepys was informed by Robert Blackborne of the inefficiency with which the government was collecting tax in comparison with 'the Treasurers at warr here of late'.¹⁰⁹ In February of the following year, Pepys met Sir John Bankes, who told him likewise how Oliver Cromwell had had the interests of the East India Company at heart to a much greater degree than Charles II.¹¹⁰ Even Sir George Downing, who was regarded as a 'turn coat' by some revolutionaries (see chapter 2), was provoked into telling Pepys that the government of the Protectorate would have secured better terms than the present government in the wake of the second Anglo-Dutch War.¹¹¹ Indeed, for Pepys, England's failure in its war against the Dutch was inseparable from the success of Oliver Cromwell in the first Anglo-Dutch War of the 1650s and in February 1669, as he was tasked by the king to make an inquiry into why the Commonwealth had been victorious.¹¹²

The significance of the Commonwealth and Protectorate to Pepys and his circle, therefore, was tied to a desire to facilitate change *within* the

¹⁰⁸ John Miller, 'Public Opinion', p. 367.

¹⁰⁹ Pepys, iv, pp. 374-375.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., v, p. 52.

¹¹¹ Ibid., viii, p. 426.

¹¹² Ibid., ix, p. 444, 484.

structures of monarchical government. To be sure, while some of those with whom Pepys associated had served the Commonwealth, there is no evidence that any of these people intended to resist the regime. In fact, Pepys found it remarkable on at least two occasions that those who identified as royalists held a similar degree of nostalgia for 'Oliver's days'. On 27 February 1665, for example, Pepys recorded in his diary how he heard several members of the Privy Council, including the former *royalist* soldier Baron Berkeley of Stratton,

[crying] up the discipline of the late times here ... wishing with all their hearts that the business of religion were not so severely carried on as to discourage the sober people to come among us, and wishing that the same law and severity were used against drunkenness as there was then – saying that our evil-living will call the hand of God upon us again.¹¹³

While it might seem odd that Berkeley was nostalgic for the 1650s, during which time he was in exile from the very government he was adulating, his words would appear to connote the extent to which restorative nostalgia was used to inform a vision of the future in which the monarchy was as *stable* as Oliver's regime. Indeed, on another occasion, Pepys wrote of how he found it 'strange' that Hugh Cholmeley, the son of an active royalist, 'and everybody doth nowadays reflect upon Oliver and commend him, so brave things he did and made all the neighbour princes fear him'.¹¹⁴ The community of memory in which Pepys found himself after 1660, therefore, was one which was geared towards moderate change.

An argument could be made that, since at least some of the memories to which Pepys was privy were intended to *assist* the king, they were not seditious. However, Pepys recorded some conversations which, if overheard by a hostile interloper, could have been interpreted as dangerous. On 3 June 1667, for example, Pepys spent some time with John Creed, a man who had

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, vi, pp. 45-46.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, viii, p. 332.

once competed with him for the favour of his patron, the Earl of Sandwich, but who has been described as a friend of his.¹¹⁵ According to Pepys, the pair came to the Spring Garden at Fox Hall (or Vauxhall, Surrey), where they began to ‘reflect upon the bad management of things now compared with what it was in the late rebellious times, when men, some for fear and some for religion, minded their business; which none now do, by being void of both.’ Rather than condemn Creed for these words, Pepys seems to have been willing to admit that there was ‘much talk of this and other kinds’ which, to his mind, were ‘very pleasant.’¹¹⁶ Pepys, in other words, appears to have consented to Creed’s view of the past. Intriguingly, on exactly the same day, Pepys noted having met with another diarist John Evelyn, a royalist whose famous account of the execution of Charles I in 1649 was poles apart from that of Pepys, who has been described by one biographer as an approving spectator of the Regicide.¹¹⁷ According to Pepys, Evelyn lamented how ‘the Kingdom is likely to be lost, as well as the reputation of it is, for ever – notwithstanding so much reputation got and preserved by a Rebell [i.e. Oliver Cromwell] that went before him.’¹¹⁸ Indeed, the manner in which Pepys wrote this entry gave no indication that he disagreed with him on this point, nor on any other occasion that Evelyn cited his anxieties about a return to Commonwealth.¹¹⁹

In his diary entry from 3 June 1667, therefore, Pepys demonstrated his capacity to identify *both* with John Creed in relation to experiences of the religious revolution of the 1650s, and with John Evelyn in relation to an anti-fanatical interpretation of the ‘rebellions’ of the recent past. Pepys, in other words, appears to have been capable of identifying both as a participant in the revolution, and as a royalist. That this was possible was a result of Pepys’s former loyalties to the Commonwealth, but also his involvement in

¹¹⁵ David Magliocco, *Samuel Pepys, the Restoration Public and the Politics of Publicity* (PhD Thesis, Queen Mary, University of London, 2014), p. 37.

¹¹⁶ Pepys, viii, p. 250.

¹¹⁷ Guy de la Bédoyère (ed.), *The Diary of John Evelyn* (Woodbridge, 1995), p. 68. See Ollard, *Pepys*, p. 26 for Pepys reference.

¹¹⁸ Pepys, viii, p. 332.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 556.

the Restoration.¹²⁰ David Magliocco has suggested that Pepys's appearances in public spaces such as coffeehouses, taverns and the Exchange related to his 'representation practice', or the way in which he wished to represent himself as part of an 'ideal public', which 'was male, elite, commercial and professional.'¹²¹ In many respects, then, Pepys's seditious memories were *also* part of his representational practice or, in the words of sociologist Erving Goffman, a means of '[conveying] an impression to others which it is in his interests to convey.'¹²² When Pepys articulated his memories, in other words, he hoped to facilitate a particular kind of action: his own professional and social advancement. As such, it was as important for him to be able to share Oliverian nostalgia with Creed as it was for him to share royalist uses of the past with Evelyn. Pepys's palpable annoyance in 1667 when his evening's work was interrupted by a lawyer, Henry Moore, who spoke of his nostalgia for the Commonwealth, suggests that, on this occasion, the sharing of such views was of no benefit to him.¹²³

Pepys's ambivalent memories of the English Revolution give a fascinating example of the *multifariousness* of the ways in which men and women constructed and represented a sense of who they were in seventeenth-century England and Wales.¹²⁴ Indeed, it permits an analysis in which 'the tactics, discourses and, above all, agency through which people "joined and fastened together"' can be established.¹²⁵ In Pepys's case, it remained important for him to identify as a participant in the revolution in order to facilitate certain kinds of action. Indeed, Pepys's ambivalence in relation to the English Revolution ought to lead us to question the very nature of consensus. Simply because two or more people were able to identify in relation to certain memories did not entail sharing the same *experiences* of the past. Indeed, there were certain symbols, ideas and figures which

¹²⁰ For an account of Pepys's activities between 1649 and 1660, see Ollard, *Pepys*, pp. 17-43.

¹²¹ Magliocco, *Samuel Pepys*, p. 49.

¹²² Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Harmondsworth, 1971), pp. 15-16.

¹²³ Pepys, viii, pp. 390-391.

¹²⁴ See Davis, *Seeing Faith*; Hughes, *Gender*.

¹²⁵ Phil Withington, 'Company', p. 307.

permitted revolutionaries to *imagine* that they shared the same past; for long enough, at least, to make possible the consensus which was required to facilitate certain forms of action. By returning to George Cockayne, for example, and his relationship with Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke after the Restoration, it seems likely that any solidarity between the pair in relation to the past relied upon the acknowledgement that only *some* experiences had been shared by the two men. Indeed, this is what James Fentress and Chris Wickham have referred to as ‘conventionalisation’ or the fact that the ‘image’ of the past ‘has to be meaningful for an entire group’ for it to be transmitted successfully.¹²⁶ For Pepys and other members of the navy, one of these conventions appears to have been Oliver Cromwell, a man that stood for revolutionary courage, puritanism, and military (particularly naval) strength. That certain themes and characters were so common in seditious remembering could well relate to the conventionality upon which communities of seditious remembering were constructed. The implications of this conclusion are that those who had not necessarily experienced a ‘radical’ revolution during the 1640s and 1650s were able to come together with those who had in ways which made possible certain forms of political action.

Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated the extent to which seditious memories were not merely internalised, but also shared among those who had participated in the English Revolution. This has been evident in records of private conversations, sermons, letters, and printed tracts: all of which offer evidence of ‘consensus in the archive’. Through an examination of this evidence, it has been possible to argue that revolutionaries validated revolutionary religio-political identities *socially*, leading to a sense of ‘physical’ or ‘imagined’ solidarity in the face of the royalists’ authority to remember. These ‘communities of seditious memories’, it was proposed, led revolutionaries to continue to conceive of each other as such, leading to the creation of ‘sequestered sites’, such as alehouses, as the locations for the

¹²⁶ Fentress and Wickham, p. 48. For some interesting comments on the formulaic nature of memories, see Freist, *Governed by Opinion*, pp. 243-244.

construction and reinforcement of collective identities. These communities of memory did not dwell on the past alone, but also envisaged alternative realities which were built in the image of a shared past, negotiating thereby the royalists' authority over the present and the future. Significantly, these social memories did not always entail the fostering of radical political action, such as anti-government plotting, but also more moderate political action, such as that in which Pepys's network partook. Moreover, it was often the case that these collective images of the future engendered a sense of hope, before a desire to take action into their own hands.

Above all, this chapter has demonstrated once more that the seditious counter-memory of the English Revolution can reveal a lot more than 'political opinion'. Instead, it can offer various means of understanding how experiences of authority were negotiated after the Restoration. In doing so, the chapter has illustrated that sociability and community after the Restoration continued to relate to events which were becoming distant, but no less powerful, memories. That many men and women were keen to keep their communities of seditious memories hidden is almost certainly an indication that the counter-memory of the revolution was more widespread than it is possible to prove. Indeed, it may be possible to argue that the 'dominance' of royalist memories has been distorted by the degree to which such memories filled the printed public sphere after the Restoration, and that contemporaries were more aware than historians have been that there were two sides to memory in post-revolutionary England and Wales. While this chapter has spoken of efforts to keep the past *hidden*, this was not always the intention of revolutionaries. It is thus to the *public* articulation of seditious memories that the thesis must now turn.

4 – Seditious Memories in Public, 1660-1678

At about five o'clock in the afternoon of 29 June, 1667, John Croscomb arrived at Chatham dock in Kent, the scene of the recent naval embarrassment inflicted on the English navy by the Dutch Republic. There, Croscomb met Dorcas Comber, a resident of the town, who saw fit to question his visit. In response, Croscomb reassured Comber that the sole purpose of his stopover had been 'to satisfy his eye as concerning the fortifications now made there' and that he liked them '(slightly) well enough.' Keen to salvage the fortifications from Croscomb's faint praise, however, Comber informed him 'that they were made by order of my L[o]rd Generall', referring thereby to George Monck, Duke of Albemarle, the Commander in Chief of the armed forces who had fortified the town two weeks earlier against further Dutch attacks. At Comber's allusion to the Duke, however, Croscomb became visibly agitated and thundered 'that [Monck] was a turncoat'. Indeed, Croscomb went on to argue that 'within three months [she] should see an Army brought from all places against London & should take it, & turne out the present Parliam[en]t & put in the old one, and then they would take the King and try him as they did his ffather'.¹

While it is possible that every detail of the conversation between Dorcas Comber and John Croscomb was not recorded, the latter's seditious memories – for which he was later imprisoned – are markedly different from those to which previous chapters referred.² Croscomb did not keep his opinions about Monck to himself, nor did he seek consensus from Dorcas Comber. On the contrary, he *contested* Comber's veneration of Monck, which he perceived to have been implicit in her fawning over his fortifications at Chatham, as well as her use of the title 'Lord General'. This chapter will demonstrate that public contests over the meaning of the revolution were common after the Restoration. In doing so, it will be possible to conclude that a 'historiography' of the revolution existed within the public sphere after 1660: one that, owing to the regime's stranglehold over the press, was

¹ TNA, SP 29/209/150/I.

² For Croscomb's imprisonment see *CSPD 1667*, p. 353.

confined to oral culture. From this conclusion, the long-held notion that later seventeenth-century historiography was dominated by royalist histories of the revolution will be modified. In addition to these claims, it will be argued that, unlike seditious remembering which was oriented personally or socially, this 'public remembering' made it possible to *concretise* the meaning of the revolution within the public sphere. In doing so, these public seditious memories enabled revolutionaries not merely to negotiate, but also to *counteract* royalist attempts to control how the past was interpreted. One consequence of this analysis will be to expose how far society after the Restoration was divided along battle-lines which had been drawn during the 1640s and 1650s. Indeed, in the second part of this chapter, the extent to which the endurance of 'revolutionary', and indeed 'cavalier', identities informed schisms at *all* levels of society after 1660 will be demonstrated. This analysis will expose an intriguing aspect of post-revolutionary politics: the intentional identification with the revolution in order to *subvert* the authority of those who, having revealed certain views about the recent past, were identified as royalists.

Uses of the past were not always retrospective, of course: sometimes the restoration of some feature of the revolution was envisaged. As a result, revolutionaries were in a position to construct altered futures, thereby summoning hope and planning political action. Returning to the case of John Croscomb, for instance, his reflections upon the revolution extended far beyond the beatification of George Monck. Indeed, he was provoked to express the much more 'seditious' view – that which provoked Dorcas Comber to testify against him, perhaps – that an army (possibly the New Model Army) would rise, take London, and that the Long Parliament would be restored at Westminster. Moreover, it was Croscomb's markedly radical opinion that Charles II would be executed as his father had been in January 1649. The evidence against John Croscomb suggests that the seditious past could be used in order to *intimidate* those, like Comber, whose views about the revolution were different. In doing so, individuals were in a position not merely to counteract the experience of authority to remember, but also as a

means of appropriating the fearful images of the *future* to which royalist memories lent themselves.

I

The ire which Monck's name provoked in John Croscomb was not without precedent in post-revolutionary England and Wales. Some three years earlier, for example, one William Coulson of Jesmond (Northumberland) was heard to challenge the prevailing image of Monck's participation in the Restoration, and he did so with a vehemence equal to, if not greater than, that of Croscomb. It was Coulson's belief, in fact, that Monck was 'a trator for by his bringing in [th]e king', since 'it had cost [him] Fiftene pounds in pruneing [i.e. bribing] a peer to free him from trouble because he sett his hand to [th]e Late Kings death': a reference, one must assume, to his having signed the Engagement in 1650. The information against Coulson was offered up by a tenant of his, William Carnes, whose belief that Monck was 'a brave man' and had 'gallantly ... brought in his Maiestye without [th]e spilling of any blood or soe much as one sword drawen' had provoked Coulson's response.³ It is likely, of course, that Carnes had no idea about the strength of his landlord's opinions about Monck, but that, perhaps owing to the local connection to the Lord General (he travelled through the town on his march towards London in January 1660), his name had been evoked in order to 'fill an awkward silence'.⁴ Conflicts such as this one were not confined to interpretations of the Restoration, however. In March 1664, John Lyley burst into the Bradford home of Rosamund Bower where he demanded 'what authority' her husband Jeremy had in arresting him for his alleged involvement in the recent Farnley Wood plot, the revelation of which had shocked the Three Kingdoms five months earlier. Calmly, Bower responded that her husband 'had an order to show for what he did therein.' Incensed, Lyley told Rosamund that 'your husband sought my life, or he would have my head upon the toll-booth of Bradford, but if his head went, more should goe with it.' To this, Rosamund responded matter-of-factly that 'he would not

³ TNA, SP 29/125/51 I.

⁴ Monck stayed in Newcastle on his way to London in January 1660. See Henry Reece, *The Army in Cromwellian England, 1649-1660* (Oxford, 2013), p. 212.

have suffered unless he went contrary to the law and government, but some had suffered unjustly, for the late King had soe suffered.' In response to this rather offhand reference to the Regicide, Lyley asked 'Will you say soe?', repeating these words three times and declaring that Charles I had 'suffered justly, and had a fair tryall, and just witnesses; but soe had not they.'⁵

Lyley was not alone in contesting the meaning of the trial and execution of Charles I, however. In March 1668, for example, a group of gentlemen gathered at the house of William Mason at Bigg Market (Newcastle), where conversation turned quickly to 'his late Ma[jes]ties unjust and unlawful sufferings.' Not all of those present agreed, however, that the late king's sufferings had been 'unjust' or 'unlawful', and, although 'not att all spoke to', one John Lee, a yeoman, responded 'that he had often spoke to his Ma[jes]tie, and ... Newcastle could not afford soe ill-favoured a face as he had.' Lee's company demanded that he 'hold his peace or begon', but Lee persevered, asking them 'what better is the present King, for there hath been no grace in the land since he came to it[?]'⁶ One intriguing feature of this case is that Lee was described by the informer as 'not att all spoke to', implying perhaps that he had been excluded from the conversation about Charles I. On the one hand, this detail could imply that Lee's company were aware of his views about the revolution, and had not expected him to speak out. Indeed, if this was the case, then it reinforces the notion that royalists assumed the sole authority to remember after 1660. On the other hand, the gentlemen could have intended to ensnare Lee, just as Rosamund Bower appears to have ensnared John Lyley at Bradford in March 1664. That revolutionaries could be ensnared in this way is illustrated in a case from December 1660, when one Simon Oldfield, a shoemaker from Canterbury, was accused of disputing the meaning of the Regicide with a local constable, Richard Prickett, at one of the city's alehouse. As beers were quaffed, one of the men broached the subject of a recent plot against the government, at which point the conversation turned to 'the death of the late king Charles the first, and of those traytors w[hi]ch lately were executed for that horrid

⁵ DCY, pp. 118-119.

⁶ Ibid., p. 158. Lee was acquitted at the next assizes.

treason.⁷ In response to these words, Oldfield challenged Prickett's version of the Regicide, explaining 'that king Charles the first had a fayre & legall tryall & that those persons w[hi]ch were lately executed for the same suffered wrongfully.'⁸ That Oldfield was heard also to speak of his enduring opposition to monarchy would suggest that, in condemning the regicides, Prickett's intention had been to ensnare the shoemaker.

The examples above suggest that the 'martyr cult' of Charles I was by no means observed as universally during the 1660s and 1670s as historians have inferred.⁹ It is possible to corroborate this inference with reference to seditious activities which occurred throughout the period on 30 January, the anniversary of Charles's execution. On 30 January 1664, for instance, the *Intelligencer* reported how 'this day was both Usher'd in and Enterteyn'd with seditious Practices against his most Sacred and Merciful Majesty That's now in Being, and by whom Acted? But by the Ingrateful, and Remorseless Persecutors of his Late Royal Father.'¹⁰ The Venetian ambassador reported of the same incident that 'libels were scattered abroad in divers places against the royal honour, the quiet of the kingdom and the safety of the first ministers of the state.'¹¹ While the content of these libels is unknown, allegations of debauchery at the royal court had been common in the months beforehand and it is possible that the libels scattered in London on 30 January 1664 were similar.¹² Contestation of the meaning of the anniversary of the Regicide was not confined to the capital, however. So common was mis-commemoration of 30 January in the city of Oxford, in fact, that in 1672, Peter Mews, the vice-chancellor of the University, commanded local constables 'to look after all Disorders on the said Day, and to give an

⁷ See a reference to this plot by the Venetian Ambassador, A. B. Hinds (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, 1659-1661* (38 vols., London, 1931), xxxii, p. 229, and by Samuel Pepys, Pepys, i, pp. 318-319.

⁸ TNA, SP 29/24/42. See also J. S. Cockburn (ed.), *Calendar of Assize Records: Kent Indictments, Charles II, 1660-1675* (London, 1995), pp. 4, 17.

⁹ See, for example, Lacey, *The Cult*, pp. 129-171.

¹⁰ *Intelligencer*, 1 Feb. 1663.

¹¹ Quoted in Lacey, *The Cult*, p. 164.

¹² See Josselin, *Diary*, p. 501.

account of all such Persons, as shall be found offending therein'.¹³ While we cannot be certain that subversive activities on 30 January were always intended to contest the meaning of Charles I's trial and execution, a fascinating case of seditious words from 1664 implies that this was the intention of mis-commemoration on at least some occasions. According to the evidence of some residents from Taunton (Somerset), a local man, Francis Griffin, had spent the day not in fasting, but in drinking at a local inn, where he was heard to sing an old parliamentarian ballad and sympathise with Oliver Cromwell.¹⁴ Clearly, then, not everyone was willing to swallow the notion that Charles I's execution had been a martyrdom.

In defending the Regicide, of course, it is possible that the broader intentions of the individuals aforementioned had been to defend vicariously *their own* participation in the English Revolution. Indeed, further evidence includes the words of revolutionaries who were provoked to defend support for the Long Parliament, the Commonwealth, or the Protectorate. Shortly before Christmas in 1662, therefore, Thomas Tonge stood on the scaffold at Tyburn, having been condemned to death for his part in the eponymous 'Tonge plot' of that year. According to evidence which was extracted from Tonge, the plot involved the seizure of the king and his brother, James, Duke of York, as well as Monck and Sir Richard Browne, both of whom were deemed traitors to the Good Old Cause.¹⁵ While historians have disagreed over the extent to which the plot was real or fabricated, Tonge remained convinced that he had been involved in a stitch-up. Speaking on the scaffold, he told his audience that, far from directing the plot, he had 'sometimes been in some men's company', among whom he had 'heard them contriving the business'. Moreover, Tonge went onto explain that 'that which led me to join with them was this: I was and had been sometimes in the army; and I have looked upon this cause to be good.'¹⁶ Like the regicides who were executed in the months beforehand, Tonge perceived his execution as more than

¹³ Peter Mews, *Whereas Tuesday next, being the Thirtieth day of this instant January* (Oxford, 1672).

¹⁴ SRO, Q/SR/105/35.

¹⁵ Greaves, *Deliver*, p. 118.

¹⁶ [William Hill], *A Brief narrative of that Stupendious Tragedie Late intended to be Acted by the Satanical Saints of these Reforming Times* (London, 1663), p. 60.

retribution for his alleged plot: it was somehow an indictment of his entire conduct during the revolution. Intriguingly, then, Tonge took the opportunity to defend himself on the scaffold from royalist censure.

Tonge was not alone in justifying participation in the revolution in public after the Restoration, and others did so in response to more explicit criticism. In September 1660, for instance, John Caethnes, living in Eltham (Surrey), felt similarly inclined to defend his actions when three Scottish merchants pointed out to him '[th]e unjustnesse' of parliament's 'quarrel' with the king. In response, Caethnes explained that 'their cause was just', since those who had participated in the revolution 'fought for [th]e peoples liberty ... but they were betrayed'. In response to Caethnes's invocation of this myth of betrayal, one of his detractors, Robert Meine, 'answered he was noe Traytor' and that, in fact, 'he was acting against Traytores for his ma[jes]tie and [th]e C[o]untry'. Interestingly, Meine appears to have assumed that Caethnes's notion that the revolution had been betrayed related to George Monck, since he then argued that 'he was glad to see honest ... Monck goe with such honor in [th]e Court and was honoured much and hee deserved it'. In response to this obviously provocative statement, Caethnes quipped that Monck 'deserved a Rope'.¹⁷ Elsewhere, in October 1663, at around the time of the revelation of the Farnley Wood plot, one Michael Blackburne from Almondbury (West Yorkshire) was moved to defend his participation in the revolution. It was alleged that Blackburne had complained to a neighbour that he could 'never come to thy house but thou art always falling out with me.' His neighbour's response was cold, and he told him that 'now you must keep a good tongue in your head, for you caused us to do so formerly.' In response to these words, Blackburne said, with a level equanimity which resulted in an allegation of seditious speech, that 'we fought for God and a Good Cause.'¹⁸

Not all of those who were willing to justify involvement in the revolution were also willing to risk a charge of sedition or treason. In one intriguing case, the decision *not* to respond to implicit rebuke of participation in the

¹⁷ TNA, SP 29/14/74.

¹⁸ Quoted in Hopper, 'Farnley Wood', p. 292.

revolution implies a contest over the meaning of the recent past. On 1 September 1665, therefore, John Rede of Porton (Wiltshire) was examined before Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington (whose large nasal wound was as a permanent symbol of his service under Charles I) regarding rumours of a plot. When he was asked by Arlington 'what employ[en]t hee had in the Late Rebellion', Rede responded that 'hee was governour of Poole.' In an effort to entrap Rede, Arlington asked 'whither hee is sorry that hee was soe', to which Rede responded calmly 'that hee would bee sorry to comitt an evill action but will not answer to the question.'¹⁹ Rede is a rather tragic figure who was obviously caught in an agonising battle between conscience and self-preservation. That the latter emerged victorious is reflected by the fact that, on 5 September following, Rede approached Arlington with the long request that 'every word sillable Circumstance and clause' of his evidence 'may be expunged.'²⁰

In these cases, the meanings over which revolutionaries and royalists struggled related to the *radical* revolution of the 1640s and 1650s. Other cases can be used to illustrate how more moderate sympathies for the revolution could be defended in public. In 1666, for instance, Malachi Dudeney, the owner of Upton Grey (Hampshire), stood before Wiltshire's justices of the peace, by whom he was accused of threatening to cut down a maypole which had been built in a neighbouring village.²¹ In order to corroborate the allegation against Dudeney, the court noted that he 'had taken up arms under Sir William Waller [a parliamentarian general] in 1643, and continued under the new modelling of the army' thereafter. Dudeney was, in other words, a participant in the revolution, and this was something which was used against him. Demonstrably upset with this implication, however, Dudeney argued that 'he took up arms for the preservation of ... the

¹⁹ TNA, SP 29/132/2.

²⁰ Rede appears to have been particularly conscious of the dangers of certain speech, TNA, SP 29/132/30.

²¹ Maypoles were something of a *bête noire* for seventeenth-century Puritans, symbolising public apathy for Reformed Protestantism and, by extension, acquiescence in the religious persecution of the 1660s and 1670s. In September 1661, Arthur Ilmeade was accused of affixing a satirical ballad called *May Pole Motto* to 'several maypoles' around Wells, Somerset, SRO, Q/SR/100/24.

true Protestant religion', a justification which resembled closely the wording of the Protestation oath and the Solemn League and Covenant.²² Taking up arms in 1643, it is not improbable that Dudeney took one or both of these oaths, the invocation of which appears to have served him in the defence of his actions.²³

Even those who were aware of the dangers of sympathising *to any degree* with their participation in the revolution could be provoked into doing so, particularly when it was felt that off-hand statements about the past were inaccurate. On 7 June 1660, for example, when it was still a genuine possibility that he might be excepted from the king's pardon, Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke spoke of his umbrage when Sir Thomas Howard, Earl of Berkshire, 'rayled ag[ains]t the Lords made by Cromwell, that they were base mechanicke fellowes[.]'²⁴ Whitelocke, whose membership of Oliver's 'upper house' in December 1657 made him one of these 'mechanicke fellowes' by implication, struggled to suppress his irritation with Howard's remarks, and he retorted 'that some of those gent[lemen], were of very antient families & of considerable fortunes'.²⁵ While Whitelocke's words were clearly intended to rescue his reputation from Howard's observations, his reference to the status of others within Oliver's 'upper house' suggests that he was not prepared to sacrifice the Commonwealth to broad-brushed claims of social inferiority. In this instance, in fact, Whitelocke was able to prevail over Howard, who conceded 'that indeed some of those Lords that Cromwell made were gentlemen of good families, & that he did not intend by Mechanicke fellowes, Wh[itelocke] & such as he was, butt [Colonels John] Pride & [John] Hewson & such men.'²⁶ For a short time at least, therefore, Whitelocke was able to stem the tide of royalist 'rayling'.

In the cases above, it has been assumed that the 'moderates' and 'radicals' of the 1640s and 1650s can be easily differentiated in relation to

²² Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Manuscripts ... Various*, i, p. 149.

²³ Unfortunately, only isolated returns from the Hampshire Protestation exist.

²⁴ Whitelocke, *Diary*, p. 600.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 600-601.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 601.

the pasts which seditious memories evoked. Two further cases suggest, in fact, that such distinctions are not always so straightforward. In July 1660, for example, Edmond Greene reported overhearing a conversation ‘about the rebles and murdrers of our lat[e] lord and sufforant [Charles I]’. ‘Sum in the company’ were happy to decry ‘that bludy reble and murdrer’ Oliver Cromwell, as ‘the [bloodiest] reble & rogue in the whol world’ and as a ‘fool’. However, Greene recalled how these views were questioned by one Edmond Bullock, who ‘semed to be very much trubled at the [words] spoke of Crumwel and replyed hee was a galant brave man.’ In further information, which was redacted, Greene reported Bullock’s view ‘that hee that could win any thing by power and kepe it twas galant all though to the murdring of Kinges.’²⁷ The significance of these latter words was that, despite considering Oliver to have been ‘galant’, Bullock did not identify with the radical revolution. It is possible, in fact, that the redaction of these sentiments was intended to secure an indictment for seditious words which otherwise would have been difficult.

Another case from late in the 1660s reinforces the notion that, given the identification of the accused with Presbyterianism, the decision to defend Oliver Cromwell did not relate to a belief in the legitimacy of the Regicide, the Commonwealth or the Protectorate: the events with which the late Lord Protector’s name was often associated. In 1669, therefore, John Reynolds, an ejected minister and a friend of Richard Baxter, entered into a quarrel with one Richard Bracegirdle, an apothecary from Wolverhampton (Staffordshire) who, judging by Reynolds response, had denigrated Oliver. According to Bracegirdle’s information, Reynolds declared that ‘the Nonconformists were not so contemptible for Number and Quality as he made them, that most of the people were of their mind [and] that Cromwel tho[ugh] an Usurper had kept up England against the Dutch’.²⁸ Here, it seems, Reynolds wished to separate himself from the ‘usurpation’, but was otherwise keen to demonstrate that Oliver had not been all bad. In doing so, he, like Edmond

²⁷ TNA, SP 29/7/145.

²⁸ CR, p. 409.

Bullock, could well have intended to legitimate a past which, via the denigration of Oliver Cromwell, had been subjected to Bracegirdle's censure.

Persistent assaults on the meaning of the revolution, then, did not go uncontested in public. On the contrary, supporters of the moderate and radical revolutions of mid-century were provoked to defend themselves and to risk an indictment of sedition or treason. This evidence has ramifications for the assumptions of some historians that, before the Licensing Act of March 1679, there was little public debate about the meaning of the past. To be sure, there is very little evidence of such a debate *within the printed public sphere* during the first two decades of Charles II's reign.²⁹ This imbalance does not derive from the sheer strength of royalists' interpretations of the revolution, however, but from the difficulties, and indeed the dangers, of doing so. Indeed, in February 1664, John Twyn had been executed for treason for having published *A Treatise on the Execution of Justice*, which was an effort to do to the martyr cult of Charles I in print what those aforementioned had attempted in speech.³⁰ In order to encounter a debate about the past in post-revolutionary England and Wales, therefore, it is necessary to penetrate *beneath* the public sphere of print, the preponderance of which in histories of the later seventeenth century has resulted in an exaggeration of the popularity of anti-fanatical prejudices.³¹ In answer to R. C. Richardson's enquiry as to whether it was possible for 'a Parliamentary historian [to] speak his mind in the uncongenial period 1660-88?' the answer of 'yes' might be given, as long as the definition of 'historian' is broadened considerably.³²

The apparent willingness of revolutionaries to enter the public sphere with alternative interpretations of the revolution speaks of the fact that, as well as being consensual, seditious remembering could involve *contest*. Thus, while the decision of revolutionaries to dwell in the past has been

²⁹ See Royce Macgillivray, *Restoration Historians*, pp. 52-95; Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, pp. 22-23.

³⁰ See Southcombe and Tapsell, *Restoration*, pp. 130-131.

³¹ Tim Harris argues this point well in his 'Understanding popular politics', p. 128. See also Woolf, *Social Circulation*, p. 333.

³² Richardson, *The Debate*, p. 3

described in previous chapters as a line of *defence* against the destabilising forces of royalist anti-fanaticism – a markedly *hidden* transcript – the cases aforementioned appear to represent an active engagement with anti-fanaticism. Scholars of remembering have referred to these kinds of contests as ‘public remembering’. This public remembering was not the virtually consensual ‘public discussion’, such as that to which John Bodnar and, latterly, Matthew Neufeld have referred,³³ but similar to that which Andy Wood has witnessed in the wake of the 1549 rebellion in East Anglia: ‘an ideological battlefield’.³⁴ Put differently, public remembering is comprised of ‘[the] complex political interactions, in which different interests vie[d] for ascendancy, influence and survival’.³⁵ In post-revolutionary England and Wales, public debates about the past sprung from the point at which the identities of ‘cavalier’ and ‘roundhead’ came into conflict. What this evidence speaks of, therefore, is an attempt to concretise revolutionary identities within the public sphere. Thus, while in previous chapters the power of the seditious past has been described in relation to the negotiation of experiences of authority, it becomes possible at this juncture to argue that power derived also from the capacity of counter-memory to *resist* actively the royalists’ authority to remember.

II

Earlier analyses have shown that the process of legitimating the meanings of the English Revolution – personally and socially – enabled men and women to conceive of themselves, and others, as revolutionaries. Elsewhere, the recognition of *conflicting* identities in relation to the recent past resulted in public conflict; both verbal and physical. In October 1662, therefore, John Tremain informed the authorities of having been approached by one Thomas Gunn who had imprisoned him ‘as a cavalleir’ at some point during the revolution. Far from seeking to bury the hatchet, however, Gunn told

³³ John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ, 1992), p. 14; Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, passim.

³⁴ Wood, *1549*, pp. 215-216.

³⁵ Cubitt, *History and Memory*, p. 224. See also Roberta Pearson, ‘Custer Loses Again: The Contestation over Commodified Public Memory’, Dan Ben-Amos and Liliane Weissberg (eds.), *Cultural Memory and the Construction of Identity* (Detroit, MI, 1999), p. 180.

Tremaine that 'he was a Roundhead and would so continue.'³⁶ Here, then, Gunn employed the acrimony of the past in order to perpetuate hostility between them. Similar circumstances can be witnessed in Fremington (North Yorkshire) in 1663, when an angry James Arrundell, yeomen, was accused of lambasting Simon Douglas, and his father, for being 'rogues and traitors', since 'all is traitors that doth fight for the King'.³⁷ Although the immediate consequences of the words of Gunn and Arrundell are unknown, there is evidence to suggest that physical disputes between cavaliers and roundheads continued after 1660. Robin Clifton, in his study of Somerset in the run up to the Monmouth Rebellion of 1685, has written of a case in which one John Diches, a labourer from the county, assaulted a fellow drinker because he 'was in the King's army and spoke against [th]e Anabaptists, but he was in [th]e Parliament Army, and upon [thaj]t Account he stroke this Informant'.³⁸ Likewise, David Appleby, in his work on 'veteran politics' in post-revolutionary England writes of two examples of bust-ups in Essex which arose as a result of conflicting former loyalties.³⁹

It was not always necessary for an individual to have actually supported the royal cause, as John Tremaine had done, in order for them to be identified as cavaliers, however. On 6 August 1667, for instance, John Trelawney wrote a letter to Secretary of State, Joseph Williamson, in which he reported 'a littell Bussell betweene som seamen and our shoulgers', which he had witnessed in Dartmouth, a port which was notorious for its parliamentarianism during the first civil war. On coming into the town, Trelawney was able to disperse the soldiers and to secure the seamen, but he reported that 'a more factious place then this I never came unto.' Notwithstanding his efforts to protect the local population, in fact, he reported that 'the peopell treat us severely ... giving out that wee are papest, the scum of Goring, and Trepanners of poore peepell for Tangers.' Here, then, two central grievances of the later 1660s – the spectre of 'popery' and the

³⁶ *MCR*, iii, p. 328.

³⁷ Atkinson, *Quarter Sessions ... [North Riding]*, vi, p. 67.

³⁸ Robin Clifton, *The Last Popular Rebellion: The Western Rising of 1685* (London, 1984), p. 47

³⁹ Appleby, 'Veteran', pp. 329-330.

strain of the colony of Tangier on the nation's coffers – entwined with local memories of the rapacious actions of Colonel George Goring's royalist troops during the first civil war.⁴⁰ In doing so, some of the residents of Dartmouth, who continued to identify with the revolution, were able to place political distance between themselves and Trelawney's men. For this purpose, of course, it was necessary for them to draw a trajectory between those who supported the regime and former royalists.

Elsewhere, the fact that individuals had been on the same side during the revolution, but had trodden different paths since the Restoration, led to conflict. At some point after the implementation of the Act of Uniformity in August 1662, for instance, Christopher Jackson the ejected rector of Crosby Garrett (Westmorland) was approached by 'some Ministers that had Conform'd'. Jackson was provoked by the ministers, who '[told] him that he had a bare Coat'. Responding angrily to this insult, which made light of his unemployment, Jackson said cuttingly 'that if it was bare, it was not turn'd'.⁴¹ The implication here, of course, was that Jackson, unlike his abusers, had stayed true to the religion to which all of the men had adhered during the revolution.

What one had done during the revolution continued to matter after 1660, therefore, and it continued to inform hostility. Further evidence speaks of how such disputes arose not from existing knowledge of conflicting identities, but from the inadvertent recognition of *divergent* memories. In the latter part of 1664, therefore, Robert Nicholas, 'one of the Barrons to [th]e Late Usurper', was heard to say 'in a braging and boasting' tone, 'that he was the Man that did draw up the Charge against his Late Ma[jes]tie.' Expecting, perhaps, that this revelation would cut some ice with whoever was then in his company, Nicholas received stern rebuke for his words. Unmoved, nonetheless, Nicholas responded that 'hee would doe the same,

⁴⁰ See Mark Stoye, *Loyalty and locality: popular allegiance in Devon during the English Civil War* (Exeter, 1994), pp. 120-121; Roy, 'Royalist reputations', p. 110.

⁴¹ CR, p. 290.

for his Ma[jes]tie was of the Norman Race and unfit to Reigne.⁴² In a remarkably similar case from Bulford (Wiltshire) in August 1665, what appears to have been an affable encounter between William Andrews and George Webb resulted in the latter being referred to as ‘a knave’ for ‘fighting against the King.’ In response to this, Webb proclaimed that ‘if that bee all, I will doe it againe to morrow upon the same account.’⁴³ As these examples suggest, then, public identification with the revolution could stem from the sudden transformation of a discussion from the consensual to the contemptuous.⁴⁴ This was demonstrated again in one fascinating case from April 1664 when one Michael Pond was ‘in companie with some [neighbours]’ of his. After some time, conversation turned to ‘his [Majesty,] God bless him’, at which one Mr Child interjected, saying ‘that Cromwell was an honest man and a beter ... then he that reules now.’ Asked by one of his company ‘are you not a shamed to speake such grouce words?’, he replied ‘why need [I?] know no differance betweene a [beggar] and he.’⁴⁵ While the neighbours had intended to shame him into acquiescence with their visions of the past, this appears to have served to drive on Child to reaffirm his identification with Oliver Cromwell.

There was, then, a sense among some revolutionaries that, in spite of the attempts of royalists to censor, and indeed censure, they would continue to identify with the revolution. In some instances, this defiance occurred following more violent attempts at censorship. In August 1662, for example, a fight broke out at the house of one ‘Widow Atkins’ of Blaxton (South Yorkshire) when Charles North declared that ‘King Charles’ – presumably Charles I – ‘was a traitor’. According to the evidence of one Anthony Barton, not long had these words fallen from North’s lips than he was punched in the side of the head by John Staunton, a gentleman from the neighbouring village of Everton (Nottinghamshire). Completing his narrative of events, Barton recalled how, after the blow, North dusted himself off and proceeded

⁴² TNA, SP 29/106/9.

⁴³ Webb denied the charges, *CSPD 1664-1665*, p. 539.

⁴⁴ For similar observations in relation to seditious words cases in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Monod, *Jacobitism*, p. 251.

⁴⁵ TNA, SP 29/97/91.

to declare 'that the ould King, when he was put to death, had but his due.' Staunton, providing his own evidence before the York assizes, painted an even more detailed picture of North's words which, according to him, were 'that he was for those men that had murdered the last King, and he would be for them as long as he had life, and that they were honest men, and that the last King did deserve the death he had.'⁴⁶ If, as Barton implied, North's act of seditious remembering directly *followed* Staunton's blow, then his words served to demonstrate to Staunton that, irrespective of his act of violence, he would continue to identify with the events of the 1640s and 1650s.

If identification with the revolution was an act of defiance, it could be an intriguing act of *subversion* as well. In February 1678, for example, the regime was given information of a group of bodice-makers in Norwich who discussed a local by-election which had been called following the death of an MP.⁴⁷ When one of the candidates in the election, Colonel William Paston, was mentioned, another of those present, John Adcock, a tailor, 'did speake severall reproachfull & undervaluing Words'. In response, Ralph Palmer of nearby Costessey admonished Adcock, telling him that '[th]e City never had a better opportunity to do themselves good then now, if they should choose Col[onel] Paston'. Another man who was present, a woollen draper called Leonard Robinson, told Adcock that 'none but such as [th]e said Adcock & his party would be against [th]e election of [th]e said Colonel Paston'. Crucially, Robinson went on to accuse Adcock of being 'one of Cromwells Gang'. To this, Adcock's response was described variously by the informants as follows: 'Cromwell was better bred then [th]e King of England'; 'he was a very good man & ruled very well'; and even 'Cromwell was a good man, & an honest Man, a good Governor, & governed & ruled [th]e Nation as well as it hath been since'.⁴⁸ John Adcock, then, rather than disowning Oliver Cromwell, chose to identify with him *against* his detractors. In doing so, Adcock appears to have appropriated the seditious past which Leonard Robinson had endeavoured to use as a stick with which to beat him: what

⁴⁶ DCY, p. 95.

⁴⁷ Henning (ed.), *The History of Parliament*, i, pp. 410-411.

⁴⁸ TNA, SP 29/401/35 II.

the sociologist Dick Hebdige refers to as 'a gesture of defiance or contempt, in a smile or a sneer.'⁴⁹

Other examples suggest similar appropriations of the seditious past in order to subvert authority. In July 1664, for example, James Wright of Darnton (Darlington, County Durham) was accused of entering the house of Anthony Hunter, a yeoman living in nearby Birkenside, where he 'begun to give ill languages, saying he valued none of the King's officers, and that Oliver Cromwell was a better man than the King.'⁵⁰ Considering that it is likely that this was the same Anthony Hunter who had been responsible for discovering a meeting of Quakers in Sunderland earlier that month, it appears that Wright had intended to subvert Anthony Hunter's authority by identifying with Oliver Cromwell before the king. In another similar example, Thomas Guy, writing at the height of the third Anglo-Dutch War, and ostensibly at wit's end, recalled his efforts in preventing a group of Yarmouth fishermen from straying into waters which were being patrolled by the Dutch fleet. For his heroism, Guy expected appreciation, perhaps even respect from members of the town's corporation. However, as he was keen to mention to secretary of state, Joseph Williamson, he received only abuse. In his own words, Guy reported that he was told by Sir George England that 'he would write to my betters; indeed he provoked me soe farr [tha]t I was forced to bid him kiss [my arse].' Getting into his rhetorical stride, Guy informed Williamson that '[th]e Kinge has not soe many rebellious spirits in any one corporation through his Dominions; they are boasting w[ha]t a brave fellow Cromwell was but despisinge [th]e Kings Capt[ai]ns.'⁵¹ Again, it seems, the corporation of Yarmouth, well known for its dissenting religious identity, invoked the spectre of Cromwell in order to provoke Guy: an endeavour in which they were quite clearly successful.

What emerges from this examination of seditious remembering in public, then, is that revolutionaries sought more than to legitimate a certain

⁴⁹ Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (London, 1979), p. 3.

⁵⁰ *DCY*, p. 94. For Anthony Hunter, see *ibid.*, pp. 88n., 94n., 194, 196, 199, 200, 201.

⁵¹ TNA, SP 29/315/210.

vision of the past within the public sphere. Indeed, public identification with this past made it possible to oppose, defy and subvert the forms of authority which royalist interpretations of the past constituted. In the latter cases, this seems to have involved associating authority in political and religious matters with the royalist's authority to remember. It is difficult to overestimate how empowering these statements must have been when individuals were confronted with the suffocating censure and censorship of the post-revolutionary era. It is important to point out, however, that identification with violent actions in the past did not necessarily entail one's desire to carry the revolution out again. On the contrary, within a particular context, identification with the revolution counteracted experiences of authority. Of additional significance is that identification with the past does not seem to have involved a strict representation of the political and religious beliefs of which certain aspects of the seditious past were representative, but, rather, as a means of *subversion*. Thus, one is brought to agree strongly with Robin Clifton's belief that 'by treating all dissenters as rebels, some were eventually made into such.'⁵²

III

If identification with figures such as Oliver Cromwell was subversive, then the act of envisaging an alternative *future* reality in public – one in which power was re-distributed into the hands of revolutionaries – could prove to be intimidating, or even threatening. In treading this line, of course, revolutionaries were not merely counteracting the authority to remember, or opposing, defying and subverting forms of authority which derived from it, but *manipulating* the fearful version of the future to which royalist memories lent themselves. John Caethnes, for example, who was mentioned earlier in relation to the public justification of his participation in the revolution and his less than favourable opinion of George Monck, evoked the spectre of the recent past in this manner in September 1660. In response to a threat against him, Caethnes responded measuredly, 'Cum, Cum, wee stood 10 yeares and [th]e King hath not stood one yeare neither doe you knowe how

⁵² Clifton, *Last Popular Rebellion*, p. 52.

long hee would stand'.⁵³ Evident in Caethnes's threat is a fact which put the revolutionaries like him in a powerful position for much of Charles II's reign: the 'restored' monarchy and the established church were still embryonic in comparison to the eleven-year Commonwealth. Similar sentiments to those of Caethnes were articulated in October 1661, when an anonymous yeoman from Keld (North Yorkshire) told a neighbour that 'thou had best be quiet, for those that thou buildest upon, I hope they will not last long, and that I lived as well when there was no King and I hope to do so again, when there will be no King.'⁵⁴ For this yeoman, therefore, there was something particularly empowering about evoking a past in which 'there was no King' and in which he had exerted power over his neighbour that had since been relinquished.

Sometimes, more specific references to the trial and execution of Charles I in January 1649 evoked a time in which power had been redistributed most dramatically. This could well have been the intention of the Lincolnshire man William Gervase, a vehement opponent of the drainage of local fenland, when he imagined a repeat of the Regicide in June 1660. When Gervase had been told that the drainage took place 'by his Ma[jes]ties Lawes', he responded hastily that 'if these bee the Kings Lawes God Curse light uppon his heart for that it was likely hee would bee a Traytor as his father was, and wisht him hang'd.'⁵⁵ Here, it seems, Gervase's use of the past was intended not merely as an expression of republicanism, but as a means of threatening the participants in the drainage schemes, whose authority derived from the monarchy. Further evidence demonstrates how the Regicide could be used to intimidate those who were identified as royalists. On the Tuesday before Whitsunday 1663, John Dixon and William Jackson were conversing at the shop window of the former in Attercliffe (South Yorkshire) when George Parkin, a knife-maker, walked by. As he approached, Dixon departed. Perhaps slightly upset by this rebuff, Parkin told Jackson that 'John Dixon will not stay if hee see me come.' Reasoning with him, Jackson said that 'you must bee civill, for hee is an honest poore

⁵³ TNA, SP 29/14/74.

⁵⁴ Atkinson, *Quarter Sessions ... [North Riding]*, vi, pp. 42-43.

⁵⁵ HL/PO/JO/10/1/293. See also, HL/PO/JO/10/1/298A. Both quoted in Keith Lindley, *Fenland Riots and the English Revolution* (London, 1982), p. 234.

man and the King's servant.' Apparently riled by these words, Parkin answered: 'A Kinge! wee were better without a King then with one, for though wee have a Kinge, the old block remains still.' Indeed, Jackson reported two incidents in the following October when Parkin had told him that 'there would come a change ere long, and then hee would banish both [Jackson] and all his like, kebbs as they were', and 'before the twelve month's end wee shall see Kinge Charles his head in a poke, as his father's was.'⁵⁶ In the light of the latter evidence, then, Parkin appears to have used the prospect of 'a change ere long', which was inextricably tied to the revolution, as a means of intimidating Dixon and Jackson. In another fascinating example from 1661, a Leeds labourer called William Lawson expressed his hopes that 'the phanaticks will disperse his Majesties trained bands like the chafe before the wind. It was justly done that the late King was beheaded.'⁵⁷ In this case, it appears that a revolutionary actually adopted the pejorative label of 'phanatick', perhaps as a means of conjuring the very threats which royalists perceived to lie with 'fanaticism' (see chapter 1).

In other evidence, nostalgic visions of the Cromwellian era served as means of intimidating those who had then suffered as royalists. In June 1663, one John Whorrow (alias Barber) stood accused of assaulting Gilbert Luther, who was 'one of his majestys guards'. Striking Luther with '[th]e barr of his doore', Whorrow shouted: '[th]e king keepes none but house-breaking rogues about him ... it was better for us when Oliver his people were heere, & wished them heere againe for then every one might keepe his owne'. Judging by Luther's account of the incident, these words formed a response to what Whorrow had interpreted as a 'robbery', of which there had been 'sixe or seaven ... donne every night'.⁵⁸ If Whorrow's allegation of robbery was accurate, then this incident may fall into more widespread concerns about the behaviour of the king's soldiers during the early 1660s. For Whorrow, however, the evocation of Oliver Cromwell provided him with sufficient leverage to intimidate the king's guards. These threats were not

⁵⁶ DCY, pp. 117-118. Parkin was acquitted at the next assizes.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 88.

⁵⁸ TNA, SP 29/55/44.

made by men alone, however. In another instance of Oliverian nostalgia from 1672, Captains Rainsford and Crossett reported how one Mrs Baxter, the wife of an ensign in the Tower regiment, had told them that she and her husband 'were not soe abused in Olivers time, and hoped that the Lieu[tenant] of the Tower would be carried out of the Tower and ... she had as good friends at Whitehall as the Lieu[tenant] of the Tower had.'⁵⁹ According to the evidence provided against Baxter, her rage was a response to the removal of her husband's wine from the Tower of London, which he was alleged to have smuggled there in order to evade the recent levy on imported alcohol.⁶⁰ Hence, looking on as her belongings were removed, she evoked the ghost of Oliver Cromwell as a means of resisting those who were presumably less willing to overlook their misconduct.

On another occasion, a nostalgic reference to an individual's role in the revolution made possible a more sinister threat. In October 1661, at Reading (Berkshire), one Mr Garrard was ordered by a Captain Blagrove to raid the house of William Stanley, a local nonconformist minister, for 'a freelock Musket [which] he had.' Stanley's response to Garrard's visit was to tell him that the musket had been sold 'to one Moses Willis', who was 'one [that] sells Armes.' Following this lead, Garrard was told by Moses Willis that 'Stanley had brought it to him by order of a servant of Mr Backhouse's to fix it for [the said] Mr Backhouse.' Returning to Captain Blagrove to inform him that the musket belonged to Backhouse, he was followed all the way by Stanley, who sought to explain his actions. Although details of the discussions between Stanley and Blagrove are scant, we know that Stanley was alleged to have 'bragd of [th]e time [when] hee was ... Judge Advocat in Col[onel] Birches Regiment adding [with] much relish [tha]t those were good daies.'⁶¹ Thus, although Stanley was almost completely disempowered by the events of 1660 (he had previously been a lay preacher), a reference to his past provided a means of resisting his treatment by the authorities.

⁵⁹ TNA, SP 29/303/235 I.

⁶⁰ See Act of 22 & 23 Car. II. c. 5. Following Baxter's arrest, he was later released and even given a new commission, *CSPD 1671-1672*, p. 234.

⁶¹ TNA, SP 29/43/84.

In a rather different example from September 1661, a Westminster cordwainer called Edward Potter stood accused of imagining the resurgence of the New Model Army. According to the evidence of William Mellin, a local silk weaver, Potter had bragged to him ‘that not long since he had not one peny to buy him bread but now had gold enough’, and that, presumably unknown to her, he had paid back a debt to Mellin’s aunt, one Amy Wildblud, with a counterfeit shilling. From this point onwards, Potter began a tirade in which he told the informer

that the booke of common prayer was burnt in Scotland and that thear would suddenly be an army up thear and that thear are brave boyes in England and that he should have a better places then a liftennantes place and if ever the ould army wear together againe they would never befooled as that have bine.⁶²

From the substance of the evidence, it is conceivable that Potter was an old soldier whose recent unemployment had resulted in debts which he was struggling to pay off. Indeed, this might be the same Edward Potter who was employed by the regime as an informant in various nonconformist congregations around the southeast of England during this period.⁶³ Thus, his sudden financial empowerment, which was perhaps a result of this espionage work, provoked a diatribe which involved reminding the creditor’s nephew of his former powers, and the possibility that they would come round again.

An even more threatening invocation of the army’s resurgence occurred in September 1663, and yet it appears to have originated from an example of the kinds of misconceived *consensus* such as were considered in the previous chapter. In this instance, William Moulthorpe of Pontefract (West Yorkshire), entered the house of a fellow labourer, Nicholas Myas, to whom he said that ‘hee had heard a pretty story that one George Marre was sworne

⁶² TNA, SP 29/41/29.

⁶³ See, for example, *CSPD 1661-1662*, pp. 84, 97, 103, 111, 114, 122, 125, 133, 154, 162, 208, 284, 430.

never to bee a cavalier againe.’ Although it is not known who this George Marre was or why he had sworne to be ‘a cavalier’ no longer, Moulthorpe’s words sat decidedly awkwardly with Myas, who answered that ‘T’was a pitty but such rogues should be hanged that could not let the Kinge alone, and meddle with their owne matters.’ Apparently riled by Myas’ rebuttal of his words, Moulthorpe began a long tirade against the king, which is worth quoting in full:

What is the Kinge better than another man? for Robin Bulman [of Pontefract, labourer and] a seaventh sonne, can cure seaven evils, and the Kinge can but cure nine, soe that the Kinge is but two degrees better than Robin Bulman. Thou shalt see that before the moneth end as many will arise in England and Scotland as will cutt the throats of all those that were for the Kinge, and to bee sure thy throate will be cutt for that thou hast beene soe long a cavalier, and now art in armes for the Kinge!⁶⁴

In this remarkably radical exposition of the similitude of the obscure Robin Bulman and Charles II, which included the evocation of revenge upon ‘cavaliers’, Moulthorpe made clear the link between those who supported the Stuarts during the revolution and those who now supported the king. In doing so, Moulthorpe was able to make it quite clear that his words were aimed against *Myas* rather than the monarchy. The use of pejorative labels such as ‘cavalier’ informed another particularly threatening incident from later on in the 1660s. On 24 August 1669, William Oliver and his sons, Richard and Thomas, overtook Thomas Hodson (or Hudson) on a road in the region of Bromley Regis (now King’s Bromley, Staffordshire). ‘Without any provocation’, Oliver and his two sons jumped on Hodson and proceeded to beat him, calling him a ‘Cavalleir Rogue’, and saying ‘that before it was longe, they should see his throate cutt and all his fellow Rogues.’⁶⁵ Here, Oliver’s perception of Hodson as a cavalier was strongly connected to

⁶⁴ *DCY*, pp. 100-101.

⁶⁵ *TNA*, SP 29/ 264/139 I.

allegations of 'roguery'; a phrase which often stood in for debauchery and miscreancy.

In some cases, invoking the spectre of the past had less radical connotations. In September 1665, in the run up to the meeting of parliament at Oxford, evidence of treasonable words was given against Francis Buller, the MP for Saltash (Cornwall) by his erstwhile chaplain, Dr Nathaniel Eaton.⁶⁶ On the following day, in what appears to have been a stroke of bad luck, Eaton bumped into Buller's servant, John Pengelly, on the road between Saltash and nearby St Stephens. Perhaps in an effort to add warmth to a presumably rather frosty encounter, Eaton ensured Pengelly of his hopes that, 'notwithstanding all [th]e ire & malice ag[ains]t him', he might still meet Buller at the parliament which was due to convene in the next fortnight. To this, Pengelly responded rather coldly that 'if Mr. Buller were tried in Parliam[ent] he did not feare, but he should find friends enough there to take his parte, but if he ... were questioned out of Parliam[ent] he did not knowe but it might cost the King as much as the Five members did his father.'⁶⁷ These words, for which Pengelly was imprisoned until the following June, were a very conspicuous reference to Charles I's botched attempt to arrest five of his most vocal opponents in the House of Commons in January 1642, an act which deepened irrevocably the animosities between king and parliament in the run up to the civil war. That Pengelly's words were 'seditious' derived from the fact that, from the perspective of Eaton and the authorities who would later condemn him, he was espousing a *wish* to see the king meet the same opposition (and perhaps even the same end) as his father, if he were to act contrary to parliamentary privilege by trying Buller for treasonable words spoken in the house.⁶⁸ Since Eaton had been very public

⁶⁶ Davies Gilbert, *Parochial History of Cornwall* (4 vols., London, 1838), iii, pp. 463-464.

⁶⁷ TNA, SP 29/138/70.

⁶⁸ Thomas Scot argued at the trial of the regicides in October 1660 that 'whatever I say in Parliament, the Privilege extends to no more than this, that I may be lawfully secured till the Parliament hath been acquainted with it, but not finally included till the Parliament have heard it', *The Indictment, Arraignment, Tryal, and Judgment, at large, Of Twenty-Nine Regicides, The Murtherers Of His Most Sacred Majesty King Charles I, Of Glorious Memory* (London, 1730), p. 75.

in his condemnation of the revolution, it is possible to interpret Pengelly's words as an attempt to strike terror into the heart of such a notable royalist.⁶⁹

Threats such as these were not consigned to oral culture, however, and some authors were daring enough to evoke the return of rebellion in print. In his *Vox & Lacrimae Anglorum*, which was published posthumously in 1668, George Wither lambasted the post-revolutionary government. Like other oppositional accounts, Wither was careful to cite the popularity of Restoration.⁷⁰ However, he warned his intended audience, which, one must assume, included the government itself, that

Since now you have an opportunity,
Redeem your selves and us from Slavery:
If not, (the wheel goes round) there is no doubt,
You'l also shared with those you have turn'd out.⁷¹

Here then, it is possible to witness the full extent of seditious references to the past as means of empowering those who had been 'turn'd out' in 1660 and afterwards. By referring to the recent past – memories of which instilled royalists' terror about the future of the Three Kingdoms – men and women were able to, for a small period of time at least, resist their coercion.

One of the most interesting examples of uses of the past as means of resisting authority comes from the very end of the 1670s. At the beginning of 1678, Edmund Appelby of Askerton, Cumbria, came into the house of William Orfeur at Allegarth in the same county. According to Orfeur, who gave evidence at the York assizes over six years later, Appelby was drinking 'pretty briskly', and began 'using severall diswasive arguments' against Orfeur, including the allegation that he was a 'Papist', and therefore was legally prohibited from 'keeping or managing any farm'. Moreover, Orfeur

⁶⁹ See, for example, Nathaniel Eaton, *De Fastis Anglicis, Sive Calendarium Sacrum* (London, 1661), pp. 3-5, 11-12, 40-43.

⁷⁰ [George Wither], *Vox & Lacrimae Anglorum: Or, The True English-mens Complaints to their Representatives in Parliament (s. l., 1668)*, p. 3.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

gave evidence of a raft of seditious memories which Appelby had spoken at his own house, including the conviction that Charles I deserved to be executed,

as a combiner with and intentionary introducer of Popery [and] that his murdering his subjects in Ireland deserved as many deaths to him as he had hairs of his head, if possibly he could have had so many lives lost, being worse then the massacr^y of France.

Moreover, Appelby believed 'that this Charles the Second was going the same rode, and had made further progress in the same, and such like matters, and consequently better deserved to undergoe the same punishment then his father.' Here, Orfeur was not merely reciting common forms of seditious remembering; he was also using them to intimidate Orfeur who, as a 'Papist', would lose his farm. Indeed, in Appelby's eyes, 'as soon as God sends us the King's business done, there will not one Papist be permitted to be within the compass of the sea.'⁷² Appelby went on to threaten Orfeur more specifically, arguing that

if it was his fortune to have the same power in the Commonwealth of England, as formerly he had in Oliver's time ... when he was a superintendant to the sequestrators of the delinquents' estates ... that then he would have a dispensation for the litle man ... for his banishment (but not from Rome, he said by way of derision, &c.) if he would be kind to him in surrendering of a lease which he then had.⁷³

In this instance, it is possible to see how the invocation of the revolution could be used as a means of intimidating a man who was suspected of Roman Catholicism. However, if we probe further into this case, we find that there was more to Appelby's hopes for the future than meets the eye. In the National Archives, documents surrounding this case exist which tell us more about the context for Appelby's seditious memories. In 1683, Orfeur wrote to

⁷² DCY, pp. 265-267.

⁷³ Ibid., pp. 265-267.

Sir Francis North, the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, complaining of how Appleby had inveigled Orfeur out of certain farm premises. Apparently, being in debt, Orfeur had certain lands seized in 1674, which were sold to Appelby, who agreed to lease the lands back to Orfeur. Although Orfeur protested that he was unable to pay his rent, owing to 'the smallness of the price & rates of corne & cattle', Appelby 'did forceably enter upon the s[ai]d farme', and repossessed it from him. Thereafter, Orfeur narrated, Appelby had turned his avaricious gaze to his personal estate, which he hoped Orfeur would forfeit on the basis of his recusancy. Having secured the property, Appelby sold Orfeur's goods 'att great undervallues being content to take halfe the worth thereof.' However, Orfeur's troubles did not cease at this point, and he found himself imprisoned for his recusancy.⁷⁴ The case of Appelby and Orfeur is fascinating enough for its depiction of how justification, nostalgia and prospection could be combined to form a narrative which spanned past, present and future. More than this, from Appelby's point of view, Orfeur's Roman Catholicism provided him with an opportunity to overturn the power which Orfeur had held since the Restoration (he was the sheriff of the county in 1675),⁷⁵ and part of this resistance took the form of conjuring the spectre of the past. Considering the fact that this evidence was provided six years after the event, and that Appelby denied all of the allegations, it is of course possible that Orfeur had fabricated this evidence to discredit Appelby during a time of political instability.⁷⁶ Nonetheless, that Orfeur was able to make a credible case against Appelby implies that this kind of language, and its use to intimidate, was not uncommon after the Restoration.

When revolutionaries constructed an image of the future from the remnants of the English Revolution, then, this was not merely a way of imagining, or facilitating forms of political action, but also of *intimidating* those who were deemed to have been terrified by the prospect of the recurrence of the political and social upheaval of the 1640s and 1650s. What can be seen

⁷⁴ TNA, C 6/247/34.

⁷⁵ See Francis Grainger (ed.), 'James Jackson's Diary, 1650-1683', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, New Series, Volume XXI (Kendal, 1921), p. 119.

⁷⁶ SP 29/438/103, 103 I.

in all of these cases, therefore, is the use of the past not merely to subvert authority which derived from royalist memories, but also to turn the terrifying vision of the future which these memories predisposed *against* their authors. For those whose roles in the revolution or religious identities meant that they had been excluded from positions of power after 1660, it cannot be overestimated quite how emboldening references to a future in which power was redistributed could be.

Conclusion

In this chapter, it has been possible to see the several ways in which the broaching of seditious ideas about the past *in public* was empowering for men and women whose lives in post-revolutionary England and Wales were defined by experiences of authority. Firstly, revolutionaries were in a position to debate the meaning of the revolution. This was done either through the ascription of positive meanings to the events of the past, and contesting the royalist interpretation in the process, or by making more personal claims about the legitimacy of participation in the revolution. In doing so, revolutionaries did not merely reflect on the past, or discuss it among those who might agree, but *contested* its meaning and attempted to stake a claim within the public sphere of how the revolution ought to be remembered. In doing so, revolutionaries took part in a nascent historiography of the revolution which could not have existed within the tightly controlled public sphere of print. Secondly, enduring identification with participation with the revolution, which could result from a firm belief in the legitimacy of the past, enabled individuals to place distance between themselves and those who were identified as royalists or as having reneged on the 'true' Cause. This could occur when revolutionaries knew that an individual had supported the Stuarts during the revolution or when these identities otherwise spilled out into the open, usually as a result of the broaching of views about the recent past. On some occasions, it seems, these conflicting identities led to physical violence. Indeed, when attempts were made to censor revolutionaries, occasionally with recourse to physical violence, identification offered a form of defiance. Moreover, some revolutionaries appear to have taken on 'revolutionary' identities not necessarily as a consequence of having a close

affinity with participation in the revolution, but because this allowed them to identify against those who were associated with the possession of anti-fanatical prejudices. In doing so, individuals were in a position to subvert authority. Finally, as a number of cases suggest, publicised desires to have some aspect of the revolution restored were *weaponised* by revolutionaries in order to intimidate and to threaten. For this purpose, it appears to have been sufficient to evoke exactly the kind of dystopian future to which royalist memories lent themselves and which were intended to legitimate religio-political uniformity. This stratagem appears to have enabled those who were disempowered after the Restoration to, however fleetingly, reclaim some of that authority. In all of these ways, seditious remembering in public re-distributed power: if only on a local, micro-political level. Furthermore, the evidence demonstrates how, contrary to the claims of some historians, the revolution continued to be fought over in some communities well after 1660.⁷⁷ It is the continuation of this conflict into the 'exclusion crisis' and 'Tory reaction' of 1678-85 that this chapter will now turn.

⁷⁷ Matthew Neufeld has argued that 'people who publicly remembered the civil wars and Interregnum were not necessarily engaging in the same debates and issues that had brought them, or their immediate forbears, to violent discord', but were 'very often they were narrating the past within and in response to a framework erected after 1660 to ensure political and religious stability and concord', *Public Remembering*, p. 16.

5 – Seditious Memories and the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-1685

In March 1682, the lyrics of a new broadside ballad, *The Whig Rampant*, echoed around the kingdom's coffee shops and alehouses.¹ The message of this ballad was clear: the Three Kingdoms were in the thrall of a faction which wanted nothing more than to repeat the rebellions and usurpations of forty years earlier. This faction were the 'Whigs', those within and beyond parliament who called for the exclusion of James, Duke of York, a Roman Catholic, and the strengthening of Parliament's hand in the government of the Three Kingdoms. In the opinion of the author of the ballad, Thomas D'Urfey, the Whigs' endeavours concealed democratic (then a term with negative connotations) impulses to 'teach the Nobles how to bow, / and keep the Gentry down'. Moreover, in imitation of the pietistic fanatics of the 1640s from whom the impulse to dismantle the monarchy and established church had been inherited, the Whigs aimed to resurrect 'Anno Forty-Three: / A Godly Reformation time' when 'Troopers Rul'd the Roast' and 'Loyalty was call'd a Crime'. 'Having Pill'd and Plunder'd all, / and Level'd each Degree', the ballad continued, the Whigs would 'make their plump young daughters fall'. The conclusion of the ballad was a reassuring one, however, since the 'Tories' – the Whigs' anti-exclusionist counterparts – had done what their royalist antecedents had failed to do by silencing the growing cacophony of dissent. Indeed, D'Urfey was pleased to be able to proclaim to his audience that 'now the Days are alter'd since ... / If we Rebel against our Prince, / to Tyburn go we.'²

The claims of *The Whig Rampant* ought now to be familiar. There was, or so Tories argued, an indomitable force called 'fanaticism' which had survived the Restoration of 1660 and all subsequent efforts to settle the Three Kingdoms. Now, the Whigs, whose ties to 'fanatics' were evident, were manipulating anxieties about a 'popish' succession in order to advance theories of resistance to the king and the Church of England. Once more,

¹ For dating see McShane, *PBB*, no. 620X.

² [Thomas D'Urfey], *The Whig Rampant: Or, Exaltation. Being a Pleasant New Song of 82. To a New Tune of, Hey Boys up go We* (London, 1682). See McShane, *PBB*, no. 620X.

this overarching narrative of seventeenth-century politics coalesced around memories of the abhorrence and unnaturalness of the English Revolution and its origins in the radical reformation of the sixteenth century. Historians of the 'exclusion crisis' of 1678-81 and the 'Tory reaction' which dominated the remainder of Charles's reign are well-acquainted with the predominance of the Tories' interpretation of the past, and it is now widely acknowledged as one of, if not *the* means through which the supporters of the Duke of York's succession and the king's prerogative powers were able to cast dirt upon, and thus to defeat, the Whig menace.³ Indeed, historians of this period have appreciated that the Tory's case against the Whigs was an updated version of a royalist interpretation of the revolution which had, as previous chapters have demonstrated, dominated the printed public sphere of the 1660s. Once more, however, historians have focused on whether fears of a return to revolution were real, or stirred up by the Tories. In doing so, none of these historians has acknowledged the remarkable revival of a seditious counter-memory which paralleled the return of royalist memories. Indeed, when alternatives to the Tory's vision of the past have been touched upon, those which emphasised the historic dangers of 'counter-reformation' since the mid-sixteenth century, and avoided thereby the 'politically incorrect' 1640s and 1650s, have been favoured overwhelmingly. Elsewhere, the Whig's 'radical' memories to which Jonathan Scott and Gary De Krey have referred tend to denote a straightforward ideological inheritance from the 1640s and 1650s: one which served the political, and, in fact, often the *high* political, interests of those who sought exclusion and religious toleration during the 'exclusion crisis'.⁴

In essence, then, historians have inferred that the period 1678-85 witnessed a similar degree of silence from revolutionaries about the events

³ See Mark Knights, 'The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of the Parties', *The Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 68:1-2 (March, 2005), pp. 353-373; and Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, pp. 87-134. See also, Harris, *London Crowds*, pp. 131-137; Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms* (London, 2005), pp. 237-253; Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, pp. 253-254; Elizabeth Clarke, 'Re-reading the Exclusion Crisis', *The Seventeenth Century*, 21:1 (2006), p. 146.

⁴ Scott, *England's troubles*, p. 344; Gary S. De Krey, 'Radicals, reformers, and republicans: academic language and political discourse in Restoration London,' Houston and Pincus (eds.), *A Nation Transformed*, pp. 71-99.

of mid-century as the previous two decades. Those who did raise their voices above the din, it is argued, did so for often radical political purposes. In relation to the first point, it is quite clear that the Whigs' opponents saw things very differently. Returning to D'Urfey's *The Whig Rampant*, it is worth pointing out that the Whigs were not only charged with revolutionary ambitions, but also with the possession of seditious memories of the revolution. At the head of this ballad, D'Urfey included a depiction of two Whigs who stood before a delighted audience, and declared: 'My book you see, Remember me ... Then the Old cause, We will set free.' In addition to this, the author included further down the page the commonplace depiction of a barrel or tub-preacher, from whose mouth came the haunting words 'Remember the good old Cause.'⁵ D'Urfey was not alone in perceiving the Whigs to possess a fondness for the revolutionary era, however. Aphra Behn, the Tory playwright, portrayed the fanatical and proto-Whiggish title role of her 1679 play *Sir Patient Fancy* as referring casually to 'the good days of the late Lord Protector.'⁶ Elsewhere, an anonymous pamphlet of 1681, which sought to explain the decay of trade in the nation's towns, described how the Whigs could be heard 'commending and slyly insinuating the good days of the late times, the plenty, power, riches, and reputation of their dear Commonwealth.'⁷

In the opinions of the Tories, then, fanaticism – now embodied in the Whigs – involved an enduring admiration for the events of the mid-seventeenth century; an admiration which, as the royalists had been keen to put forward in the aftermath of the Restoration of 1660, disclosed a compulsion to repeat those events. While this would appear to support the claims of historians that a radical ideological thread connected the 1640s to the 1680s, it is important to acknowledge that concerns about '41 come

⁵ The image of a tub-preaching puritan was common during the 1640s. See the frontispieces of John Taylor, *A Svvarme of Sectaries, and Schismatics, Wherein is discovered the strange preaching (or prating) of such as are by their trades Coblers, Tinkers, Pedlers, Weavers, Sowgelders, and Chymney-Sweepers* (London, 1642). The latter of these provided the image from which the tub-preacher depicted in *The Whig Rampant* was copied.

⁶ Aphra Behn, *Sir Patient Fancy: A Comedy* (London, 1678), p. 17.

⁷ Quoted in Jenkins, "The Old Leaven", p. 822.

again' were propaganda devices.⁸ Nonetheless, as this chapter will demonstrate, the Tories' exaggeration of the radical connection between Whigs and the revolution does not mean that sympathies for the revolution did not continue to exist in the 1680s. On the contrary, through a cautious use of allegations and prosecutions of seditious or treasonable speech and writing from this period, as well as some of the printed texts which circulated following the lapse of the Licensing Act in March 1679, it will be possible to locate a revival of seditious memories which, far from always relating to radical political intentions, formed the counterpart of a resurgent royalist interpretation of the revolution.

In this chapter, seditious memories of the revolution will be portrayed once more as inseparable from the context of pervasive and persistent attacks on the revolution and its participants. Indeed, it will be possible to regard seditious memories as the means through which – privately, publicly, individually, and socially – these experiences of authority were negotiated, resisted, and subverted. The first part of this chapter, then, will trace the revival of royalist attacks upon the revolution in the Tories' compulsion to demonstrate the dangers of resistance, but it will do so in a way which emphasises the pervasiveness and persistency of these attacks. Furthermore, these attacks will be conceptualised as renewed experiences of an authority to remember the revolution which lay squarely with the Tories. In order to do so, it will be necessary once more to illustrate that the rise of attacks on the revolution resulted from the fact that *royalists* continued to possess the means of transmitting their version of the past to wide audiences, not from inherent popular fears of a return to the revolution. Having established the return of royalist memories within the printed public sphere, the second part of this chapter will examine the re-emergence of seditious memories as means by which revolutionaries confronted these attacks on the past, and re-appropriated the authority to remember. In the final part of the chapter, whether the Tories were correct to fear a second rebellion and usurpation in the manner of the first will be considered. In

⁸ Knights, *Politics*, p. 11; Zook, *Radical Whigs*, pp. xix-xx.

addition, it will be proposed in this section that the Whigs' threats of a return to revolution were as often means of subverting forms of authority which derived from Tory attacks on the past as they were indications of radical intent. Once more, it will be emphasised throughout that seditious memories belonged to those who had supported the radical and the moderate revolutions of the 1640s and 1650s.

I

In order to gain a thorough understanding of seditious memories, it is crucial to establish the extent to which these memories were conjured in the midst of resurgent, and ever more pervasive, attacks on the revolution. As in the early 1660s, the 'anti-fanaticism' of the 'exclusion crisis' responded to concerns about the rise of opposition to the monarchy and the established church. By 1678, many Protestants in England and Wales were apprehensive of a 'popish' successor in the form of James, Duke of York, whose resignation from the office of Lord High Chancellor in June 1673 was taken as *prima facie* evidence of his inability to conform to the 1673 Test Act and, by extension, his Roman Catholicism. Moreover, a growing faction within Parliament looked on in horror in 1672 as the Triple Alliance between the Protestant powers of England, Holland and Sweden was terminated, and a new war against the Dutch was instigated. In the meantime, onlookers found it difficult to separate the king's domestic policies from these events; particularly his circumvention of Parliament in 1672 with a 'Declaration of Indulgence' for his nonconformist, but also (more importantly) his Roman Catholic subjects. In 1675, fears of 'popery' and 'arbitrary government' were compounded when Charles, in response to an increasingly vocal faction within parliament, prorogued the body twice.⁹ In the autumn and winter of 1678, the anxieties of the king's subjects fused in the aftermath of revelations about the despotic intentions of Charles's chief minister, Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby, and the now notorious 'Popish Plot'; a fabricated conspiracy in which an extensive network of Roman Catholics were alleged to have been

⁹ Scott, *England's troubles*, p. 180.

plotting to assassinate Charles II, reconvert England to popery and massacre its Protestants.¹⁰

Within a few short months, these anxieties coalesced around Parliament's extraordinary measures to exclude James, Duke of York from the throne and to secure a Protestant succession. Indeed, some of the Whigs who supported these measures would not rule out armed resistance as a means of ensuring that the Duke was excluded.¹¹ Following fresh elections in the wake of failed attempts by Parliament to impeach the Earl of Danby in December 1678, Whig MPs tabled a bill to exclude James from the throne. Charles outmanoeuvred the exclusionists, however, and dissolved Parliament. Furthermore, in response to the ensuing election of MPs who were no less vehement in support of exclusion, Charles prorogued Parliament once more; this time before it was able to convene.¹² In the months following, the intensity of support for MPs to reconvene was manifested in an outpouring of polemical print, unparalleled parliamentary petitioning¹³ and dazzling public pageantry.¹⁴ When, in response to this pressure, Parliament was finally allowed to convene in October 1680, a new bill of exclusion in the Commons, which responded to fears of renewed plotting by foreign papists, was voted out by 70 lords (amongst whom were many bishops) to 30.¹⁵ The same Parliament, which resolved to find other means to ensure the security of Protestantism, was prorogued on 10 January 1681, and when a new Parliament met at the more loyal city of Oxford in March, it was quickly dissolved in the wake of renewed efforts to introduce a similar bill. Following the dissolution of March 1681, Charles was never to call Parliament again. Indeed, for the remainder of Charles II's reign, the 'Tories' – those who stood firm in support of the king's prerogative during this 'exclusion crisis' – secured an ascendancy which ensured the banishment of

¹⁰ See John Kenyon, *The Popish Plot* (London, 1972).

¹¹ In November 1681, the Commons drew up a bill which entailed, in the event of Charles's death, the arming of those who subscribed to an "Association". See Knights, *Politics*, p. 89.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹³ Knights, 'London's "Monster" Petition of 1680', *The Historical Journal*, 36:1 (March 1993), pp. 39-67.

¹⁴ See Sheila Williams, 'The Pope-Burning Processions of 1679, 1680 and 1681' *The Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 21:1-2 (Jan.-Jun. 1958), pp. 104-118.

¹⁵ Harris, *Restoration*, p. 189.

the Whigs to the political margins for almost a decade. In the words of Tim Harris, this 'Tory reaction' ensured that 'all forms of political opposition to the king and his heir were effectively crushed, and the Whigs and their nonconformist allies were driven underground.'¹⁶ Indeed, by 1683, a number of the Whigs were imprisoned or had been executed for complicity in plotting, such as Stephen Colledge who will be considered in the next chapter. Their leaders, meanwhile, including the Earl of Shaftesbury and the Duke of Monmouth had been forced into exile.

It is important to reinforce the claims of historians that, while the rise of anti-fanaticism did form an important part of the Tories defeat of the Whigs, this did not draw upon views about the past which were universal, but strongly royalist fears that the Whigs intended to divide the nation, unleash renewed civil war, and construct a second commonwealth from the Kingdoms' ruins. That this was a remarkably successful propaganda campaign resulted, in part, from the eerie similarities between the political atmosphere of the years 1679-80 and that of 1637-42.¹⁷ In a remarkable echo of the year 1641, for example, (when the Long Parliament had brought Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, to the scaffold), 1679 witnessed efforts to impeach the king's chief minister, the Earl of Danby. Moreover, a tumultuous rising of Scottish Presbyterians in the summer of the same year closely resembled the outbreak of the Bishops' Wars in 1639, leading the author of one government newsletter to warn his readers that 'the Covenanting party begin to con their old lesson'.¹⁸ In addition to these disturbing developments, urban areas such as London were witnessing the revival of the kinds of public politics which royalists had blamed for the breakdown of 1640-42. Both members and the supporters of the regime, therefore, converged on the opinion that the gradual increase of public petitioning in 1680 echoed the prelude to the civil wars. Elsewhere, Sir Leoline Jenkins highlighted how scandalous, seditious and treasonable speech had increased as a haunting echo of the early 1640s. Indeed, as he

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 211.

¹⁷ Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, pp. 87-88

¹⁸ *CSPD Jan. 1679-Aug. 1680*, pp. 197-198

was anxious to point out, although 'in former times and other nations people have thought and spoke as ill of their governors as we do now', yet now 'no governors have ever been so much manacled as ours are'.¹⁹ Others balked at outbursts of political violence. The judge William Scroggs, for instance, while stopping short of envisaging renewed civil war, implored those to whom he gave a speech in 1679 that 'no Act of Oblivion ought to make us to forget by what ways our late troubles began, when the Apprentices and Porters mutinied for Justice in their owne sense' and that 'the like insolence ought not to be suffered for the example past, and to come.'²⁰

The Tories' cries of '41 come again' were only amplified by the fact that, as Richard Ashcraft has pointed out, the personnel of the Whig movement drew to an alarming extent on that of the English Revolution.²¹ Chief among the Whigs, of course, was Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, who had joined parliament's forces in 1643, and later served on the Council of State.²² Furthermore, Tories were keen to highlight the participation in the Whig movement of those 'fanatics' whose religious dissent was deemed to have been responsible for the revolution. In the markedly blunt words of the loyal inhabitants of Ossulstone (Middlesex), for example, 'the Phanaticks' who were now at work were those who had 'raised a Rebellion, Murdered the best of Kings, many of the Loyall Nobility, and Gentry, tooke away their Estates, laid aside the Monarchy, destroyed the Church, and for almost twenty yeares exercised Arbitrarie and Tyrannicall Governm[en]t against Law.'²³ As in the 1640s, argued the Tories, these rabble-rousers were repeating the old confidence trick that only their politicians, the Whigs, could be trusted with the defence of the realm from popery. Sir Leoline Jenkins argued in September 1680, therefore, that the *true* hazard to the Three Kingdoms lay not with Roman Catholicism, but with

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 586-587.

²⁰ William Scroggs, *The Lord Chief Justice Scroggs his Speech in the King-Bench The first day of this present Michaelmas Term 1679* (London, 1679), p. 6.

²¹ Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics & Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (Princeton, NJ, 1986), pp. 247-248.

²² See John Spurr, 'Shaftesbury and the Seventeenth Century', Spurr (ed.), *Anthony Ashley Cooper*, pp. 11-14.

²³ TNA, SP 29/421/74.

'[th]e Wealthy dissenters [tha]t pretende [th]e fear of Popery but under [tha]t pretexte drive at [th]e change of Government into a Commonwealth.'²⁴

From the end of 1678 onwards, then, as in the wake of the Restoration in 1660, those who supported the authority of the monarch and the established church were convinced that the 'fanatics' were intending to re-enact the sufferings of mid-century. As a result of the historiographical emphasis on the 'exclusion crisis', and the 'Tory reaction', there has been much more interest among historians of the later period of Charles II's reign in the role which was played by anti-fanaticism in the successful defence of the Stuarts and the Church of England. On the one hand, Mark Knights and Matthew Neufeld in particular have reflected upon the public sphere of print, and the 'historiography' that emerged from it, as the central medium through which Tories promulgated their anxieties about a return to revolution.²⁵ Elsewhere, Tim Harris, in several seminal portrayals of crowd politics during the crisis years, has gone much further than any other historian in showing how Tory uses of the past were able to percolate through the structure of society.²⁶ Indeed, these emphases upon the role of the past in 'exclusion crisis' politics have filtered through into more general studies of the period. In Grant Tapsell's brilliant study of Charles II's 'personal rule' of 1681-85, for instance, the past looms large in the sermons, printed polemic and private correspondence of the period.²⁷

While much has been done, therefore, to expose the role of the past during the 'exclusion crisis', it is worth reemphasising the pervasiveness and persistence of this kind of material. One way of doing so is by examining the boom in the production of broadside ballads, such as *The Whig Rampant* with which this chapter commenced, that contained anti-fanatical messages after 1679, and particularly in 1681; material which was able to reach a wider audience than other media (see chapter 1). An early example of these

²⁴ TNA, SP 44/62, f. 145.

²⁵ Knights, 'Tory Interpretation', pp. 353-373; Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, pp. 87-134.

²⁶ Tim Harris, 'Party Turns? Or, Whigs and Tories Get Off Scott Free', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 25:4 (Winter 1993), p. 587; Harris, *Restoration*, pp. 238-250.

²⁷ Tapsell, *Personal Rule*, passim.

ballads is *The Lamentation* (1679) which argued that “Tis neither Love nor Loyalty, / That make Phanaticks talk so high / ’Gainst Popish Plots and Treachery.’ Instead, argued the author, ‘they’l rejoice at *Charles’s* Fall, / And hope, once more, to have at all; / If Common-Wealth they could Recal.’²⁸ In another example from 1680, *The Wiltshire Ballad* took part in a vehement, and occasionally pornographic, tirade, which made similar use of the association between the Whigs and the revolutionaries. Speaking from the perspective of someone who was enlightened about the true identities of his or her political opponents, the author claimed that ‘We know it: / They serv’d his Father so before, / These Saints would still increase the store/ Of Royal Martyrs, Hum! no more.’²⁹ Another year later, the balladeer James Dean was even more direct in his admonition of the Whigs by illustrating how

Now at last the Riddle is Expounded,
Which so long the Nation has confounded,
For the Round-head; Begins the Game agen,
Which so well, they play’d in Forty Four
And in greater hope:
That the Damn’d Sham-Plot [i.e. the Popish Plot], will ne’re be o’er
Till piously they routed King and Pope.³⁰

In chapter 1, it was argued that the role played by ballads in the mediation of critical interpretations of the revolution, on top of speech, printed material, sermons and the law itself, offers a flavour of the sheer ubiquity of anti-fanatical opinions. These Tory ballads suggest how far these opinions re-emerged in the wake of the Whigs’ surge in popularity from 1678 onwards.

It is important to re-emphasise that the re-emergence of anti-fanaticism corresponded with the renewed concerns of royalists within the regime. Few individuals were as influential within the ‘Tory reaction’ as Sir Roger

²⁸ *The Lamentation* (London, 1679). McShane, *PBB*, no. 534.

²⁹ *The Wiltshire Ballad: Or, A New Song Compos’d by an Old Cavalier* (London, 1680). McShane, *PBB*, no. 549.

³⁰ [James Dean], *Treason Unmasqued, Or Truth brought to Light. To a Pleasant New Tune, &c.* (London, 1681). McShane, *PBB*, no. 602.

L'Estrange, a man who, as one biographer has argued, was front and centre in the regime's endeavours to '[stir] memories of the levelling lessons of mid-century revolution as a portent of a "democratical" future.'³¹ In viewing anti-fanaticism as a royalist-Tory enterprise, of course, it is possible to represent the extent to which a censorious version of the past was not the default position of the population of the Three Kingdoms, but the result of a *struggle* over 'the authority to remember' which had commenced immediately after the Restoration. That the Tories were overthrowing a policy of 'oblivion' once more is evident in the writings of the Whigs, or at least those of whom the Whigs were deemed representative. In 1681, for instance, it was argued that the corporations' loyal addresses to the king in that year, many of which made unfavourable comparisons between the Whigs and the parliamentarians of the early 1640s,³² 'reviv[ed] the memory of the late unhappy troubles, which it is the interest both of His Majesty and the whole kingdom to have buried in perpetual oblivion', and served 'to make men remember three hasty Dissolutions of Parliaments, and Twelve years want of one'.³³ These views were echoed by others, including the erstwhile parliamentarian Arthur Annesley, Earl of Anglesey, whose 1681 edition of the *Memorials* of Sir Bustrode Whitelocke included a preface which spoke of his opposition to the Tories' 'habit of publicly invoking party labels from a past civil war'.³⁴ Elsewhere, John Phillips, the nephew of one of the famous revolutionaries, John Milton (a man with whom he had lived during the 1640s)³⁵ urged Tories to 'let *Six Hundred Forty One* sleep in the Bed of *Oblivion*, lest you wake *Five Hundred Eighty Seven* [a reference to the Siege of Jerusalem in 587 BC] about your Ears: Who, should he be once *conjur'd* up, will hardly be *laid* a gain'. Phillips went on to compare Tory priests to 'certain People in the World, called *Pharisees*, Persons that always extoll'd their *Own* Holiness and Vertues, and laid Crimes and Miscarriages to the

³¹ Geoff Kemp, 'L'Estrange and the Publishing Sphere', Jason McElligott (ed.), *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s* (Aldershot, 2006), p. 69.

³² See, for example, 'Address of the city of Exeter to the King', *CSPD 1680-1681*, pp. 659-660.

³³ *An Impartial Account of the Nature and Tendency of the Late Addresses* (London, 1681), pp. 25-26.

³⁴ Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, p. 118.

³⁵ Gordon Campbell, 'Phillips, John (1631-1706?)', *ODNB*, xliv, p. 117.

Charge of Other Men; perhaps, not so guilty as Themselves.’³⁶ Elsewhere, in 1682, an anonymous pamphlet argued that

there are a sort of Men that labour much to turn the *Act of Oblivion* into an *Act of Remembrance*; there’s no Act that ever the King Pass’d more grievous to them than that; and the reason is not, because the King has Pardoned His Enemies, but because they cannot by his power wreck their malice upon their hated Neighbours.³⁷

Richard Baxter joined in these attacks on the Tories, arguing that the ‘Prelacy and Clergy’ continued to ‘rub over all the healed wounds, and strive again what ever it cost us to ulcerate the peoples minds, and resolve that the Land and Church shall have no Peace, but by the destruction of such as restored the King [i.e. the Presbyterians].’³⁸

It is important to point out, of course, that most of these references to the Tories’ re-overthrowing of oblivion were couched as warnings of what might happen if rebellion was put in the minds of the population. While many of these individuals might have been concerned about renewed civil war, however, it is crucial to appreciate that, in order to be publishable, each of these authors *had* to demonstrate that their intentions were loyal. Considering that some of these revolutionaries (particularly Baxter) were not willing to repent of participation in the revolution, it is possible to interpret some of these arguments as an attempt once more to prevent Tories from ‘[rubbing] over all the healed wounds’. Put differently, the ‘exclusion crisis’ was witness to a renewed struggle between those who desired the authority to seal the public sphere from attacks on the revolution and those who regarded it of utmost importance to be able to publicise the dangers of

³⁶ [John Phillips], *Speculum Crape-Gownorum, The Second Part. Or a Continuation of Observations and Reflections Upon the Late Sermons Of some that would be thought Goliah’s For the Church of England* (London, 1682), p. 23. See also [John Phillips], *New News from Tory-Land and Tantivy-Shire* (London, 1682), p. 3.

³⁷ J. W., *Some Remarks Upon a Speech Made to the Grand Jury For the County of Middlesex, Concerning the Execution of Penalties upon the Churches of Christ, Which worship God in Meeting-Houses, For their doing* (London, 1682), p. 4.

³⁸ Richard Baxter, *The True History of Councils Enlarged and Defended* (London, 1682), p. 44.

fanaticism. Since royalists such as Sir Roger L'Estrange possessed the means of transmitting the past, of course, this latter view prevailed.

The arguments above could also be taken as evidence of the fact that revolutionaries remained conscious not only that royalists retained the authority to remember, but also that this informed other experiences of political and religious authority; what was referred to as the 'power wreck their malice upon their hated Neighbours.' By emphasising that the Tories held onto the authority to remember, as well as the other forms of authority which derived from it, it becomes possible to argue once more that seditious memories, of which there was a parallel revival from 1678 onwards, speak of strategies with which experiences of these forms of authority was negotiated, resisted and even subverted. It is to *seditious* memories which existed beyond the Tories' efforts to control how the past was remembered that this chapter must now turn.

II

The parallel resurgence of a counter-memory of the revolution during the 'exclusion crisis' is observable in dozens of cases of seditious words from across England during this period. While historians of the crisis years have utilised this kind of evidence much less than those of the earlier period of Charles II's reign – a result, perhaps, of the prevalence of perjury and subordination in the wake of the Popish Plot revelations – a careful treatment of such evidence still suggests an upsurge in seditious remembering. As in the 1660s, much of these resurgent memories were exclusively retrospective in their orientation. In other words, revolutionaries *justified*, and *identified with* participation in the revolution, or reflected upon it *nostalgically*. In the spring of 1681, therefore, Thomas Hall, a miller from Godalming, Surrey got into trouble for saying that 'his late [Majesty] of blessed memory had whatever deserved for runing from his parliam[en]t.'³⁹ Elsewhere, in April of the same year, the parliamentarian veteran Ralph Bamford was accused of justifying

³⁹ Newdigate, *Newsletters*, no. 1257. See also 'Papers relating to the King v. Thomas Hall of Godalming, accused of saying that Charles I deserved to be executed, including draft and copy of indictment and summary of defence to be offered', SHC, LM/1058/1-3.

the Regicide with the words that the 'late King had a Legall tryall for his life And if hee had not deserved death hee had not had itt and that itt was nothing but what hee deserved.'⁴⁰ Following information provided by two women in whose company he had been in Lichfield (Staffordshire), Bamford was found guilty and fined 200 marks later that year.⁴¹ Elsewhere, and almost two years later, the Kentish man William Fagg was indicted for expressing likewise that 'Old King Charles dyed according to law'.⁴² Others spoke more forcefully of why Charles I deserved to be ousted. In November 1684, for example, an old participant in the revolution spoke of Charles I as 'the worst of Kings and the worst of Tyrantts'.⁴³

Earlier, it was discovered that the revolutionaries who justified participation in the revolution during the 1660s were moderates as well as radicals. This appears to have been the case during the 'exclusion crisis' as well. One case of seditious words, for instance, suggests that Presbyterians remained sensitive to the use of the Regicide as a means of castigating them. Instead, the events of the late 1640s were portrayed as a 'betrayal' of the 'true' revolution. Thus, Thomas Ludlam, a yeoman of St Giles's-in-the-Fields (Westminster) was heard to argue that 'the Church of England and Papists were the persons that cutt of the late King's head, and that the presbyterians had noe hand in itt, and that the presbyterians were the King's only Friends, and that he was crowned a Presbyterian.'⁴⁴ For Ludlam, then, there was an enduring sense that the revolution had not been republican in intent, and that this was manifest in the Presbyterians' support for the Restoration in 1660, views with which Richard Baxter concurred during the 'exclusion crisis'. In December 1679, for instance, he was moved to inform Richard Allestree, a royalist, that he 'was one of those that were glad that Parliament, [in] 1640, attempted a reformation'. That Baxter was unwilling to

⁴⁰ TNA, ASSI 5/5.

⁴¹ William A. Shaw (ed.), *Calendar of Treasury Books: Preserved in the Public Record Office* (32 vols., London, 1904-1957), vii, pp. 307, 332.

⁴² J. S. Cockburn (ed.), *Calendar of Assize Records: Kent Indictments, Charles II, 1676-1688* (London, 1997), p. 153.

⁴³ TNA, SP 29/438/79.

⁴⁴ MCR, iv, pp. 187-88.

repent entirely for doing so, however, is represented in the following equivocation that he had 'perhaps' expressed these views 'too openly'.⁴⁵

In legitimating participation in the revolution, men and women validated religio-political identities of which the meaning of the 1640s and 1650s was crucial. Additional evidence suggests that one consequence of this process was identification with the revolution, and the enduring perception of oneself as a revolutionary. In July 1683, for example, the regime was sent a list of reasons for the apprehension of Samuel Gibson, the first of which was that 'Hee was all along in the first warres in Oliver's Army and tho[ugh] since admitted into [th]e Guards yet often vindicated [th]e old Cause and boasted of his Successe against the Then Cavaliers.'⁴⁶ This enduring identification with the Good Old Cause stretched beyond the borders of England and Wales. In 1684, for instance, John Dixwell, the regicide who hid in Connecticut after the Restoration, stated that that for which he suffered was 'the good old cause'.⁴⁷ In contrast to Dixwell, however, the aforementioned Samuel Gibson's identification with the Good Old Cause does not appear to have conflicted with his service of the Stuarts after 1660, suggesting, perhaps that he intended no particular malice to the monarchy or the established church. Indeed, that *moderate* revolutionaries continued to conceive of themselves as such during the 'exclusion crisis' is reflected, perhaps, in the accusation against Thomas Tutty, an Oliverian lieutenant, that he 'declares hee will never renounce the [Covenant]'.⁴⁸ Indeed, failure to abjure the Solemn League and Covenant appears to have continued well into Charles's reign. In Berwick, for instance, several of the town's corporation had still not abjured the Covenant in 1679.⁴⁹ Closely related to enduring fidelity to the Covenant were attacks on those who had been less faithful to it. In particular, some revolutionaries remained angry that the king had reneged on the Covenant, which he had taken in 1650 (the year before he was crowned at Scone) in return for Scottish Presbyterian support against

⁴⁵ Baxter, *Letters*, p. 211.

⁴⁶ TNA, SP 29/429/162.

⁴⁷ Peacey, "The good old cause", p. 180.

⁴⁸ TNA, SP 29/429/27.

⁴⁹ TNA, SP 29/411/62.

the Commonwealth. Thus, one Thomas Stubbs was accused, although later cleared, of saying in September 1683 that ‘the king had broken his Coronation Oath’.⁵⁰ That this language was prosecutable, of course, implies that it was not unheard of into the 1680s.

Further evidence illustrates the enduringness of support for the Cromwell family. In October 1681, it was alleged that John Jones, an inhabitant of Canterbury had declared in public that ‘Henry Cromwell ... had a better title to the Crowne of England, then the Duke of Yorke’.⁵¹ Intriguingly, the man to whom Jones referred, the second son of Oliver Cromwell, had died seven years earlier. That Jones’s believed that a dead man was more worthy of the succession than James, Duke of York, of course, was almost certainly rhetorical. Significantly, the evidence provided against Jones related that the Mayor of Canterbury, James Wraight,⁵² kept this information and did ‘nothing in it’; the implication being that he was attempting to protect his ‘party’ in the city.⁵³ If this allegation was truthful, and speaks of a wider pattern of failure to prosecute seditious words across England and Wales, it might be possible once more to infer that the seditious memories of which there is documented evidence form the tip of an iceberg.

Remarkably enough, a sense of *nostalgia* for the revolution appears to have endured into the 1680s, as well. In July 1681, for instance, Nicholas Cullen was hauled before the Maidstone assizes for saying publicly ‘that the Presbyterian Government was the best government that ever was used in England’, words which were reported elsewhere as ‘the Presbyterian government was [th]e best Government in [th]e world.’⁵⁴ While evidence suggests that, despite being ejected from the corporation of Dover in 1662 under the terms of the Corporation Act, Cullen had been a loyal servant of

⁵⁰ TNA, SP 29/434/61 I. Stubbs strenuously denied these charges, and, in January 1687, after years of legal wrangling, he was cleared through the entry of a *nolle prosequi*, see *CSPD Jan. 1686-May 1687*, pp. 341-342.

⁵¹ TNA, SP 29/417/30.

⁵² William Urry and Cyprian Rondeau Bunce, *The Chief Citizens of Canterbury: A List of Portreeves (Prefects, Prepositi) from A.D. 780 until c. 1100 of Prepositi (Bailiffs) from the 12th Century until 1448 and of Mayors from 1448 until 1978* ([Canterbury, 1978]), p. 56.

⁵³ TNA, SP 29/417/30.

⁵⁴ Cockburn, *Assize Records: Kent, 1676-1688*, p. 142; TNA, SP 29/416/173, 173 I.

the crown, his words appear to have been spoken around the time he was accused of refusing to prosecute the town's dissenting population; behaviour which suggests his own religious convictions.⁵⁵ If Cullen was a 'Presbyterian', then his words could reflect a deeply held sense of nostalgia for the revolution which was brought into focus as a result of an intensification of religious persecution. Indeed, it is plausible that, for Cullen, the capacity to reflect upon the revolution permitted some kind of escape from the pernicious experiences of the present, as it seems to have done for nonconformists during the 1660s. This kind of nostalgia is observable in a more coded fashion in John Bunyan's famous *Holy War* (1682). Bunyan had fought for parliament in the 1640s and the opening pages of *The Holy War* appear to offer a thinly veiled allegory of the 1650s,⁵⁶ when England had been, in Bunyan's words, God's 'countenance, his protection, and ... his delight'.⁵⁷ Indeed, these opinions were shared by an erstwhile member of Bunyan's congregation at Bedford, Samuel Hensman, who was accused in 1683 of reminiscing on the 'good old way' (see chapter 6).⁵⁸

As the publication of Bunyan's work implies, of course, seditious memories were not always internalised. Indeed, other evidence suggests the degree to which revolutionaries continued to form 'communities of memory' within which collective identities were mediated and a crucial sense of solidarity was derived through the sharing of the meaning of the past. One intriguing case of seditious remembering suggests that the regime and its supporters were aware of these communities, and in fact took advantage of them. In August 1683, therefore, the regime was informed that Thomas Linthwaite, a member of the corporation at Stamford (Lincolnshire) had spoken of hopes that he might 'see [the] Presbiterians look up againe [and that] they who were conserved in the Death of [the] late Old King did it for the good of [the] Nation.' Confused by Linthwaite's outburst, one of those present informed the regime that Linthwaite was 'in very good repute, [and]

⁵⁵ TNA, SP 29/416/173 I.

⁵⁶ Hill, *Turbulent*, p. 118.

⁵⁷ Roger Sharrock and James F. Forrest (eds.), *John Bunyan, The Holy War made by Shaddai upon Diabolus* (Oxford, 1980), p. 9.

⁵⁸ TNA, SP 29/431/76.

hath always showne himselfe loyall to [the] King.’ In order to clear Linthwaite of any wrongdoing, therefore, the corporation concluded that his words were spoken in order ‘to pump one he suspected in [the] Company who he thought to be a Presbyterian.’⁵⁹ If this is true, then it seems that Linthwaite was aware of how memories of the revolution continued to be *shared* by some of its participants.

Another case, which appears to confirm the endurance of communities of seditious remembering, is a rather more famous one. In 1684, Samuel Barnardiston, a Whig MP, was accused of writing of his support for ‘[th]e Old Cause in w[hi]ch hee had been engaged from his youth & in w[hi]ch God had soe long & soe wonderfully showed himselfe.’⁶⁰ It is thought that Barnardiston was among the apprentices who rioted in London in 1640, so this statement reflects how ‘the Old Cause’ was deemed representative of much more than the establishment of the Commonwealth, to which it is often attached by historians. Intriguingly, these words were not original; instead Barnardiston had copied them from the dying words of Colonel Algernon Sidney, an old republican who was executed for high treason in 1683 following the revelation of the Rye House Plot. On the scaffold, Sidney had made the emotional claim that

I may Dye glorifying Thee [i.e. God] for all thy Mercies; and that at the last Thou hast permitted me to be Singled out as a Witness of thy Truth; and even by the Confession of my Opposers, for that *OLD CAUSE* in which I was from my Youth engaged, and for which Thou hast Often and Wonderfully declared thy Self.⁶¹

For Barnardiston, who could have read the transcript of Sidney’s dying speech or actually attended his execution, echoing the colonel’s words must have offered him a sense of solidarity from having possessed the *same* ‘Old

⁵⁹ TNA, SP 29/430/38.

⁶⁰ Newdigate, *Newsletters*, no. 1465.

⁶¹ See [Algernon Sidney], *The Very Copy of a Paper Delivered to the Sheriffs Upon the Scaffold on Tower-Hill, on Friday Decemb. 7, 1683 by Algernon Sidney, Esq.; Before his Execution there* (London, 1683), p. 3.

Cause'. Indeed, this case suggests that revolutionaries continued to see *each other* as such during the 'exclusion crisis'. Moreover, it is significant that, while Barnardiston and Sidney had supported different 'revolutions', the former identified with the latter in relation to the events of the 1640s and 1650s, suggesting perhaps that memories continued to be 'conventionalised' in order to mediate the construction of communities of memory.

The endurance of a 'revolutionary' identity into the third decade of Charles's reign could exhibit itself in more pernicious ways, however. The continued conception of those who participated in the revolution as 'revolutionaries' involved conceiving of *others* as an enduring enemy: namely, the 'cavaliers'. In March 1683, for example, Emanuel Ford, and Philadelphia and John Bickerton, residents of Hoddesdon (Hertfordshire), attacked an elderly man called Robert Humberstone from neighbouring Broxbourne with 'brickbats, stones, and bones' while saying that 'you are an old cavilere, beggarly rougue, and that none but rouges served the king – meaning King Charles the First.'⁶² This was presumably the same Robert Humberstone who had been accused of a raft of anti-revolutionary speeches during the 1640s.⁶³ What is remarkable about this brutal incident is the fact that, in East Hertfordshire at least, the dividing lines between roundhead and cavalier endured into the final years of Charles II's reign. Indeed, the case of Robert Humberstone illustrates not only that revolutionaries conceived of others as cavaliers, but also that there remained a sense of *conflicting* views about the meaning of the past within the public sphere. It would not have made sense to call Humberstone 'an old cavilere, beggarly rougue', in other words, if Ford and the Bickertons had not identified an enduring difference between them about what the revolution meant.

Elsewhere, the public debate about the revolution which led to the conflict between Robert Humberstone and some of his neighbours is visible. This was particularly the case on 30 January, a day which was highly

⁶² W. J. Hardy (ed.), *Hertford County Records, Notes and Extracts from the Sessions Rolls, 1581-1698* (4 vols., Hertford, 1905), i, pp. 326-327, 330.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

charged and which often involved revolutionaries being castigated for participation in the revolution. On 30 January 1682, for example, a government informant visited the school of one William Roberts at Southwark (Surrey) who was asked '[what] made him keep schoole that day'; the anniversary of the execution of Charles I. To this, Roberts answered that 'he would work [that] day rather than any other, and that ... [he] was a knave for saying King Charles was murdered being he had his tryall by due course of law And that the beheading of his late [majesty] was the best deed that ever the Parliament did.'⁶⁴ A further case from the same day suggests that, during the 'exclusion crisis', opposition to the solemn commemoration of the Regicide was renewed in some quarters. At the other end of the country, the recently-instituted minister of Preston (Lancashire) Thomas Birch, was accused of failing to observe either 30 January or, in fact, 29 May. In relation to the first charge, Birch told his curate, who we might imagine to have admonished him for his failure to observe the anniversary, that 'noe preaching should be on [th]e Kings martyrdome' as 'hee was not Convinced nor Satisfied [tha]t [th]e late King was murdered but died by providence.'⁶⁵

While Roberts and Birch used their views about the revolution in order to justify non-attendance at church on 30 January, the views of others came into direct conflict with those of parish priests, who used the anniversary to expound censorious interpretations of the revolution (see chapter 1). On the thirty-first anniversary of the Regicide in 1680, one John Sherstone, a member of Bath's corporation, interrupted an anniversary sermon given at Bath Abbey by one Mr Williams. From evidence which was offered against him, it appears that Sherstone responded angrily to the minister's glorification of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, who was executed by parliament in 1641, and his contemporary, Archbishop William Laud, who faced a similar fate in 1645, saying that 'I wonder Mr. Williams ... should speak in their commendation, when they were two of the greatest rogues in the kingdom.'⁶⁶ Significantly, these sentiments suggest that criticisms of the

⁶⁴ TNA, SP 29/421/162.

⁶⁵ TNA, SP 29/429/233.

⁶⁶ *CSPD Jan.-Jun. 1683*, pp. 60-61.

revolution that went *beyond* the events of January 1649 continued to be contested in public during the 'exclusion crisis'. Indeed, the case of John Sherstone pre-empts an increase in *published* material which, as Matthew Neufeld has pointed out, justified (albeit negatively) parliament's opposition to Charles I in the early 1640s.⁶⁷ Indeed, these kinds of moderate readings of the revolution appear to have become considerably more common after 1679. In 1682, for instance, Samuel Amy, born in 1633 and sometime Clerk of the bonds in the Wine Licence Office,⁶⁸ published an attack on those, like Sir Roger L'Estrange, who had 'labor'd to revive the Memory of forty, in contemptof [sic] the *Act of Oblivion*, and terrifi'd the people with groundlesse Apprehensions of a new Fanatick War[.]' Amy, in this standalone publication, continued his assault on the political Goliath of L'Estrange by illustrating

How constantly has he patch'd up his loose Discourses with unseasonable thread-bare Comments on the Disorders of the late times, and colour'd his malicious enmity to the Liberties of *England* with violent Invectives against *Fanaticks*? Their Defamation has been the chief aime of all his Writings since the Plot, the Burden of his overflowing Impertinence, and the Common-place Topick of his Railing.⁶⁹

Crucial here is Amy's suggestion that L'Estrange's reading of history was 'thread-bare', as if to suggest that there was more to the revolution than 'his malicious enmity' would otherwise allow. Moreover, Amy suggests his resentment at the degree to which the embers of the past were, once more, being raked over in order to castigate revolutionaries. All of these cases demonstrate that it remained important for revolutionaries to establish the 'true' meaning of the revolution within the public sphere, and that it did not always remain *hidden*. That it sometimes did, of course, could imply once

⁶⁷ Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, pp. 98-120.

⁶⁸ Joseph Foster (ed.), *London Marriage Licences, 1521-1869* (London, 1887), p. 25; Shaw, *Calendar of Treasury Books*, iii, pp. 862, 1199.

⁶⁹ S[amuel] Amy, *A Præfatory Discourse To A Late Pamphlet Entituled, A Memento for English Protestants, &c.* (London, 1682), pp. 17-18.

more that there were many more men and women who shared these views than meets the eye.

One final case from the 'exclusion crisis' demonstrates how views about the past were not always fixed. Brome Whorwood was an MP who, despite his support for the exclusion of James, Duke of York, had been a fastidious adherent to the Stuart cause during the revolution.⁷⁰ Nonetheless, on 30 January 1683, Whorwood was reproached for his team's refusal to abstain from labour on the anniversary of the Regicide by one James Eustace. Whorwood's original response to Eustace appears to have been well-mannered, telling him that he might have observed the anniversary had he known what day it was. Later, however, and seemingly exasperated by Eustace's haranguing over the subject, Whorwood enquired of Eustace how he 'should be such a fool for [he] was once endeavouring a [motion] in the house [i.e. the Commons] against [tha]t day.' Eustace responded that 'he was sorry to hear him say soe for [tha]t itt was a day for ever to be marked with a black letter.' In response to this, Whorwood protested that 'the old King deserved what he had'.⁷¹ Elsewhere, it has been claimed that Whorwood described Charles I's execution to Eustace as a 'farterdome' rather than a martyrdom.⁷² While the emergence of these words from a royalist might seem surprising, Whorwood's views about the revolution had rather unsurprisingly changed as a consequence of his discovery that his wife, Jane, had been having an affair with Charles I during the 1640s; an affair which resulted in lengthy divorce proceedings.⁷³ Whatever Whorwood's political opinions during the 1640s, therefore, his views about the Regicide related to his now firm belief that the late king had received his just deserts. What this case could imply, of course, is that the use of an individual's memories of the revolution in order to infer whether he or she had been a *radical* is not always straightforward.

⁷⁰ Leonard Naylor and Geoffrey Jaggard, 'Whorwood, Brome (1615-84), of Holton, Oxon. and Sandwell Hall, West Bromwich, Staffs.', Henning, *History of Parliament*, iii, p. 714.

⁷¹ TNA, SP 29/431/89.

⁷² Greaves, *Secrets*, p. 257.

⁷³ Sarah Poynting, 'Deciphering the King: Charles I's Letters to Jane Whorwood', *The Seventeenth Century*, 21:1 (2006), pp. 128–40.

This evidence demonstrates that, well into the 1680s, revolutionaries continued to have faith in the legitimacy of the English Revolution; convictions which were dwelt on individually, reinforced socially and concretised within the public sphere. The importance of these seditious memories must be understood in the context of the revival of royalist attacks on the revolution to which the previous section referred. In other words, revolutionaries were neither passive nor acquiescent in Tories' attempts to take control of the past and use it as a stick with which to beat nonconformists. Remembering helped to validate identities, and these identities appear to have manifested themselves in an enduring sense of who had participated in the revolution and who had fought against it. Indeed, in at least one case, these divisions resulted in physical violence.

III

The evidence so far has evoked how far revolutionaries continued to legitimate participation in the English Revolution, and that this was a process which occurred on an individual, as well as a collective, level, and in both private and public contexts. What made all of these views about the past scandalous, seditious or treasonable, of course, was the regime's belief that an enduring identification with the revolution entailed the intention to pursue a revolutionary *future*. It was a cause of deep anxiety for the authorities, then, that some revolutionaries *did* evoke the past in order to conceive of an alternative reality in which the monarchy and the established church would be reformed or overthrown. The 'exclusion crisis', in other words, witnessed a resurgence of the *restorative* memories to which the last three chapters have referred.

Much of this prospective remembering originated from a strongly *nostalgic* view of the revolution. In 1681, for example, William Beever, a Yorkshireman, was accused of saying that 'as long as this king reigns we must never have good government and there hangs a great judgment over the nation's head for his wickedness. There was good times when Oliver

raigned and I wish there was as good now.⁷⁴ Elsewhere, one Mr Cauldron, who was employed as steward to the Earl of Clare, was tried for 'High Misdemeanor' for having said around the time of London's hotly contested shrieval elections on Midsummer's Day 1682 that 'in Olivers [time] there was noe such stirr but every man Could sleep quietly under his owne vine & that he hoped ere long to see such times againe.'⁷⁵ This kind of restorative nostalgia continued until the final year of Charles II's reign when Thomas Burt of Kingston-upon-Thames (Surrey) was convicted for saying 'the Goverment of Oliver Cromwell was better then the Kings'.⁷⁶ While these words tended to be fairly general, there was a prevailing sense in each case that, in comparison to that of Charles II, the government of Oliver Cromwell was both virtuous, and it had ushered in an era of peace.

Elsewhere, images of the past were transmuted into a more direct evocation of the future. In May 1679, for instance, Anthony Croft was indicted at the assizes at York for saying 'the Parliament will downe with the Lords and Bisshopps, and will doe with this King as they did with the last; and then wee shall be men.'⁷⁷ Elsewhere, in October 1683, Mathew Webb, a labourer from the London parish of St Giles's-without-Cripplegate, was accused of uttering that, if the king should remove the City's charter, 'then it will not bee long before the King looseth his head, And hee will dye as his Father did'. Found guilty, Webb was condemned 'to be flogged' on the back of a cart as it travelled around the streets of London.⁷⁸ Some of these prospective uses of the past were considerably more violent, and involved statements of active intent to overthrow the regime. At some point in 1681, the Somerset man Anthony Sandford was accused of saying that 'he hoped ere long to bee a brave fellow and to ride a good Horse againe'.⁷⁹ Elsewhere, in July 1682, George Kettle, a victualler from Southwark and a Fifth Monarchist, evinced similarly that 'he had one good horse', that 'he feared no man, & if calld to it

⁷⁴ Quoted in Sharp, 'Popular political opinion', p. 17.

⁷⁵ Newdigate, *Newsletters*, no. 1530. For the shrieval contest, see Harris, *Restoration*, pp. 295-296.

⁷⁶ Newdigate, *Newsletters*, no. 1620.

⁷⁷ *DCY*, p. 238.

⁷⁸ *MCR*, p. 227.

⁷⁹ TNA, SP 29/430/95.

again (as he was before) he knew how to [rule] his sword' since 'the Non-Conformists were provided with Arms, and that he himselfe was sufficiently provided herewith besides many more old Oliverian boyes whoe knew how to Ride'.⁸⁰ Here, Kettle evinced firm support for a revival of the conflict in which he appears to have been involved forty years earlier. Moreover his words evoke the fact that an 'imagined' solidarity between 'old Oliverian boyes' continued well into the 1680s. In a similar fashion, in May 1682, one Mr Blake of Taunton (Somerset) reassured a government spy that 'we have sum of [Oliver's]ould offissers to command us still.'⁸¹

On other occasions, this kind of language appears to have been aimed at stirring up support for plotting. In January 1682, for instance, the old radical Henry Danvers, a possible contributor to the *Mirabilis Annus* tracts of the early 1660s (see chapter 1), confided in Samuel Oates, the former Leveller and Baptist preacher, that 'he doubted not but he & other sufferers should in a short tyme be restored to their possessions meaning the lands that party had lost by the Kings restora[ti]on into his Throne'.⁸² Five months later, William Dolby was informed against for having declared that 'it would never Be good times till we served the Black foole [i.e. the king] As they did his father.'⁸³ It was from these kinds of cases that the regime inferred intentions to rise up against the monarchy and the established church; inferences which are backed up with evidence that would appear to suggest that, when these seditious memories were *shared*, the intention had been to facilitate radical action. In December 1680, for instance, one John Zeale was approached in his cell in the Marshalsea prison by a Mr Haitor,⁸⁴ who suborned him to provide information that might implicate the king in the seizure of 'the Citty Treashury'. In response, Zeale protested that 'I had not an order for the printing of my Information', to which a clearly frustrated Haitor responded that 'had it not been for the Bishops the Bill had pased the

⁸⁰ TNA, SP 29/420/6.

⁸¹ TNA, SP 29/431/76.

⁸² TNA, SP 29/419/86.

⁸³ TNA, SP 29/419/87

⁸⁴ It seems possible that the man behind these words was Thomas Hayter, a 'conventicler' who was dismissed from his role as Comptroller of the Navy shortly after these words were spoken. Pepys, x, p. 171; *CSPD 1682*, p. 20.

hous of Lords against the Duke'. In fact, Haitor told Zeale that 'hee hoped to see the times againe: that there should bee noe such persons as Bishops; and that hee him selfe did not doubt butt to have as Good an Employ as ever hee had: by the Earl of Shaftesburys means'.⁸⁵ For Haitor, then, his experiences of the demise of episcopacy in the 1640s appear to have informed his desire to see the bishops deposed.

In another case from October 1681, Sir James Hayes provided information against the Earl of Shaftesbury's secretary, Samuel Wilson. According to Hayes, a conversation about the recent execution of the Whig pamphleteer Stephen Colledge (see chapter 6) led Wilson to say that 'their [sic] was once 48 judges hanged in [one] yeare; it may Justly fall a second time.' What Wilson appears to have been getting at here was that while the hanging of '48 judges', or the judges of 1648 (i.e. the regicides), had been unjust, to mete out similar treatment against those who judged Stephen Colledge would be much more legitimate. In additional evidence, Hayes recalled how Wilson went on to reassure him with the words 'dont be melancoly for our designe is in a greate readynes and will be putt in execution very suddainly in a month or 2, and then wee shall have mony enoughe.' In the ensuing discussion about a plot against the government, Hayes asked Wilson, 'have they not Resolved what to doe with the King if he will not Comply to all their demands[?]', to which Wilson replied, 'dont you know the Replye witty Oliver made, give him a shoulder of mutton and a whore, and thats all he Cares for, they think he will not deserve soe much now, and thats all I know they will doe with him.'⁸⁶ What is remarkable about this conversation is the consistency of Wilson's references to the past, an explanation for which could be his assumption that Hayes, who was a common councilman in London during the early 1650s, would have been receptive to the evocation of a shared past in order to imagine its recurrence.⁸⁷ Indeed, the degree to which the collective image of a radical past might encourage action is suggested in the seditious sermon of Thomas

⁸⁵ TNA, SP 29/417/183.

⁸⁶ TNA, SP 29/417/29.

⁸⁷ Gary S. De Krey, *London and the Restoration, 1659-1683* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 314.

Rosewell, minister at Rotherhithe (Surrey). In September 1684, Rosewell became notorious for preaching

*That the People made a flocking to the King, upon pretence of healing the King's Evil, which he could not do; but we are they to whom they ought to flock, because we are Priests and Prophets, who can heal their Grievs. We have now had two wicked Kings together, who have permitted Popery to enter under their Noses, whom we can resemble to no other Person, but to the most wicked Jeroboam: And if you will stand to your Principles, I do no fear but we shall be able to overcome our Enemies, as in former Times, with Rams Horns, broken Platters, and a Stone in a Sling.*⁸⁸

Filtered through the biblical story of Gideon's rebellion against the ungodly Midianites, Rosewell appears to have relied upon his congregation's nostalgic views of 'former times' in order to provoke them into action.

While these cases speak of plots against the government which were foiled, other cases appear to represent shared views which actually informed active resistance to the regime. Indeed, perhaps the most intriguing uses of the past in order to imagine radical futures from the reign of Charles I occurred in a part of the country which would become notorious in its involvement in the Monmouth Rebellion of 1685. Over Christmas 1681, Thomas Parsons of Membury (Devon) was heard to say at the nearby villages of Upottery and Offwell that 'as wee did fight ag[ain]st Charles the [1]st & his B[isho]ps for; & in a more Cruell man[ne]r ag[ain]st this & these B[isho]ps & whoever takes [th]e Oath of Allegiance & supremacy is A Roge Knave & Fool'.⁸⁹ During this same period, John Trowde, a resident of Upottery, had told a local Church of England minister that 'he did hope to draw a sword ag[ain]st them & theyre masters as [he] had done ag[ain]st [th]eyre fore fathers' and that 'he did hope to draw & fight as willingly for the

⁸⁸ S. Rosewell, *The arraignment and tryal of the late Rev. Mr Thomas Rosewell, for high-treason ... to which is prefixed an account of his life and death* (s. l., 1718), p. 13.

⁸⁹ TNA, SP 29/420/36.

parliam[en]t that voted for [th]e bill of [Exclusion] as ever he did for the old parliam[en]t'.⁹⁰ It is conceivable, of course, that the words of these men – evidence for which was provided by the same government informant – were conflated. Nonetheless, since these men belonged to neighbouring parishes and possibly frequented the same local Baptist fraternity, it is equally conceivable that these men had shared their experiences of the revolution and employed them as a way of conceiving of a radical future.⁹¹ Indeed, both of these men joined the Duke of Monmouth in his rebellion in 1685, which might suggest that others who did so found strength from experiences of violent resistance during the 1640s.⁹²

The evocation of the past in order to facilitate political action, however, was not always radical. In September 1682, for example, one Mr White (probably Arthur or Mark White)⁹³, an alderman of the corporation of Gravesend (Kent) and 'an old oliverian', reminisced about the revolution while in the company a government agent, James Harris (the same individual who informed the regime of the abovementioned words of Thomas Parsons and John Trowde).⁹⁴ Speaking at the London house of John Rouse, a Scottish Whig, White lamented that 'he never thought in [16]42 ... that ever popery should ride Admirall as itt present does'; words which implied a degree of nostalgia for the armed resistance to the 'popish' government of Charles I.⁹⁵ Significantly, Harris did not dispute the words, suggesting instead that he complain to '[th]e King & Counsell' or '[th]e [parliament]'. Here, then, White's invocation of a common understanding of the meaning of the civil wars as an anti-Catholic movement appears to have facilitated (or provoked the advice to take) rather mundane action.

⁹⁰ Ibid. See also, TNA SP 29/421/30.

⁹¹ This could be the 'Troud, John jun.' listed on the Devon Protestation Returns, see A. J. Howard (ed.), *The Devon Protestation Returns 1641* (s. l., 1973), p. 39.

⁹² Wigfield, *The Monmouth Rebels*, pp. 127, 173.

⁹³ See Robert Peirce Cruden, *The History of the Town of Gravesend in the County of Kent, and of the Port of London* (London, 1843), p. 540.

⁹⁴ TNA, SP 29/420/79.

⁹⁵ For John Rouse, see Greaves, *Secrets*, p. 101.

Notwithstanding the case of Arthur White, the evidence above would appear to reinforce the arguments of some historians that a 'radical memory' existed during the 'exclusion crisis' which informed opposition to the monarchy and the established church. It would be erroneous, however, to claim that the invocation of the spectre of the revolution always entailed the desire to overthrow the regime. On the contrary, these seditious sentiments could reflect the degree to which, as late as the 1680s, identification with the revolution permitted those who had been involved to *imagine* a future in which the circumstances of the present were *altered*. During the 'exclusion crisis', when the Tory backlash resulted in an emphasis of conformity in both religion and politics, there can be no question that the capacity to envisage an alternative reality was comforting. In November 1684, for example, a London man spoke with palpable emotion of having 'seen the citty gattes puld down and the Lead melted to make bullets' during the revolution; days which he hoped to witness 'a gaine before he dye'.⁹⁶ Here, then, there does not seem to have been any suggestion that this individual would have engaged in radical activity himself, but found comfort instead in the knowledge that there were others who, in recreating the conditions of the 1640s, might do so. This kind of hopeful solidarity appears to have been conjured by ministers, as well. In July 1683, for instance, the bookseller Samuel Starkey provided information about a conventicle he had attended where the minister preached of the 'Cloud of persecution' which 'was Likely to Obscure [th]e Gospel of Christ Jesus'. According to Starkey, however, the minister prayed that 'once again they might be possessed of their Late Libertyes & then [that] the Gospell of Christ might shine forth in its anciente Splendour'.⁹⁷ Here, then, the anonymous minister intended to mediate a sense of hope among his congregation, rather than radical action.

One must not assume that the hazard of rebellion or the chimera of hope were the only options available to revolutionaries during the 'exclusion crisis'. On the contrary, in a society in which power-holders were overt about the source of their fears – the prospect of the redistribution of power in a

⁹⁶ TNA, SP 29/438/79.

⁹⁷ TNA, SP 29/427/22.

manner akin to the 1640s and 1650s – the seditious past became a method through which, albeit fleetingly, supporters of the regime could be threatened. In the summer of 1679, for example, James Appelby was confronted by William Orfeur, a neighbour and former sheriff (see chapter 4), for carrying arms in his native Cumbria. Unwilling to relinquish the weapon, James informed Orfeur that ‘he had authority to keep a gun, but the Papists had noe, neit[h]er for gun or other weapons’; a comment which was aimed at Orfeur, a suspected Roman Catholic. Having failed to disarm Appelby, another of Orfeur’s servants, Dorothy Stephenson, approached him and asked ‘by what authority he detained [the gun]’, to which Appelby responded ‘by virtue of the law and severall acts of Parliament which was in force against Papists bearing or wearing arms.’ Apparently unconvinced by his argument, Appelby was asked further ‘whether he had the King’s commission to put such laws in execucion against the Papists or no,’ to which he responded

The King! no! he had better warrant then either King or Papist. He had the fundamentall laws of the kingdom for his warrant, and hop’d in a few days now that the Commonwealth of England should be once up againe, and should gett their hearts all well eas’d of this King and the Papists, as formerly they had done of his father and them in those days.

In response to this, Stephenson replied that ‘she hoped for better things’, which prompted Appelby to respond

That it was but bare hopes, for the law hath as good right to try a King as a subject, as experience the fair tryall of the last King Charles the First. And the same law hath the same power over this Charles the Second; which if he see not before he be a yeare elder, I’ll be content to hang for him, therefore never feed yourselves fatt with vaine hopes of a boasting sound and ring, a King! a King! No. Let him be sure that his treacherous wayes and his red letter men’s (meaning the King and Papist’s) will not many years after seventy-eight be graven upon his

neck with letters of blood, as sure as his father's was in forty-eight; he need expect no other.⁹⁸

Since the evidence which was given against Appelby was provided five years after the events in question, it is possible that some, if not all, of it was fabricated. Evidence from elsewhere, however, suggests that evocations of the past did inform intimidation strategies; particularly in relation to perceived 'popery'. In March 1681, for example, less than three weeks before the meeting of the Oxford Parliament, Henry Francis, a landowner living in West Ham (Essex) found himself on a jury to hear the case of Edward Jenner, a Church of England minister who sought compensation for a vicious attack from which he feared he should 'never recover.' Infuriated by Jenner's preferential treatment by the judges, Francis proclaimed before the court that he deserved no damages as 'a Papist' and that, instead, he 'deserved to have [his] Gown pulled off.' Francis' tirade continued, accusing the judge of being 'popishly affected' and that, indeed, 'all or most of the Bishops and Clergy were papists or popishly affected, that they ruined the Nation and strove to bring in popery.' Ignoring these allegations, the judge awarded Jenner 5s. in damages, but this only served further to provoke Francis who later 'did that very day Rayl Bitterly against the present Government of Church and State,' telling the judge, a Mr Lenthall, that the regicides of 1649 'were honest, godly men and that the men of 40 or 41 were men of sound [and] honest principles.'⁹⁹ Elsewhere, one of the more interesting examples of these hostile uses of the past comes from Ilton (Somerset) in June 1683. According to the collector of the Hearth Tax there, the wife of one Gabriell Cox, the town's innkeeper, told him that 'Charles I lost his head for levying hard taxes on the people, and that the officers would never stop levying taxes until this present king's head was on the block.'¹⁰⁰ Considering the employment of the man to whom these words were spoken, it seems likely that Cox's intentions had been antagonistic. Indeed, by imagining another

⁹⁸ DCY, pp. 265-267.

⁹⁹ TNA, SP 29/416/123.

¹⁰⁰ SRO, Q/SR/155/4.

Regicide, Cox was bringing the tax collector's future into question. Moreover, this represents the extent to which *women* continued to sympathise with the revolution into the 1680s, and that political discourse during the 'exclusion crisis' was not monopolised by men.

In a final, intriguing case from three years earlier, the actions of several dozen apprentice carpenters in Bristol could be regarded as emblematic of a similar manipulation of royalist fears. On 2 February 1680, the *London Gazette*, a government newspaper, reported the alarm which had been caused three days earlier when fifty or sixty

young Fellows, (most of them Carpenters) ... marched together in a tumultuous manner through some of our principle Streets, one of them bearing on his shoulder a great wooden Ax, painted red, with a Lyon carved thereon ... and drawing a multitude after them, to the great Terror of all His Majesties Loyal Subjects here.¹⁰¹

Although the local militia intervened, and some of the participants were arrested, the event appears to have caused uproar beyond the city of Bristol. The event was recorded, for instance, by the famous diarist Narcissus Luttrell of Holborn (London) and by the scribal newsletter to which Sir Richard Newdigate of Arbury (Warwickshire) subscribed.¹⁰² What is surprising about this incident is that its occurrence on 30 January was ignored by everyone who referred to it. Indeed, Newdigate's newsletter reassured him that the riot 'did arise from an old disorderly Custome' in which 'the ffree Carpinders of the Citty ... goe through the Towne to search out all ... who use that trade [but] are not ffreemen'.¹⁰³ While Jonathan Barry has written that it was common for Bristol's guilds to act boisterously in the city on Shrove Tuesday, 'bearing their occupational emblems before them ... and clashing with rival trades', the day upon which this event occurred was

¹⁰¹ *London Gazette*, 29 Jan.-2 Feb. 1680, p. 2.

¹⁰² Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714* (6 vols., Oxford, 1857), i, p. 33; Newdigate, *Newsletters*, no. 896.

¹⁰³ Newdigate, *Newsletters*, no. 1679.

not Shrove Tuesday.¹⁰⁴ In fact, the events in question had occurred just over three weeks beforehand.¹⁰⁵ There was, then, surely some significance to the fact that this riot occurred on the anniversary of the Regicide, particularly when one reflects on the fact that one of the rioters carried an axe which was painted *red*: symbolising perhaps the bloody execution of Charles I. Indeed, the original account of the riot mentioned how the rioters were all nonconformists and therefore 'disaffected to the Government'.¹⁰⁶ Whatever the grievances of these individuals, it would appear that 30 January was chosen in order to air these grievances. The use of the bloody axe could imply an attempt to intimidate those within the city whose minds that day were focused on the rebellion which had occurred forty years earlier. Indeed, it is perhaps symbolic of the success of that intimidation that royalist observers chose to play down the significance of this act in the media.

The evidence provided here suggests that it remained important for revolutionaries to invoke the spectre of the revolution. On the one hand, this was, as historians have argued, the ideological use of the events of the revolution in order to facilitate political action, some of which intended to bring down the monarchy and the established church. Nonetheless, the past could also offer men and women a sense of hope, which was empowering in and of itself. The past could be used, however, in order to threaten those who, in serving the regime, were perceived as fearing a return to revolution. Overall, of course, all of these uses of the past relied upon a consciousness of the degree to which myriad forms of authority derived from, *but also fed into*, the promulgation of a royalist interpretation of the past. In appropriating the central message of the resurgent anti-fanaticism, therefore – that the Whigs wished to repeat the rebellion and usurpation of the 1640s and 1650s – those who had participated in the revolution were able to negotiate, resist and subvert this authority. On one level, this could involve taking on the monarchy and the established church. However, as some of the cases above would appear to suggest, it informed the micro-politics of the parish as well.

¹⁰⁴ Jonathan Barry, 'Popular Culture in Seventeenth-Century Bristol', Barry Reay (ed.), *Popular Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (London, 1985), p. 74.

¹⁰⁵ See Bédoyère (ed.), *Diary of John Evelyn*, p. 232.

¹⁰⁶ *London Gazette*, 29 Jan.-2 Feb. 1680, p. 2.

Conclusion

It has become apparent in this chapter that a seditious counter-memory of the recent past remained vital to those who participated in the revolution well into the 1680s. Since the period witnessed the return of royalist claims to an authority to remember, as well as other forms of religio-political authority which were founded upon these memories, it is possible to regard forms of seditious remembering as means of negotiating, resisting and subverting the widespread experience of this authority. On the one hand, it involved countering the royalists' interpretation of the past. On the other hand, however, it involved manipulating the royalists' anti-fanatical fears about the future. These strategies were employed both by those who had supported a radical revolution during the 1640s and 1650s, as well as by those who had balked at the Regicide and the establishment of the Commonwealth.

The wider implication of this conclusion is that the 'exclusion crisis' ought to be seen not only on a high political level, in which only the radical inheritances of key figures such as John Locke and Algernon Sidney are recognised, but also on the level of the many men and women whose memories of the revolution informed a variety of political strategies which helped them to 'make do' in a society which did not always work in their favour. Indeed, it would be possible to argue that, much as the Tories claimed during the 'exclusion crisis', the Whigs *did* hark back to the glory days of the revolution. For some, this involved remembering days in which the reformed religion had flourished. For others, of course, this involved the much graver matter of the Regicide. For only a minority, however, did it entail support for a repeat of the events of the 1640s and 1650s. In making this claim, it becomes possible to contribute to the debate about how the Whigs can be defined. While some have described the Whigs as the very origins of modern, partisan politics, others have suggested that the Whigs and Tories drew support from the same people.¹⁰⁷ In this chapter, the Whigs have been

¹⁰⁷ For the former opinion, see J. R. Jones, *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-1683* (London, 1961), passim. For the latter opinion, see Jonathan Scott, 'Radicalism and Restoration: the Shape of the Stuart Experience', *The Historical Journal*,

regarded quite differently. Since the Whigs were those against whom the Tories targeted their anti-fanatical propaganda, then some of these individuals could be defined in relation to the possession of defiant and subversive seditious memories. The Whigs, in other words, were those who, ever since the early 1660s, had contested the royalists' authority to remember. That this was as true for those who *had not* experienced the English Revolution as it was for those who had is the subject of the final chapter of this thesis.

6 – Seditious Memories and the Post-Revolutionary Generation

Sandwiched between the anxious 1660s and the acrimonious ‘exclusion crisis’, the 1670s was a much quieter decade when it came to contesting the meaning of the English Revolution. This trend was bucked spectacularly in December 1675, however, when the bustling streets of the cities of Westminster and London became clotted with men and women who crowded around two copies of a print entitled *A Dialogue between Two Horses*. In a brilliant act of street theatre, copies of the poem were attached to the equestrian statues of Charles I at Charing Cross and Charles II at St Mary Woolnoth in the City, between whom the poem’s dialogue took place. The poem comprised of a damning indictment of the rider of the latter horse, Charles II, who, together with his chief minister, Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby, was accused of ‘holding the door’ open to let in popery, and imposing ‘bondage and beggary’ on the nation.¹ In addition to these claims, however, the poem included several references to the 1640s and 1650s, of which both statues were redolent (the latter depicted Charles II riding over Oliver Cromwell).² Thus, the poem began with both the Charing Cross and Woolnoth horses agreeing that the king had shown the deepest ingratitude, by forgetting the terms of his Restoration, and by making his subjects ‘slaves by Horse and Foot Guards.’³ Continuing in this vein, when the Woolnoth statue asked ‘where is thy King gone?’ his Charing Cross counterpart responded ‘to see Bishop Laud’; the archbishop who had been executed by parliament in 1645.⁴ Later, the Charing Cross horse asked the Woolnoth equivalent ‘What has thou to say against my royal rider? [i.e. Charles I]’ to which Woolnoth replied that

¹ [John Ayloffe], ‘A Dialogue between Two Horses’ (1676), George Lord (ed.), *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714* (7 vols., New Haven, CT, 1963-75), i, p. 277.

² The statue of Charles I at Charing Cross had been erected in 1633, but had only recently been restored having been pulled down during the revolution. The statue of Charles II at St Mary Woolnoth had been constructed in 1672, and while it had originally depicted a horse trampling on a Turk, this had been changed into the body of Oliver Cromwell, see F. G. Hilton Price, *The Signs of Old Lombard Street* (London, 1902), p. 49. According to George, *Poems on the Affairs of State*, i, p. 276, the statue was erected on 29 May 1672, compared to the one at Charing Cross erected by Danby in 1675.

³ Ayloffe, ‘A Dialogue’, p. 278.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 280.

Thy priest-ridden King turn'd desperate fighter
For the surplice, lawn sleeves, the cross, and the mitre,
Till at last on the scaffold he was left in the lurch
By knaves that cri'd up themselves for the Church.

Here, then, is a classic example of the damning indictment which had been made against Charles I ever since 1649; that he was brought to the scaffold for his obstinate attachment to the Laudian church.

In evoking the memory of Charles I, of course, the poem was able to make claims about his son as well. Continuing, the Woolnoth statue argued that

Though father and son be different rods,
Between the two scourges we find little odds.
Both infamous stand in three kingdoms' votes:
This for picking our pockets, that for cutting our throats.⁵

Indeed, the Charing Cross statue was forced to admit that, in comparison, '[Oliver] Cromwell had ... a brave soul', to which Woolnoth agreed, saying

I freely declare, I am for old Noll.
Though his government did a tyrant's resemble,
He made England great and its enemies tremble.

Approaching the end of the poem, the horses declared in chorus:

A commonwealth! a commonwealth! we proclaim to the nation,
For gods have repented the King's Restoration.⁶

⁵ Ibid., p. 281.

⁶ Ibid., p. 282.

And finally, in the concluding stanza of the poem, the king was threatened with the words ‘they that conquer’d the father won’t be slaves to the son.’⁷

A Dialogue between Two Horses is thus a striking summation of the seditious memories which had been common during the 1660s, and which would return during the tumultuous 1680s. Firstly, the revolution, and indeed the Regicide, were justified in the light of Charles I’s religious policies, and Oliver Cromwell’s rule remained the object of nostalgic comparison with that of Charles II, even if he was a ‘tyrant’. Furthermore, an alternative reality, in which the monarchy would be overthrown once more, was foreseen. Overall, the poem spoke of the survival of an identity which entailed an enduring belief in the legitimacy of the English Revolution. The placement of this poem in public, moreover, is representative of the fact that seditious memories were not always internalised, but also shared among ‘communities of memory’. Indeed, additional evidence suggests that at least two people agreed with the sentiments of the poem.⁸ The poem was also, of course, an attempt to *contest* the royalists’ censorious interpretation of the revolution to which the statues at Charing Cross and St Mary Woolnoth spoke. Furthermore, the rhetoric of the poem intended to facilitate support for political action, but also to intimidate royalists with a warning of how easily the wheel might turn.

When one considers the prominence of the past in *A Dialogue between Two Horses*, it is unsurprising that its authorship was once ascribed to Andrew Marvell,⁹ a man who remained convinced that the ‘Good Old Cause’ was ‘too good to have been fought for’.¹⁰ Tim Harris has refuted this claim of authorship, however, arguing that the poem was almost certainly penned by John Ayloffe, a radical member of the Green Ribbon Club.¹¹ What is intriguing about Ayloffe is that, unlike Marvell, he was *not* a veteran of the

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

⁸ Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Reginald Rawdon Hastings, Esq., of the Manor house, Ashby de la Zouche* (4 vols., London, 1928-47), ii, p. 169; TNA, SP 29/375/170.

⁹ Lord (ed.), *Poems on Affairs of State*, i, p. 275.

¹⁰ Hill, *The Experience of Defeat*, p. 249.

¹¹ Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 92. See also Montañó, *Courting*, pp. 194-196.

English Revolution. On the contrary, it is likely that Ayloffe was born in 1645, three years into the first civil war, and that he did not matriculate at the University of Oxford until July 1662, two years after the end of the revolution.¹² Ayloffe, then, was a member of a *post-revolutionary* generation; one which had not experienced the revolution as adults. In this chapter, it will be argued that Ayloffe was not the only member of this 'new' generation to possess seditious memories such as those presented in *A Dialogue between Two Horses*. On the contrary, particularly during the 'exclusion crisis' at the end of Charles's reign, seditious memories will be regarded as common among those who were too young to have experienced the revolution.

As in previous chapters, an attempt will be made to explain the purpose of these memories. In order to do so, of course, no longer will it be possible to speak of attempts to legitimate *participation* in the revolution, since those who held these opinions were, by definition, non-combatants. Instead, two different explanations will be offered. On the one hand, it will be argued that the networks of the emergent party of Whigs, and particularly those of the 'Green Ribbon Club' (of which Ayloffe was a member), included many individuals who *had* participated in the revolution. As a consequence, these seditious memories will be regarded as part and parcel of the process of 'socialisation' which the younger generation went through in order to identify as Whigs. Thereafter, it will be demonstrated that many of the younger people who exhibited seditious memories were not only Whigs, but *the* children of revolutionaries, and that this sheds light on yet another conduit through which seditious ideas about the past flowed across generational boundaries. The result of this analysis will be to offer another explanation of why those who had participated in the revolution held onto, and expounded, seditious memories. To finish with, the chapter will consider the enigmatic figure of Stephen Colledge, a member of the post-revolutionary generation whose obsession with the revolution, to which he was bound by connections of politics and blood, has been overlooked by historians of the 'exclusion crisis'.

¹² Warren Chernaik, 'Ayloffe, John (c.1645–1685)', *ODNB*, iii, p. 31.

I

John Ayloffe identified strongly with the English revolution, and was even led to declare 'freely' that he was 'for old Noll'. He was not, however, the only person who, despite having no experience of the politics of the 1640s and 1650s, was willing to identify with its participants. In July 1683, for example, a thirty-three year old Scotsman, John Heborn, was called before the Privy Council as part of its ongoing investigation into the Rye House plot. In response to doubts about his loyalty, Heborn responded that 'he hopes none taught him his principles but the Lord' and that 'His fathers taking the Covenant obliges him [to it]'. Moreover, when asked if he had taken 'the Test' – a oath of commitment to the royal supremacy¹³ – Heborn responded that he had never taken it, since 'he cannot maintain [th]e Covenant and take the Test.'¹⁴ Heborn, then, despite being born several years after the Covenants of 1638 and 1643 were signed, considered himself 'obliged' to them owing to the actions of his father. In speaking these words, Heborn reflects the extent to which the *moderate* revolution of the 1640s continued to offer a source of identity after the Restoration (see chapter 2). Indeed, Heborn was not the only one who identified with parliament's opposition to Charles in the early 1640s. In August 1681, information was given at Windsor (Berkshire) against Colonel Edward Dering, for saying that 'he dranke confusion to Lawne sleeves' and that 'he was of his Gran[d] fathers opinion, neither for Lord Bishops nor Duke Bishops.'¹⁵ The grandfather to which Dering referred here was almost certainly Sir Edward Dering, an MP who had spoken out against Archbishop Laud in the Long Parliament, but later fought for Charles I.¹⁶ Like Heborn, Dering junior identified strongly with the actions of his forbears in standing up to the Stuarts.

¹³ Greaves, *Secrets*, p. 80.

¹⁴ TNA, SP 29/428/60.

¹⁵ TNA, SP 29/416/92.

¹⁶ S. P. Salt, 'Dering, Sir Edward, first baronet (1598–1644)', *ODNB*, xv, pp. 875-80. For Dering's allegiances during the early 1640s see also Jason Peacey, 'Sir Edward Dering, Popularity, and the Public, 1640-1644', *The Historical Journal*, 54:4 (December 2011), pp. 955-83.

As previous chapters have demonstrated, it was not a giant leap from identification with the past to envisaging a future in which, for instance, the monarchy was overthrown. In September 1683, therefore, John Robinson, a mariner living in Shadwell (Middlesex) said, in relation to the Rye House plot, that ‘the Duke of York is a Papist and this is his Plott’. Despite being reprimanded for these ‘rash words’, Robinson gave no ground, and went on to declare that ‘I care not a fart for the King of England himselfe’ since ‘my father was a soldier to Oliver and fought against the King, and I would do the like if there were occasion.’¹⁷ Here, then, Robinson, like Heborn, identified with the actions of his father in resisting the Stuarts during the 1640s, framing thereby his desires to rise up against the regime. For others, however, identification with the actions of revolutionaries did not involve such explicit desires to rebel, but hopes or expectations nonetheless that the regime might be toppled as it had been during the 1640s. In April 1681, therefore, just over two weeks after Charles II dissolved the Oxford Parliament, the West Country man Captain Gregory Alford was overtaken on a Dorset road by a coach containing two young passengers: Thomas Grey, Earl of Stamford and Edmund Gibbons. Following an enquiry ‘for newes’ by Alford, Gibbons launched into a tirade against the king for dissolving parliament a month earlier. In fact, it was Gibbons’ belief that Charles had signed a contract with the French king for a pension worth £800,000 in exchange for the dissolution of parliament and ‘[tha]t now there was a nessesyty that There must and would be a warr w[i]th the King as there was w[i]th and a gaynst the Late King to desyd the matter’.¹⁸ Shocked by these words, Alford (a royalist veteran of the civil wars¹⁹) wrote to the King, informing him of what he had heard, including his belief that Gibbons was the son of a soldier under Oliver Cromwell; possibly Major Robert Gibbon.²⁰ That Alford mentioned Gibbons’ identity as the *son* of a revolutionary could well

¹⁷ *MCR*, iv, p. 224.

¹⁸ TNA, SP 29/415/119.

¹⁹ Alford’s account of Charles II’s escape from England after the Battle of Worcester in 1651 helped cement the Royal Oak legend in popular culture after Charles’ death in February 1685, William Matthews (ed.), *Charles II’s Escape from Worcester: A Collection of Narratives Assembled by Pepys* (Berkeley, CA, 1966), p. 124.

²⁰ See Firth and Davies, i, pp. 116, 119-20, 123, 325, 381; ii, pp. 507, 519-21, 532, 556.

imply that, unlike his father, he had been too young to fight 'a gaynst the Late King'.

Those who had not experienced the revolution, therefore, continued to identify with the Good Old Cause and to predict its return in much the same manner as those who had. Within all of these claims, of course, was an enduring belief that the actions of the older generation remained *legitimate*. For the Scotsman Heborn, the righteousness of the 'Cause' lay within the Covenant's pursuit of reformation, while Colonel Dering believed that the malignancy of the bishops and the imposition of Laudianism during the 1630s justified the actions of the Long Parliament, and indeed his grandfather, during the early 1640s. Meanwhile, John Robinson and Edmund Gibbons saw the parliamentarianism of their fathers as principled responses to the more general encroachment of 'popery' and 'arbitrary government' during Charles I's reign. That these seditious interpretations of the revolution endured beyond the generation who were involved is evident in the words of Strange Southby, a scholar at the University of Oxford. In June 1682, Southby was denied his degree for expressing his belief that the execution of Charles I in 1649 'was a glorious action, and done in the face of the nation' since 'the common fame was that the old king was a man of ill principles', and that 'he would not excuse' either Charles I or Charles II from the 'guilt' of the civil wars.²¹ Southby, then, despite having been born in the year preceding the Restoration, was willing to risk his degree for the sake of holding onto a seditious version of the past.

In order to understand why these young men held onto seditious memories of the revolution, the understanding of remembering on which previous analyses have drawn needs to be modified. It is likely that none of the individuals aforementioned participated in the events which were cited, and so the act of remembering did not involve the validation of identities which were bound up with *experiences* of the revolution. What it more likely is that these images of the past had been in some manner *transmitted* to

²¹ Anthony Wood, *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary, of Oxford, 1632-1695* (5 vols., Oxford, 1891), iii, pp. 19-20.

them. Here, it is worth considering the work of scholars of memory who have illustrated other ways in which catastrophic events, such as the Holocaust, affected the generation who did not experience them. Marianne Hirsch, for example, refers to this phenomenon as 'post-memory' or the result of '[growing] up with overwhelming inherited memories' and being 'dominated by narratives that preceded one's birth or one's consciousness'.²² For scholars of social memory, therefore, the way one remembers a past before one's birth is defined by one's 'habitus'.²³ It is possible to argue, in relation to the later seventeenth century, that the younger generation grew up with similar 'overwhelming inherited memories'. After all, previous analyses have demonstrated the degree to which, within oral culture, seditious accounts of the revolution were being shared, and almost certainly to a greater degree than it is possible to infer from the available evidence.

It would be erroneous to claim, however, that the minds of the younger generation soaked up seditious memories like mnemonic sponges. On the contrary, some cases of seditious remembering suggest that members of the 'revolutionary generation' actively sought to transmit favourable versions of the revolution to posterity. In November 1680, for example, William Serocold was recuperating at the London house of Stephen Standen. At some point during his stay, he engaged in a discussion with his host about the recent decision of the House of Lords to vote out the Bill of Exclusion (see chapter 5). Although Standen believed '[th]e Bill was out of kindnesse to his [Royal Highness]', he believed 'they would proceed in a severer way [against] Him.' Scrutinising Serocold, Standen went on to deduce that his guest 'was not old enough to remember what sorte of men they were; as for Example in [th]e late Civil Warrs of England'. In order to enlighten Serocold, Standen expressed that 'whatever they did sett upon, they never left off till they had performed it; and that they were [th]e same men still; and that they would never leave off till they had Turnd [th]e Duke of Yorke out of [th]e succession.'²⁴ In this remarkable example, Standen appears to have been

²² Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory*, p. 107.

²³ See Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts*, pp. 106-107.

²⁴ TNA, SP 29/414/159.

particularly keen to prevail upon Serocold the doggedness of those who supported the revolution and how, in the circumstances of the 'exclusion crisis', this doggedness might serve them once more.

Elsewhere, the comprehensive evidence of Edward Massey, a prisoner at the King's Bench, demonstrates how the evocation of the seditious past in order to facilitate radical collective action involved prevailing upon the younger generation the legitimacy of participation in the revolution. In September 1683, in order to secure his release from the prison, Massey chose to inform the regime of the discussions of a group of men from Bocking and Braintree (Essex) regarding how to defend themselves in the event of a Roman Catholic invasion.²⁵ In order to drum up support for these actions, explained Massey, some of those within the group who had participated in the revolution emphasised the courageousness of Charles I's opponents. For instance, in order to overcome the pusillanimity of some of the younger members, Samuel Hensman told the plotters that he should search instead for '[two] or three thousand of such ould boyes as Jo[se]ph Smitheman is [senior].'²⁶ Here, Hensman could have been referring to Joseph 'Smytheman' who was indicted shortly after the Fifth Monarchists' rising in January 1661, along with a former servant of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, concerning alleged meetings at the Black Lion in Braintree, and the possession of arms.²⁷ Considering his use of the expression 'ould boyes', which was often shorthand for those who had fought in the revolution (see chapter 5), it seems that Hensman was intending to evoke an image of their bravery in comparison to the weak wills of some of the younger members of the group. Indeed, on another occasion Joseph Clarke, a local brazier, was supposed to have declared to the group 'what brave tymes was in Olivers days.'²⁸ On the one hand, Clarke's words might be illustrative of an attempt by the revolutionary generation to promote a view of itself as courageous. Otherwise, it is possible that Clarke was himself a member of

²⁵ TNA SP 29/431/76, 108.

²⁶ TNA SP 29/431/76.

²⁷ ERO, D/DEb 95/118. The office-holder was Dudley Templer, a JP from as early as January 1652 onwards, see D. H. Allen (ed.), *Essex Quarter Sessions Order Book, 1652-1661* (Chelmsford, 1974), passim.

²⁸ TNA, SP 29/431/108.

the younger generation, and that his words reflect the success of the elders within the group in inculcating a romantic vision of the revolutionaries.

The courage of the revolutionary generation pervaded Edward Massey's evidence. In September 1681, for example, it was related that Massey had encountered one of the members of the cabal, Samuel Hensman, while he was on business in London. According to Massey, Hensman told him 'he would bring [him] to a brave ould bead' who turned out to be Major John Gladman, a veteran of the New Model Army who was then living in Bishopsgate and was known to frequent one of London's radical clubs, the Salutation Tavern.²⁹ In a fascinating account of the meeting, it appears that Gladman told Hensman of his pride that he 'did so much imitate his father as hee doth to tread in his steps as [I] heard he doth.'³⁰ While Hensman's background is unclear, we know that he had been a member of John Bunyan's congregation during the 1670s, before being transferred to Braintree as a minister.³¹ While we cannot be certain, it is possible that Hensman's father was the Robert Hensman, who, like Bunyan,³² had been garrisoned at Newport Pagnell in the first civil war.³³ Indeed, it is conceivable that Gladman, also from Bedfordshire, was also acquainted with Hensman's father during this time.³⁴ For Gladman, it appears to have been of some significance that Hensman acknowledged that his father, like Gladman, had been a participant in the revolution.

For those who had supported the English Revolution, then, it was deemed necessary to prevail upon others that resisting the monarchy and the established church were worthwhile, and perhaps even courageous actions. That these kinds of views existed within certain political circles during the 1670s and 1680s is reflected in the degree to which many of the

²⁹ TNA, SP 29/431/76; Greaves, *Secrets*, p. 99.

³⁰ TNA, SP 29/431/76.

³¹ Greaves, *John Bunyan*, p. 98; *The Church Book of Bunyan Meeting, 1650-1821* (London, 1928), p. 30. One Samuel Henceman, grocer' was indicted for attendance at a conventicle in Bedford in May 1670, BLA, HSA/1671 W/84.

³² Hill, *Turbulent*, p. 8.

³³ H. G. Tibbutt (ed.), *The Letter Books of Sir Samuel Luke, 1644-45, Parliamentary Governor of Newport Pagnell* (London, 1963), p. 200.

³⁴ With thanks to Professor Jason Peacey for this information.

people abovementioned were connected with the Green Ribbon Club; the organisational body of the radical Whigs. Strange Southby, for instance, who was thrown out of Oxford University for justifying the Regicide, was a member of the club.³⁵ So too was John Ayloffe, with whose seditious *A Dialogue between Two Horses* the chapter began.³⁶ Indeed, the very name of the club alluded to the green ribbons which had been worn by the Levellers during the 1640s.³⁷ It is possible, then, that the political identity of the Green Ribbon Club, a group which included people like Slingsby Bethel and William Howard (Baron Howard of Escrick), who had participated in the revolution, was itself a 'community of memory'. Indeed, one case of seditious remembering from the 'exclusion crisis' would appear to demonstrate a meeting of members of the Green Ribbon Club in which certain views about the past were transmitted between generations. In July 1683, Samuel Starkey, a legal clerk by trade, provided detailed evidence of seditious meetings at the office of his employer, Aaron Smith, a member of the club. In the wake of the dissolution of Parliament in June 1679, Starkey overheard Smith speaking with others in adjoining room and '[falling] into discourse concerning their then affairs in agitation'; in other words, plotting against the regime. During a 'passionate way of discourse' one of those present, Thomas Haselrig, 'said to them (& hath often suggested [th]e same to me) that [th]e Old King deserv'd his death for entertaining private conferences w[i]th Priests & Jesuits, & that this King exactly follow'd his Fathers Steps & would assuredly receive his Fate'. 'By their constant discourse,' Starkey continued, Haselrig's audience 'seem'd well pleas'd at these words.'³⁸ Haselrig, who was the son of the republican Sir Arthur Haselrig, was, like his father, involved in the revolution, taking on the role of colonel of the Leicestershire new militia in 1659.³⁹ Smith and at least one more member of the cabal, Simon Maine, however, were probably too young to have

³⁵ Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops who have had their Education in the University of Oxford* (4 vols., London, 1813-1820) i, p. lxxxviii.

³⁶ Warren Chernaik, 'Ayloffe [Ayliffe], John (c.1645-1685)', *ODNB*, iii, p. 31.

³⁷ David Allen, 'Political Clubs in Restoration London', *The Historical Journal*, 19:3 (1976), p. 569.

³⁸ TNA, SP 29/427/99.

³⁹ See Ruth E. Mayers, *1659: The Crisis of the Commonwealth* (Woodbridge, 2004), p. 103.

experienced the Regicide to which Haselrig referred. Assuming that they were indeed both 'well pleas'd' to hear Haselrig's interpretation, of course, consensus about the meaning of the past was created.⁴⁰ Indeed, it is possible that it was in the presence of imprudent revolutionaries such as Thomas Haselrig that the younger generation first heard justification of the Regicide.

While many of the cases above would suggest that the inter-generational transmission of seditious memories occurred within a radical political environment, they contain clues to another way in which this process might have occurred. If one returns to Samuel Starkey's evidence, for example, it is notable that also in Haselrig's company that day were Simon Maine, 'son to Maine that was one of his late [Majesty's] Justices' and Aaron Smith, whose friends, in the words of a biographer, 'were roundheads' sons.'⁴¹ Indeed, throughout this chapter, many of the people to whom evidence of seditious memories has referred were the children or grandchildren of revolutionaries. The alleged Essex plotter Samuel Hensman, for example, appears to have been identified by John Gladman as having a father who was involved in the revolution. Meanwhile, Strange Southby was the grandson of a man who participated in the revolution.⁴² Moreover, as Captain Gregory Alford pointed out, Edmund Gibbons was the son of a Cromwellian soldier. In fact, the two cases of *identification* with the revolution at the beginning of this section involved people – John Heborn and Edward Dering – who made explicit the fact that their father and grandfather respectively had participated in the revolution. Gary De Krey has argued in relation to the 'exclusion crisis' that, contrary to the claims of J. R. Jones,⁴³ 'family and fortune', as well as 'interest and intellect, education and experience' were massively important in the transmission of radical ideas

⁴⁰ TNA, SP 29/427/99.

⁴¹ Paul Hopkins, 'Smith, Aaron (d. 1701)', *ODNB*, li, p. 11.

⁴² See Leonard Naylor and Geoffrey Jaggard, 'Southby, Richard (c.1624-1704), of Somerford Keynes, Wilts. and Carswell, Buckland, Berks.', Henning (ed.), *History of Parliament*, iii, p. 458.

⁴³ Jones argued that 'the causes of the Exclusion crisis were not identical with those of the civil war, and individuals reacted not according to any set pattern but as a result of their own attitudes of mind and their own interests, and these did not necessarily coincide with those of their fathers,' Jones, *The First Whigs*, p. 12.

after the revolution.⁴⁴ One might adapt his argument to suggest that, as well as radical ideas, revolutionaries sought to demonstrate to their offspring the importance of the revolution. It is worth pointing out, however, that the younger generation were not mere soft wax to be moulded by their parents. In some instances, it is likely that a strong sense of filial duty resulted in an enduring belief in the legitimacy of the revolution. Justin Champion, for example, has illustrated how the Anglican minister Isaac Archer, who was son of a radical revolutionary, 'was torn' after 1660 'between the need for financial security, the demands of conscience, filial duty to his father and his theological commitments.'⁴⁵ Even for those who allied themselves with the Church of England, therefore, it was not easy to throw off a sense of loyalty to the actions of their forefathers.

The argument that there is a link between the political persuasions of radical Whigs and the participation of family members in the revolution is reinforced by the degree to which the government played upon such connections during the 'exclusion crisis'. As discovered earlier, Captain Gregory Alford deemed it significant that Edmund Gibbons, whose seditious memories he had heard, was the son of what he referred to as a 'Cromwellite'.⁴⁶ Three months earlier, the Bishop of Winchester saw fit to inform the government that one Oliver St John, MP for Stockbridge, Hampshire had gone hunting with one Oliver Cromwell, who was the 'Eldest sonne of Richard, [himself the]eldest sonne of Oliver Cromwell [th]e usurper, & murdrer of his Master; o[u]r late king of Ever blessed Memory'.⁴⁷ Significantly, it seems, the men had gone hunting on 30 January, doing so in the face of royalists, like the Bishop of Winchester, who would have observed the anniversary day with utmost solemnity (see chapter 4). In another example from Newcastle-upon-Tyne in 1683, an attempt to rid the town's government of disloyal elements, resulted in the identification of John Blakiston, a local justice of the peace, with the actions of his father during the

⁴⁴ De Krey, 'Radicals', p. 98. See also Zook, *Radical Whigs*, pp. 30-31.

⁴⁵ Justin Champion, "My kingdom is not of this world": the politics of religion after the Revolution', Tyacke (ed.), *The English Revolution*, p. 191.

⁴⁶ TNA, SP 29/415/120.

⁴⁷ TNA, SP 29/415/96, 96 I.

revolution. According to a letter sent to Whitehall, Blakiston was the 'only son of [tha]t notorious Rebell, John Blakiston late of Newcastle upon Tine, who was a Burgesse for tha[t] Place [in] 1648, and was [th]e man who set out [th]e Ground, & Caused to be Erected [th]e Scaffold whereupon his late [majesty] was murdered'.⁴⁸ In some cases, the regime manipulated, or attempted to manipulate these familial connections to the revolution. One of the most intriguing examples of this kind of espionage occurred in 1681 when Elizabeth Lilburne, the daughter of the famous Leveller John Lilburne, wrote to the Earl of Shaftesbury to tell him of a meeting she had had with George Savile, Marquess of Halifax, who, having discovered whose daughter she was, asked her if she 'did not know the Duke of Buckingham and Major Wildman.' Lilburne responded to Halifax that she did, leading him to tell her that 'it was in my power to get a great sum of money if I would undertake a business he would put me upon.' According to Lilburne, Halifax sought her help in infiltrating a republican faction which included John Wildman (sometime Leveller), the Duke of Buckingham and Francis Jenks (son-in-law of the notorious Leveller William Walwyn).⁴⁹ She added that Halifax had said that 'they would make no scruple of trusting me, being Lilburne's daughter'.⁵⁰ This, as well as the cases aforementioned are significant, because they reflect the degree to which the government perceived genuine links between those who had been involved in the revolution and their offspring; links which were strong enough to serve the needs of espionage.

Members of the post-revolutionary generation, then, could be as convinced about the legitimacy of the revolution as some of those who participated in it. That these seditious *post*-memories existed, particularly during the 'exclusion crisis', is representative of the fact that many of those who had not experienced the revolution grew up surrounded by men and women who had, and who refused to concede to the royalists' claim that it had been a

⁴⁸ TNA, SP 29/424/118.

⁴⁹ Gary S. De Krey, 'Jenks, Francis (bap. 1640, d. 1686)', *ODNB*, xxix, p. 92.

⁵⁰ V&A, F.48.G.3/9. With thanks to Professor Jason Peacey for this reference.

rebellion against and a usurpation of natural forms of government. For some, this message was transmitted through political movements which included revolutionaries, such as the Whigs and their Green Ribbon Club. For others, this message appears to have been passed through families. What this evidence suggests is that revolutionaries were not only interested in ensuring the survival of seditious memories of the revolution, but also that it was of fundamental importance to transmit these memories to posterity as well. For those who had participated in the revolution, in other words, it was insufficient to defend certain religio-political identities against the claims of royalists: it was necessary also to make sure that these identities were *reproduced*. That revolutionaries could be successful in transmitting these claims about the past is evident in a case from July 1682 when a Baptist woman from Stepney (Middlesex) informed the authorities that she had been approached by two bright-eyed, and presumably young, men who told her that ‘they must shortly pull downe Babylon and all the greate ones ... And that they must fight as Resolute as her husband or any other in the Late wars’.⁵¹ That the transmission of these kinds of seditious memories was the cause of significant anxiety among royalists is evident from the words of an onlooker to the seditious annual commemoration of the parliamentary relief of the siege of Taunton in 1683. The anniversary, he argued, served ‘not only to continue the memory of a horrid rebellion’, but also ‘to transmit it as a thing of imitation to posterity’.⁵²

The ‘exclusion crisis’ was not, of course, the only period within which revolutionaries had attempted to reproduce identities which were bound up with the events of mid-century. As seen in chapter 2, revolutionaries like Richard Shawe wrote memoirs which were aimed at providing the post-revolutionary generation with a ‘neutral’ or rather un-royalist account of the recent past. Elsewhere, Philip Henry, the Presbyterian minister at Worthenbury (Flintshire) – a man who, despite having supported the Restoration, had suffered considerable rebuke for his assumed loyalties

⁵¹ TNA, SP 29/421/30.

⁵² *CSPD Jan.-Jun. 1683*, p. 266.

during the revolution⁵³ – was compelled to tell a neighbour who ‘knew little’ of ‘[th]e state of publique affaires, as to the late war & Covenant’ that ‘though partic[ular] Instrum[ents] might miscarry, yet twas in general the Cause of God [and] Religion, and will in due time bee made so to appear.’⁵⁴ For those who participated in the revolution, therefore – even moderates who had welcomed the Restoration such as Philip Henry – it was deemed important to inform the next generation that the cause for which so many had risked lives, liberties and fortunes had been legitimate. That the transmission of these ideas appears to have informed the actions for which one man became notorious during the ‘exclusion crisis’, is the subject of the final section of this chapter.

II

At just after 11 o’clock on final day of August 1681, Stephen Colledge, a joiner, was hanged, drawn and quartered at Oxford Castle. His crime was high treason for involvement in a plot to seize the king in Oxford.⁵⁵ During the ‘exclusion crisis’, Colledge had become a well-known activist for the Whig cause in London, producing literature which was hostile to the king and inventing a weapon, or so it was claimed, with which Protestants might protect themselves against Roman Catholics.⁵⁶ It was for this reason that, having failed to convict Colledge in his native London, where juries were known to be sympathetic to the Whigs, the regime moved his trial to the loyalist stronghold of Oxford. In sacrificing this prominent symbol of the Whig

⁵³ In January of that year, for example, while journeying with Captain Edward Taylor, a former revolutionary soldier (see Alfred Neobard Palmer, *A History of the Older Nonconformity of Wrexham and its Neighbourhood* (Wrexham, 1889), pp. 4-5), Henry was overtaken by Roger Puleston, once a pupil of his. According to Henry, Puleston took out his sword and appeared as if he ‘would needs fight’ and yelled that Taylor and Henry ‘were all Traytors, swearing desperately’, Henry, *Diary*, p. 75. The following June, a rather more intrusive abuse of oblivion occurred within Henry’s church, when the Lord’s order for burning the 1643 ‘Solemn League and Covenant’ was hung next to the reading desk by another member of the Puleston family; an act which Henry interpreted as a personal affront. In response, Henry plucked up the courage to pull down the order in defiance, writing in his diary a week later that he knew ‘no Authority but malice, that caus’d it to be hang’d there’, *ibid.*, p. 89.

⁵⁴ Henry, *Diary*, p. 102.

⁵⁵ B. J. Rahn, ‘A Ra-ree Show – A Rare Cartoon: Revolutionary Propaganda in the Treason Trial of Stephen Colledge’, Paul J. Korshin (ed.), *Studies in Change and Revolution: Aspects of English Intellectual History, 1640-1800* (Menston, 1972), p. 85.

⁵⁶ Gary S. De Krey, ‘Colledge, Stephen (c.1635–1681)’, *ODNB*, xii, pp. 616-18.

cause, the regime hoped that a decisive blow would be struck against the movement. Indeed, the eventual conviction of Stephen Colledge became the first of several successes for the Tories in their efforts to quell growing support for the exclusion of James, Duke of York (see chapter 5). What is remarkable about both trials, however, is the degree to which, in order to corroborate the charge of treason, the regime cited Stephen Colledge's views about the *past* and more specifically the English Revolution.⁵⁷ One of Colledge's most famous references to the revolution came in the form of his ballad *A Ra-ree Show*, which upbraided the king for his decision to move parliament to Oxford in March 1681, and which was used as evidence of his politics at his trial. One of the prominent motifs of *A Ra-ree Show*, therefore, was the use of the overthrow of Charles I as a means of attacking Charles II, his son, and, by extension, envisaging his downfall. Hence, Colledge asked the reader, or indeed the listener of *A Ra-ree Show* to 'Remember old *Dry Bobbs* [i.e. Charles I] ... For Fleecing *Englands* Flocks'.⁵⁸ Moreover, the ballad went on to relate 'Ha-loo the *Hunts* begun ... Like Father, Like Son.'⁵⁹ Comparisons between Charles and his father, such as these, formed something of a favourite trope for Colledge. His first recorded reference to the revolution came in 1679 in a ballad concerning the suspected assassination of London magistrate Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey by Roman Catholics. In it, Colledge lamented 'Alas! poor nation, how art thou undone / By a bad father, and now a worse, his son!'⁶⁰

These uses of the seditious past were not confined to Colledge's literary output, however. When the regime attempted to convict Colledge of seditious words in June 1681, one of the charges against him was that he said he would 'serve [the King] as [the logger-head his] father was served.'⁶¹ On the scaffold, Colledge strenuously denied imagining the death of Charles II, but he did admit having 'uttered some words of Indecency ... concerning

⁵⁷ Rahn, 'Rare', p. 85

⁵⁸ [Stephen Colledge], *A Ra-ree Show. To the Tune of I am a Senceless Thing* (London, 1681).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ Lord (ed.), *Poems on Affairs of State*, ii, p. 16.

⁶¹ Howell (ed.), *State Trials*, viii, p. 717.

the King or his Council.⁶² Indeed, while Colledge might not have spoken the *exact* words attributed to him, he was certainly not averse to treating the Regicide of 1649 more glibly than was deemed acceptable. In his 1681 broadside aimed at the loyalist judge, William Scroggs, therefore, Colledge referred to Scroggs' father by the term 'man of Blood', the epithet which Charles I's enemies had bestowed upon him before his trial in January 1649.⁶³ Colledge's apparent obsession with the past was evident in other words of which he was accused. In January 1681, therefore, Colledge was alleged to have held forth before a group of coffee-house Whigs that 'Well, I see what it will come to, We must [even] draw our swords and fight it over againe.'⁶⁴ Here, then, Colledge's alleged use of the word 'we' illustrates the degree to which he, like other Whigs aforementioned, *identified* with participation in the English Revolution, as well as his hopes that such actions might be repeated. Indeed, on another occasion in the same month, it was alleged of Colledge that he had waved around a copy of the Long Parliament's 1641 act to prevent its dissolution without consent. According to the witness, Colledge proclaimed that 'there were men ready to justify the Remnant of [the] Long [Parliament].'⁶⁵

Although historians have been inclined to treat Colledge's comparisons between Charles II and his father as a literary device, it is important to appreciate them within the light of his genuine convictions that the events of the English Revolution had been *legitimate*. Indeed, although Colledge denied justifying the Regicide at his trial, he *did* admit that he had justified the Long Parliament, citing the legitimacy of their actions before 'Pride's Purge' in 1648. Notwithstanding this extenuation of his guilt, it was argued at Colledge's trial that his justification of the Regicide was *implicit* in his refusal to condemn it when prompted.⁶⁶ When Colledge protested that he had not

⁶² [Stephen Colledge], *A true Copy of the dying Words of Mr. Stephen Colledge* (London, 1681), p. 2; cited in De Krey, 'College', *ODNB*, xii, p. 618.

⁶³ [Stephen Colledge], *A Satyr Against Injustice; Or, Sc[rog]gs upon Sc[rog]gs* (s. l., [1681]), p. 2.

⁶⁴ TNA, SP 29/416/172.

⁶⁵ TNA, SP 29/427/81.

⁶⁶ *The Arraignment, Tryal and Condemnation of Stephen Colledge for High-Treason, In Conspiring the Death of the King, the Levying of War, and the Subversion of the Government* (Dublin, 1681), p. 32.

spoken these words, therefore, it was contended by a witness at his trial that, when reproved for justifying the Parliament that 'cut off' Charles I's head, he argued that 'they did nothing but what they had just cause for, and the Parliament that sat last at *Westminster* were of the same opinion.'⁶⁷ Unless the evidence against Colledge was entirely fabricated, it seems likely that he shared the views of some of the more radical Whigs, such as the aforementioned Strange Southby, that Charles I's execution had been just.

Colledge, then, offers a remarkable representation of the degree to which seditious memories of the revolution had taken hold during the 'exclusion crisis'. His use of such language in ballads, but also in his every day speech, suggests once more that a counter-memory of the revolution was more common than historians have inferred. The foregoing account has knowingly omitted a key fact about Stephen Colledge, however; one which he used in his defence during his trial. Despite his strong feelings about the revolution, Colledge was forced to admit to his prosecutors that 'I was then a child, and do not know all the passages.'⁶⁸ Colledge's words, therefore, are an example of the kinds of *post-memory* which, as the previous section demonstrated, appear to have been common among some of the younger Whigs. Why Colledge wrote, spoke and even sang⁶⁹ these seditious memories, therefore, requires a consideration of those from whom such memories might have been transmitted. On the one hand, as we have mentioned, Colledge was a Whig and was remarkably well connected considering that he was a joiner by trade. Nonetheless, as his sole biographer Gary De Krey has argued, his 'success as a popular spokesman' for the exclusionists 'brought him to the attention of London Whig leaders'.⁷⁰ One of these leaders, the Earl of Shaftesbury had himself been accused of comparing the king with his father during his trial in 1681, although it is difficult to assess the truth of these claims.⁷¹ Even if Shaftesbury did not hold

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁷⁰ De Krey, 'Colledge', *ODNB*, xii, p. 617.

⁷¹ Amongst other things, Shaftesbury was accused of saying that 'the king would never be quiet till he came to his father's end' since 'he followed the same steps.' See Howell (ed.), *State Trials*, viii, pp. 759-843.

such views, however, his secretary, Samuel Wilson, certainly appears to have done (see chapter 5). Indeed, Wilson's decision to justify the Regicide had been spoken in response to Colledge's execution, implying perhaps that the two men were acquainted and that Wilson felt the need to show solidarity with Colledge's views. In addition to these Whigs, it is worth comparing the lyrics of Colledge's broadside ballads with those of John Ayloffe with which this chapter began. Although Colledge is not known to have been a member of the radical Green Ribbon Club, of which Ayloffe was an attendee, it is possible that he had become acquainted with Ayloffe at some point during the 'exclusion crisis'.⁷²

Another Whig with whom Colledge was acquainted was Edward Whitaker, whose justification of the revolution became a notable case during the 'exclusion crisis', continuing well into the reign of James II.⁷³ That the two men were close was implied in a pamphlet which was released after Colledge's execution in which he bade Whitaker goodbye.⁷⁴ Indeed, the fact that both men had attended the trial of Edward Fitzharris, for whom Whitaker had acted as lawyer, in June 1680 increases the likelihood that the two men were acquainted.⁷⁵ Intriguingly, in July of that year, Whitaker had become embroiled in a debate in Bath (Somerset) about annual parliaments which resulted in an indiscrete reference to the revolution. According to the information provided against him, Whitaker had irked the gentlemen with whom he was debating, one of them (perhaps unknown to Whitaker) being the royalist veteran Sir James Long. Long told Whitaker that he favoured not annual parliaments 'such a one as that of (41) [which] caused rebellion and murdered the late King.' In a move which would entangle him in legal proceedings until November 1686, Whitaker retorted that 'hee knew of noe Rebellion they made for twas in Justification of their rights & that the King was not Murdered but taken of by a Legall Tryall.'⁷⁶ These words should be

⁷² Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 101.

⁷³ See *CSPD Jan. 1686-May 1687*, p. 1107. Whitaker acted as Colledge's attorney in July 1681, see Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis*, p. 290n.

⁷⁴ *A Letter from Mr. Edward Whitaker to the Protestant Joyner Upon his Bill being sent to Oxford* (London, 1681).

⁷⁵ Howell (ed.), *State Trials*, viii, p. 335; De Krey, 'College, Stephen', *ODNB*, xii, p. 617.

⁷⁶ Newdigate, *Newsletters*, no. 1294.

compared to Colledge's own views about the justice of the Long Parliament of which he was alleged to have spoken at his trial. These two men – one the 'Protestant Joiner', the other the 'Protestant Attorney'⁷⁷ – might well have known each other and it is conceivable that certain views about the revolution had cemented their mutual identification as Whigs. It is conceivable, therefore, that Colledge, like other members of the post-revolutionary generation, had attained certain views about the past as a result of a process of his socialisation into radical Whig circles.

While it is difficult to extricate Colledge and his views about the recent past from the Whig circles in which he operated, there is perhaps another reason for his strong views about the revolution. When Colledge was executed in August 1681, the Oxford diarist Anthony Wood wrote down some key biographical information which has been overlooked by his biographers. According to Wood, Colledge was the nephew of one Edward Golledge, a musician and a staunch puritan, who lived in Oxford during the early 1640s.⁷⁸ Edward Golledge is a figure worthy of study in his own right, since his name appears in connection with much of the turmoil through which Oxford went as civil war approached in the early 1640s. Indeed, one famous anecdote involves an effigy of Golledge being placed on top of a maypole in Oxford during this period.⁷⁹ This incident seems to have captured the anti-puritan imagination in Oxford, and it was alleged that one Daniel Woolmaster had derided Golledge afterwards by telling him that he 'was preaching in a tubbe on the Maypolle in Holliwell, and ... that if it had not been for such Puritane rogues as he, there had not been such a tumult in the kingdome'.⁸⁰ Indeed, Golledge was something of a target for royalist reproach in the 1640s, with one pamphlet from the period referring to him as 'the *Tub-man's Corporall*, or the *New-Inne Scar-crow*'.⁸¹ It is likely, then, that this was the

⁷⁷ See J. G. Muddiman, 'Sidelights on Macaulay and the Rye House Plot', *Notes and Queries*, 161 (December 1931), p. 417.

⁷⁸ Wood *The Life and Times*, ii, p. 552.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, i, p. 49.

⁸⁰ M. G. Hobson and H. E. Salter (eds.), *Oxford Council Acts, 1626-1665* (Oxford, 1933), xcvi, p. 366.

⁸¹ *Oxonii Lachrymae, Rachell weeping for her Children, Or, a Patheticall Relation of the present Grievances of the late famous University of Oxford* (London, 1649), p. 4.

same Golledge who signed the Protestation oath at New Inn Hall, Oxford, in 1641, and was forced to flee the city in August 1642 as almost two-hundred royalist soldiers approached the city.⁸² Indeed, it is probable that Golledge was something of a leading figure in Oxford, since it was recorded elsewhere that 'a great company', perhaps a conventicle, were taken at his house in February 1641.⁸³

The connection between Stephen Colledge and Edward Golledge is corroborated elsewhere by the joiner's documented complaint in 1681 that his name was spelled with a 'G' rather than a 'C'.⁸⁴ Hence, it is reasonable to associate Stephen Colledge with a number of Golledges who appear to have been related to his puritan uncle, Edward. One of these may have been one Thomas Gollidge, another musician who came from Stephen's native county of Hertfordshire.⁸⁵ According to the will of this man, which includes a reference to his son Edward (who could well have been he who was resident in Oxford), he had other sons named Thomas and Richard.⁸⁶ Intriguingly, a Thomas Golledge fought for parliament during the civil wars, and a man of the same name, from Oxford, gave information during the trial of William Laud, the famous archbishop who had been responsible for the wrongful imprisonment of his brother, Richard.⁸⁷ That this Thomas Golledge served in a civil war regiment which had been raised in Oxfordshire could suggest that this was the same man.⁸⁸ Moreover, the will of the parliamentarian Thomas Golledge suggests that he possessed land in Hertfordshire, strengthening some kind of Oxfordshire-Hertfordshire link.⁸⁹ Indeed, it is conceivable that, as was common among those who were employed as musicians by the University of Oxford, such as were Edward and another man with the name

⁸² Jeremy Gibson (ed.), *Oxfordshire and North Berkshire Protestation Returns and Tax Assessments, 1641-42* (Oxford, 1994), p. 163; Wood, *The Life and Times*, i, pp. 56n-57n.

⁸³ Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland: Preserved at Welbeck Abbey* (10 vols., London, 1891-1931), ii, p. 74.

⁸⁴ TNA, SP 29/416/118, 119.

⁸⁵ It is likely that Thomas Golledge was also employed as a musician in Oxford, see P. M. Gouk, 'Music', Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV: Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), p. 632.

⁸⁶ Will of Thomas Gollidge of Ware, Hertfordshire, musician, ERO, D/ABW 17/150.

⁸⁷ HL/PO/JO/10/1/46.

⁸⁸ Firth and Davies, i, p. 337.

⁸⁹ TNA, PROB 11/204.

Thomas Golledge, these men had travelled from Hertfordshire.⁹⁰ If this hypothesis is stretched to its maximum point, it is possible that the musicality of the Golledges had been responsible for Colledge's use of ballads to make his case against the government during the 'exclusion crisis'. In fact, it is worth pointing out that Colledge's most famous print – *A Raree Show* – includes an image of the king as a travelling musician, removing to Oxford as his probable uncles had done.⁹¹

Most significantly, the will of the elder Thomas Golledge includes the name of another of his sons, Stephen. If Wood's connection between Stephen Colledge and Edward Golledge is accurate, then this could well have been Colledge's father, who was also called Stephen.⁹² If so, then not only were Stephen Colledge's uncles all involved in some way in the English Revolution in its earliest stages, but his father may well have been the same Stephen Golledge who was employed as a marshal in Hertfordshire by parliament during the first civil war, and who appears to have been from Colledge's birthplace of Watford.⁹³ If Stephen Golledge was a member of the Golledge family who played an active part in the English Revolution, then one might argue that his use of seditious memories did not relate merely to his political identity as a Whig, but, perhaps, from a certain degree of familial loyalty to the senior members of his family; many of whom had striven for religious liberty during the 1640s. In 1681, a satirical pamphlet was released which claimed to be Stephen Colledge's own words from prison.⁹⁴ While the pamphlet was a fabrication, the claim that Colledge died in support of the 'Good Old Cause' – if we take that phrase to mean much more than republicanism – was not far from the truth. For Stephen Colledge, like other members of the post-revolutionary generation who supported the Whigs and had strong links to those who had participated in the revolution, the

⁹⁰ Michael Fleming, 'Phillippe Golledge: Another Oxford Musical Instrument Dealer?', *The Galpin Society Journal*, 61 (April 2008), p. 333. With thanks to Dr Fleming for information regarding the Golledges of Oxford.

⁹¹ [Colledge], *A Ra-ree Show*.

⁹² TNA, SP 44/54, f. 81.

⁹³ See TNA, SP 28/231, passim.

⁹⁴ *A Letter Written from the Tower by Mr. Stephen Colledge (the Protestant-Joyner) To Dick Janeways Wife* (London, 1681), p. 1.

'exclusion crisis' was a time in which the present was inextricably bound with the events of an increasingly distant past.

Conclusion

Throughout this chapter, the permeable barrier between the generation who experienced the revolution and those which did not has been observed. Remarkably, then, the seditious past endured in the minds and words of the generation for whom the easiest, and indeed the safest, option would have been to forget. For those who grew up in post-revolutionary England and Wales, seditious ideas about the past were available within families, but also from political movements which included individuals who had participated in the revolution. In some cases, in fact, it is possible to pinpoint the moments in which seditious memories were transferred from one generation to the next.

The implication of this evidence is that at least some of those who had not experienced the events of mid-century were brought up in a society in which there were very much *two* sides to the story of the English Revolution. Indeed, it is possible to argue that, contrary to the claims of historians, it was not the natural recourse of those who had participated in the revolution to 'bury' that past. Instead, those who felt that the revolution had been legitimate and that, increasingly, it might be worth resurrecting some aspect of the Good Old Cause, were keen for these ideas to be passed onto the next generation.

What is perhaps most striking about the post-memory of the English Revolution is that the transmission of seditious ideas about the past appears to have happened within an almost exclusively *oral* culture. As previous chapters have demonstrated, it was virtually impossible for those who possessed different interpretations of the revolution to disseminate them in print. Therefore, while the regime's grip over the printing presses afforded them an advantage when it came to vetting which past would be remembered, by no means were they completely successful. Private remarks which differed from the royalists' interpretation of the revolution could never

be rooted out entirely by the regime. Indeed, one is left with the intriguing question, which can never be answered, of how much the transmission of certain ideas about the English Revolution into the eighteenth century and beyond was the lasting legacy of those who participated to concretise the righteousness of those actions.

Conclusion – ‘On the right side’

This thesis has demonstrated that a seditious counter-memory of the English Revolution survived the Restoration of 1660. These memories, it has been argued, formed an intricate tapestry, the richness of which has been overlooked by historians, or lost within efforts to illustrate a radical politics which endured beyond 1660. The tapestry spanned England and Wales, incorporating images which were common to men and women who were otherwise separated by geographical and social distance. Woven into its fabric were the ‘heroes’ of the revolution such as Oliver Cromwell, whose domestic and foreign leadership during and after the civil wars endured in the hearts and minds of his erstwhile supporters. Oliver was not alone in this respect, however. A minority, for instance, held onto the idea that Oliver’s heir, Richard Cromwell, and General John Lambert, who spent the remainder of his life in prison, might one day cast the Three Kingdoms back into its other mould. For others, the authority of those who left a fainter mark on the archive endured, such as the celebrated West Country officer Colonel Richard Buffett, to whom healths were still being drunk in Somerset in the mid-1660s. Indeed, for some men and women, it had been memories of the military engagements of the 1640s which were most vivid: a time when power had been wrenched from the king and his supporters with unprecedented force. Some termed this the ‘Good Old Cause’, while others continued to imagine communities of ‘old oliver’s boys’ whose swords, while rusty, might be unsheathed once more. The first to feel the fury of the ‘saints’, it was often argued, would be George Monck, Duke of Albemarle, around whom an entire ‘myth of betrayal’ was concocted in the aftermath of the Restoration. For those whose memories of the revolution were less militant, the Protestation oath and the Solemn League and Covenant remained most redolent of the legitimacy of opposition to the Stuarts in the early 1640s. Indeed, ‘reformation’ and the extirpation of ‘popery’, of which these documents spoke, remained the two principal goals to which seditious memories referred after 1660, leading even those who had baulked at the Regicide to speak of the comparable godliness of the Commonwealth.

Indeed, it has been difficult to escape the fact that, however much men and women remained convinced about the 'truth' of the events of the 1640s and 1650s, it was the episode upon which those decades had hinged – the trial and execution of Charles I in January 1649 – which became the hardest feature of the past to resolve. Some, of course, remained convinced that the Regicide had been a providential act, and these views were reinforced somewhat by the daring speeches of the regicides who were executed in October 1660. Nonetheless, the vast majority were certain that the Regicide had been abhorrent and unjustifiable. In this sense, of course, the period after the Restoration was no different from that which followed the execution of Charles I. It is important to acknowledge, however, that the Regicide was not a 'deal-breaker'. Those who considered it to be abhorrent, in other words, were not led to repent of participation in the revolution wholesale. On the contrary, individuals such as Richard Baxter spent much of the 1660s, 1670s and 1680s explaining that, if anything, the Regicide had been *external* to the 'true' revolution that was occurring during the 1640s and 1650s, and that it was to be lamented that royalists continued to associate it with those, like Baxter, who had sought 'reformation'.

Irrespective of the specific images which were conjured when revolutionaries remembered, the sheer amount of time that these men and women spent thinking and speaking about the past is the most striking observation to be made. It is no longer possible, therefore, to speak of the post-revolutionary era as one in which only royalist memories of the 1640s and 1650s prevailed, nor to argue that 'many of the changes England experienced between 1640 and 1660 proved ephemeral.'¹ Furthermore, the origins of posterity's passion for the revolution ought to be wrenched from the patriotic 'long' century which followed the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688-89 and into the period which, for so long, has been mislabelled as the 'Restoration'. In order to do so, it is necessary to look outside the 'visible spectrum' of evidence in which printed histories dominate, and consider the voices which royalist censorship sought to silence. Indeed, a recurring theme of this thesis has been that a politics of memory existed in post-revolutionary England and Wales which cannot be

¹ Pincus, 1688, p. 480.

witnessed in the printed, proto-historiography of the period. Instead, it was in alehouses, inns, town squares, town halls, churches and country lanes that the antagonists of the revolution contested the meaning of the recent past. These divisions remained throughout the reign of Charles II, to the extent that violence based upon what one had done during the 1640s and 1650s occurred well into the 1680s. When one considers the degree to which royalists had stirred up memories of the revolution during the 'exclusion crisis', of course, the endurance of enmity is hardly surprising. Indeed, while those who fought for parliament continued to harbour prejudices against cavaliers – an 'anti-cavalierism' with origins in the early 1640s² – it is difficult to escape the degree to which later seventeenth-century society was pervaded by the prejudice of 'anti-fanaticism': one which was distinct from 'anti-puritanism', and which was second only perhaps to its more famous counterpart, 'anti-popery'.

This storehouse of seditious memories did not merely 'exist' after the Restoration, then; it corresponded with royalist attempts to control how the revolution was remembered. While this contest over the meaning of the revolution did spill out into public on some occasions, it was more common that dissent remained private. Consequently, it is possible to find evidence of men and women who were willing only to record their views about the past in private diaries, memoirs and letters. Elsewhere, individuals took great care to ensure that the authorities were unable to hear their reflections on the past. Through this process, it has been argued, the 'weak' were able to negotiate, and to resist, royalist efforts to take control of the past. In doing so, one of the central means by which authority was exerted after the Restoration in 1660 was contested. Indeed, it has been possible to argue that, to a greater degree than historians have demonstrated, control over the past provided both the 'experience of defeat' and the methods through which it was possible to confront it. Memories have not been regarded as purely *retrospective*, of course. On the contrary, it has been claimed throughout this thesis that revolutionaries used seditious nostalgia in order to construct alternative realities. On the one hand, this past was something within which individuals and collectives resided. However, it was also possible to

² Michael J. Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (London, 2008), p. 200.

use this past in order to construct a future. For some, this imagination facilitated political action. Indeed, the extent to which the Fifth Monarchist rising of 1661, the Farnley Wood plot of 1663, and the Rye House plot of 1683 were the consequences of a sense of collective identity which derived from membership to what have been referred to as 'communities of memory' has been evident throughout. However, it has also been clear that these kinds of memories enabled *hope*, as much as expectation, that better times would return. In doing so, individuals were able to negotiate, defy and subvert royalists' attempts to construct a present and a future in relation to anti-fanatical interpretations of the English Revolution.

Perhaps the most enduring theme of this thesis has been that opinions about the past did not always relate to a desire to see the revolution repeated. On the one hand, it is clear that references to the revolution began to blur significantly throughout the 1660s and 1670s, to the extent that a Presbyterian minister, Oliver Heywood, was able to speak of his identification with the 'Good Old Cause'. Elsewhere, the invocation of a more seditious past than that which had been experienced appears to have been the consequence of the requirements of social existence. In chapter 3, for instance, it was discovered that Samuel Pepys was willing to engage in discussions which could have been regarded as seditious in order to reinforce the professional networks with which he identified. Finally, it was possible to demonstrate that the evocation of the spectre of the revolution enabled some men and women to stir up royalists' anxieties about the sufferings of the 1640s and 1650s, and that this could entail sentiments which appeared more radical than the individuals who were responsible. At the heart of all of these claims, of course, is the idea that it was of continued importance for revolutionaries to validate senses of self which were bound up with distinct experiences of the revolution. This process occurred privately and individually, but also publicly and socially. Indeed, while historians of the post-revolutionary era have long deemed religion to have been an important aspect of political identities, it is crucial to highlight that seditious memories of the English Revolution continued to play a part in this self-perception. Further research might concentrate on how the other perceptions of the past, stretching back into the sixteenth century and beyond, informed

identities during the seventeenth century, and how debates about the meanings which ought to be attached to these pasts could lead to societal conflict. More generally, there are grounds to argue that considerations of memory in early modern Britain, and Europe more generally, can inform understandings of the processes of social remembering across time.

In tracing seditious memories, it has been possible to peer in through the windows of post-revolutionary society, and to demonstrate how men and women used the past in order to negotiate, resist and subvert the structures into which the restoration of the monarchy and the established church between 1660 and 1662 locked them. In doing so, it has been possible to place 'politics' firmly back into understandings of society and culture in the wake of the Restoration. There are, however, other remarks to be made, and other conclusions to be drawn from this evidence. Firstly, it is clear that seditious memories were more common in certain parts of England and Wales than others. The regions of London (and Middlesex), Essex, Yorkshire, Northumbria and Somerset, for instance, have dominated this study. While it is important to point out that the records of seditious and treasonable words in these regions are most complete, it would be wrong to assume that there is not some broader trend to be exposed here. In comparison to areas such as Herefordshire, Shropshire and the vast bulk of Wales, it was over these regions that seditious memories possessed the firmest grip. On the one hand, of course, this could have resulted from the fact that these locations were where the regime *expected* to see seditious memories, and so where surveillance was strongest. Nonetheless, it is surely not a coincidence that it was in these counties that the civil wars had been contested most fiercely, and that the puritan presence had been strongest.

The focus of this thesis has, of course, been dominated by a discussion of England and Wales and it has not been possible to consider other parts of the Three Kingdoms. It is clear, however, that both Ireland and Scotland were locations of the endurance of 'revolutionary' identities well into the later seventeenth century. In parts of Ireland in which there remained Cromwellian soldiers after 1660, for example, nostalgia for the 1650s continued into the

1660s.³ In Scotland, meanwhile, memories of the 1630s and 1640s remained stronger than perhaps any other part of the Three Kingdoms. Principally, this was the consequence of the strength of Presbyterianism in Scotland, as well as the degree to which nonconformists experienced persecution throughout the reign of Charles II. For these individuals, the National Covenant of 1638 and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643 provided the symbols, but also the ideas, around which opposition to these experiences of persecution coalesced after 1660.⁴ Indeed, the extent to which Scotsmen and women, as well as some Irishmen and women, continued to identify as ‘Covenanters’ is worthy of sustained analysis. In addition to the Three Kingdoms, an exploration of how the revolution was remembered by those who fled or were transported to Britain’s colonies after 1660 would be worthwhile. Moreover, a consideration of the manner in which the Dutch Republic stirred up memories of the revolution amid their propaganda wars with England would broaden the horizons of this project.⁵

Another conclusion to be drawn is that seditious memories, while predominantly articulated by, were clearly not the preserve of, men. On the contrary, there were many women who continued to reflect upon the past with nostalgia, and to legitimate the actions of those who participated. That this was the case should not be a surprise, since, as Ann Hughes has demonstrated, women’s lives were affected as deeply as those of their husbands, fathers and sons during the revolution.⁶ Moreover, as Keith Lindley has demonstrated, this period witnessed an upsurge in the participation in politics of women.⁷ Indeed, this thesis has demonstrated that a consideration of gender and politics after 1660 is long overdue, and part of this endeavour ought to consider the ways in which women looked back upon the events which preceded the return of the king.

³ In April 1663, one Daniell O’Quinlyne was accused of saying ‘I doe not care for the King[,] Queen or Duke of Yorke I gott more by Cromwell then by them’, see NLI MS 4908/27. With thanks to Dr Coleman Dennehy for this and other references pertaining to seditious memories in Ireland.

⁴ See, for example, James Turner, *Memoirs of his own life and times* (Edinburgh, 1829), pp. 23, 33, 156, 176; *The Last Speeches of the Two Ministers Mr. John King and Mr. John Kid, At the Place of Execution at Edenburgh On the 14th day of August, 1679 (s. l., 1680)*, pp. 6-8.

⁵ In May 1665, for instance, it was reported that one Dutch warship carried a copy of the Covenant on its stern, which read ‘If the King take me, he will not keep me’, *CSPD 1664-1665*, p. 353.

⁶ See Hughes, *Gender*.

⁷ Keith Lindley, ‘London and popular freedom’, p. 139.

As well as blurring distinctions between the politics of men and women, this thesis has also demonstrated that individuals from across the socio-economic spectrum possessed seditious memories. In part, this has been evident in the extent to which seditious memories were evident both in cases of seditious or treasonable words, which tended to involve individuals from lower status groups, as well as in memoirs, letters and diaries of those from more privileged positions. One way in which this thesis could be expanded would be to consider more closely the manner in which memories differed across the socio-economic spectrum (an investigation which could also incorporate differences which resulted from gender and location). The principal intention of this thesis, however, has been to demonstrate that, irrespective of background, individuals continued to hold seditious memories, and this was very much the consequence of the degree to which the royalists' censure of revolutionaries tended not to see distinctions of geography, gender or class. It served the royalists' case, in fact, to blur these distinctions as much as possible.

Yet another aspect of this thesis from which further, intriguing conclusions can be drawn, is the extent to which the output of seditious memories varied throughout the period. Broadly speaking, seditious memories became most common around the period 1662-63, before steadily falling away during the mid-1660s and largely disappearing during the early 1670s. In order to explain this pattern, one must take into account the degree to which the regime was 'on the lookout' for these kinds of sentiments during times of crisis, such as the plotting of 1661 and 1663, and the Anglo-Dutch War of 1665-67. Nonetheless, it is surely significant that seditious memories fell away towards the end of the 1660s, when the experience of nonconformists in particular had eased up to a greater degree.⁸ On the one hand, this meant that comparisons between present and past need not have been so unfavourable, and that there was much less need to speak of hopes for a future which might be built in the image of the seditious past. However, it is also important to point out that the early 1670s in particular saw the diminution of royalist censure, and the anti-fanaticism to which it gave rise.

⁸ For the sporadic nature of religious persecution between 1667 and 1675, see Greaves, *Enemies*, pp. 226-227; Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 64; Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, p. 152; Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent*, p. 7; Bardle, *The Literary Underground*, p. 121.

Consequently, it was not simply that revolutionaries had no use for the past during this period, but also that the need to *legitimate* the meaning of the past, and contest the authority to remember, was no longer such a pressing matter. In other words, the seditious past was not on the tips of the tongues of those who participated in the revolution during the late 1660s and early 1670s to the extent that it had been during the early to mid-1660s. What is clear, of course, is the extent to which the year 1681, at the height of the 'exclusion crisis', witnessed a massive increase in seditious memories.⁹ Clearly, some of this revival resulted again from the regime's concerns that such views were redolent of a desire to overthrow the monarchy. Nonetheless, it is also significant that this return of seditious remembering tracked a steep increase of royalist attacks on the past (in the form of Tory propaganda) during this period. The 'exclusion crisis', as much as the earlier period of Charles II's reign, therefore, witnessed a debate about the meaning of the past.

The period to which this thesis has referred for evidence of seditious memories, of course, has been strictly demarcated by the reign of Charles II. There are, however, grounds for finishing this thesis with a consideration of what happened to these memories after Charles II breathed his final breaths on 6 February 1685. Several historians have argued that the Monmouth Rebellion of June 1685 – when thousands of Somerset men, largely cloth-workers and agricultural labourers, assisted James, Duke of Monmouth, in his attempt to prise the crown from the hands of Roman Catholic, James of York – was the last gasp of the 'Good Old Cause'.¹⁰ Many of these claims, however, have been unsubstantiated, and have involved the notion that, since many of those involved had participated in the revolution, the same cause was being fought for. Indeed, these views have led to the rather emotive portrayal of the Monmouth Rebellion in Channel 4's 2014 drama *New Worlds*, in which an old parliamentarian was depicted dusting off his armour and marching to certain death for the Old Cause.¹¹ This thesis has demonstrated on several occasions, of course, that this portrayal was not as far from reality as it might seem. On the contrary, there were

⁹ Buchanan Sharp has witnessed a similar pattern across the reign of Charles II to which he refers at length in Sharp, 'Popular political opinion', pp. 14-15.

¹⁰ See Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, p. 22; Greaves, 'The Tangled Careers', p. 39.

¹¹ *New Worlds*. 'Episode 4', *New Worlds* (Channel 4, 22 April 2014).

individuals, such as the Devonian John Trowde, whose strong sense of nostalgia for the revolution, and his desire to repeat it, was evident during the 'exclusion crisis' (see chapter 5), and who was almost certainly involved in the rebellion of June 1685. Indeed, the fact that some of those who did articulate seditious memories participated in Monmouth's attempt to claim the crown has been regarded as evidence of the fact that not all of those who yearned for the revolution did so as a result of forlorn hopes.

It is clear, of course, that the period following the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 witnessed openness about the English Revolution which had been hitherto unseen. While individuals such as Edmund Ludlow were disappointed that a desire to fulfil the 'Good Old Cause' had not been carried with William of Orange as he arrived at Brixham (Devon) on 14 November 1688, others took advantage of the fact that the Whigs, many of whom had legitimated the English Revolution, were in the ascendancy. One individual who was quick to avail himself of this new found freedom was John Birch, an MP and parliamentarian veteran. On 29 January 1689, almost seven years to the day since his brother Thomas had justified the Regicide (see chapter 5), Birch stood before the House of Commons and took the liberty to look back over 'these 40 years' when 'we have been scrambling for our Religion'. Indeed, Birch came to the conclusion before his audience of MPs that, during the revolution, he had been 'on the right side'.¹² One gets the sense here that in these few words, Birch had done something which so many of his comrades had failed to do over the previous thirty years: legitimate participation in the English Revolution with equanimity. Incredibly, he had been able to do so in front of the body which had been responsible for providing legislative justification for the censure of which he, and his brother, had been on the receiving end. There can be little doubt that this desire to concretise the meaning of the revolution continued after Birch's death. Indeed, his monumental inscription at Weobley Church (Herefordshire) contains his belief that, in supporting parliament during the civil wars, he had been

¹² *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England. From the Norman Conquest, in 1066 to the Year 1803* (36 vols., London, 1809), v, p. 51.

‘vindicating [th]e Laws and Liberties of / his Country in War, and of promoting its Welfare and / Prosperity in Peace’.¹³

Indeed, the previous chapter of this thesis placed a strong emphasis on the fact that revolutionaries, like Birch, were keen to emphasise that the Cause had been ‘Good’ in order to bequeath to posterity religio-political identities which had been forged during the revolution. In this sense, Birch’s tomb was one of thousands of efforts – some recorded, many others hidden – to transmit to posterity an image of the past which differed from that of the dominant royalist interpretation. Much of this occurred within an oral culture which was out of the reach of the regime’s efforts at surveillance. Within this oral culture, the bearers of seditious memories ensured that messages about the past survived the royalists’ attempts to secure its meanings during the 1660s, 1670s and 1680s. How much twenty-first century British men and women owe to these individuals in having done so is unclear of course. Nonetheless, it is surely significant that the degree to which the meaning of the English Revolution continues to be fought over is a consequence of the fact that the royalists’ interpretation was not permitted to go uncontested between 1660 and 1685. To be sure, seditious memories have endured long after the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660. Christopher Hill, and others, have demonstrated the degree to which the memory of Oliver Cromwell, in particular, has spanned across the centuries.¹⁴ Often, these kinds of memories, and those of the revolution more generally, have been associated with the left wing of politics, and there can be little doubt that, from the twentieth century onwards at least, this has had a lot to do with the work of Christopher Hill himself.¹⁵ Elsewhere, memories of the Levellers have endured among those who have sought a more egalitarian society.¹⁶ In one part of the United Kingdom, of course, nostalgia for Cromwell takes a considerably more sinister edge. On Shankill Avenue in Belfast, a mural of the Lord Protector is a lasting reminder of the extent to which the wounds of the mid-seventeenth century have yet to heal.

¹³ See his monumental inscription in Weobley Church (Herefordshire).

¹⁴ See Christopher Hill, *God’s Englishman: Oliver Cromwell* (Harmondsworth, 1972), pp. 261-67.

¹⁵ See Worden, *Roundhead Reputations*, pp. 316-338.

¹⁶ See, for instance, the annual ‘Levellers’ Day’ at Burford (Oxford), which has the support of radical political movements and trades unions, ‘Levellers Day’ <<https://levellersday.wordpress.com/>> (16 April 2015).

Bibliography

I – Primary Material: Manuscript

Bedfordshire and Luton Archives and Record Service, Bedford

HSA Records of the High Sheriff: Assizes

Essex Record Office, Chelmsford

D/ABW Commissary of Bishop of London: Bonds
D/DEb Bramston family records
Q/SR Quarter sessions records

House of Lords Record Office, London

HL/PO/JO/10 Main papers

The National Archives, Kew

ASSI 5 Assizes: Oxford Circuit: Indictment files
C 6 Court of Chancery
IR Inland Revenue records
PROB 11 Prerogative Court of Canterbury: Wills
SP 28 State Papers Domestic: Interregnum
SP 29 State Papers Domestic: Charles II
SP 44 State Papers Domestic: Entry Books
SP 89 State Papers Foreign: Portugal

National Library of Ireland, Dublin

MS 4908 Assize Books: Clonmel, 1663-1675

Somerset Record Office, Taunton

Q/SR Quarter sessions records

Surrey History Centre, Woking

LM Loseley Manuscripts

Victoria and Albert Museum, London

F Forster collection

II – Primary Material: Printed (Pre-1700)

Amy, S[amuel], *A Præfatory Discourse To A Late Pamphlet Entitled, A Memento for English Protestants, &c.* (London, 1682)

An Answer to the Geneva Ballad ([London], 1674)

The Arraignment, Tryal and Condemnation of Stephen Colledge for High-Treason, In Conspiring the Death of the King, the Levying of War, and the Subversion of the Government (Dublin, 1681)

[Aylofffe, John], 'A Dialogue between Two Horses' (1676), Lord, George, *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714* (7 vols., New Haven, CT, 1963-75), i, p. 274-283

[Bagshaw, Edward], *A Letter unto a Person of Honour and Quality, Containing some Animadversions Upon the Bishop of Worcester's Letter* (London, [1662])

Baxter, Richard, *His Account To his dearly beloved, the Inhabitants of Kidderminster, Of the causes of his being forbidden by the Bishop of Worcester to preach within his Diocess* (London, 1662)

Baxter, Richard, *Catholick Theologie: Plan, Pure, Peaceable for Pacification Of the Dogmatical Word-Warriours* (London, 1675)

Baxter, Richard, *Farewel Sermon, Prepared to have been Preached to his Hearers at Kidderminster At his departure, but forbidden* (London, 1683)

Baxter, Richard, *The True History of Councils Enlarged and Defended* (London, 1682)

Baxter, Richard, *Church Concord* (London, 1691)

Beaton, Nehemiah, *No Treason to Say, Kings are Gods Subjects* (London, 1661)

Behn, Aphra, *Sir Patient Fancy: A Comedy* (London, 1678)

[Butler, Samuel], *A Turn-Coat of the Times, Who doth by experience profess and protest, That of all his professions, a Turn-Coat's the best. Tune is, The King's Delight, Or, True Love is a Gift for a Queen* ([London, 1663])

[Butler, Samuel], *Bloody News from Chelmsford: Or, A Proper New Ballad, Containing A true and perfect Relation of a most barbarous Murder committed upon the Body of a Country Curate, who died of a great Wound given him in the bottom of his Belly, by a most Cruel Country-fellow, for being too familiar with his Wife. To the Tune of Chevy Chase* (Oxford, 1663)

[Butler, Samuel], *The Geneva Ballad. To the Tune of 48* ([London], 1674)

- [Butler, Samuel], *Another Ballad: Called the Libertines Lampoone: Or, the Curvets of Conscience* (London, 1674)
- The Cavaleers Complaint. To the Tune of, I tell Thee Dick, &c.* (London, 1661)
- The Cavaleers Letany* (London, 1661)
- The Cavaliers Comfort; Or, Long lookt for will come at last* (London, [1662])
- The City's Remonstrance and Adresse to the King's Most Excellent Majesty* (London, 1661)
- [Cockayne, George, Danvers, Henry, and Jessey, Henry], *Mirabilis Annus, Or, The year of Prodigies and Wonders* ([London], 1661)
- [Cockayne, George, Danvers, Henry, and Jessey, Henry], *Mirabilis Annus; Or, The Second Year Of Prodigies* ([London], 1661)
- [Cockayne, George, Danvers, Henry, and Jessey, Henry], *Mirabilis Annus Secundus: Or, the Second Part Of the Second Years Prodigies* ([London], 1662)
- [Colledge, Stephen], *A Ra-ree Show. To the Tune of I am a Senceless Thing* (London, 1681)
- [Colledge, Stephen], *A Satyr Against Injustice; Or, Sc[rog]gs upon Sc[rog]gs (s. l., [1681])*
- [Colledge, Stephen], *A true Copy of the dying Words of Mr. Stephen Colledge* (London, 1681)
- Cook[e], John, *King Charls his Case: Or, an Appeal To all Rational Men, Concerning His Tryal at the High Court of Justice* (London, 1649)
- C[oo]per, A[ndrew], *Stratologia, Or, The History of the English Civil Warrs, In English Verse* (London, 166[0])
- [Cooper, Anthony Ashley], *A Letter From a Person of Quality, To His Friend In the Country (s. l., 1675)*
- [Cooper, Anthony Ashley], *Two Seasonable Discourses Concerning this present Parliament* (Oxford, 1675)
- A Countrey Song, Intituled, The Restoration* ([London], 1661)
- Covenant-Renouncers, Desperate-Apostates* ([London], 1665)
- [Dean, James], *Treason Unmasqued, Or Truth brought to Light. To a Pleasant New Tune, &c.* (London, 1681)

[Denham, John], *The True Presbyterian Without Disguise: Or, A Character of a Presbyterians Wayes and Actions, in Verse* (London, 1661)

A Door of Hope: Or, A Call and Declaration for the gathering together of the first ripe fruits unto the Standard of our Lord, King Jesus ([London], 1661)

[D'Urfey, Thomas], *The Whig Rampant: Or, Exaltation. Being a Pleasant New Song of 82. To a New Tune of, Hey Boys up go We* (London, 1682)

Eaton, Nathaniel, *De Fastis Anglicis, Sive Calendarium Sacrum* (London, 1661)

F[ox], G[eorge], and H[ookes], E[llis], *The Arraignment of Popery* (London, 1667)

A Full Relation Or Dialogue Between a Loyallist and a converted Phanattick since the time of the late Rebellion ([London], 1660)

The Grand Rebels Detected, Or, The Presbyter Unmasked (London, 1660)

[Hill, William], *A Brief narrative of that Stupendious Tragedie Late intended to be Acted by the Satanical Saints of these Reforming Times* (London, 1663)

An Impartial Account of the Nature and Tendency of the Late Addresses (London, 1681)

Intelligencer

[Jordan, Thomas], *Here is some comfort for Poor Cavaleeres* (London, [1661])

Jenkyn, William, *Exodus, Or, The Decease of Holy Men and Ministers, Consider'd in The Nature, Certainty, Causes, and Improvement thereof: A Sermon Preach't Sept. 12. 1675: By occasion of the much lamented Death of that Learned and Reverend Minister of Christ, Dr. Lazarus Seaman, Late Pastor of Alhallows-Bread-Street, London* (London, 1675)

[Jones, Roger], *Mene Tekel; Or, The Downfal of Tyranny* (s. l., 1663)

The Joviall Crew, Or, Beggars-Bush (London, [1661-1663])

Keble, Joseph, *Reports in the Court of the Kings Bench at Westminster from the XII to the XXX Year of the Reign of our Late Sovereign Lord King Charles II* (London, 1685)

Kingdomes Intelligencer

The Lamentation (London, 1679)

Langley, William, *The Death of Charles The First Lamented, With the Restauration of Charles The Second Congratulated: Delivered in a Speech, at the Proclaming of our gracious King, at his Town of Wellington, May 17. 1660* (London, 1660)

The Last Speeches of the Two Ministers Mr. John King and Mr. John Kid, At the Place of Execution at Edenburgh On the 14th day of August, 1679 (s. l., 1680)

[Leigh, Richard], *The Transproser Rehears'd: Or The Fifth Act of Mr. Bayes's Play* (Oxford, 1673)

[L'Estrange, Roger], *A Caveat to the Cavaliers* (London, 1661)

L'Estrange, Roger, *Considerations and Proposals In Order to the Regulation of the Press: Together with Diverse Instances of Treasonous, and Seditious Pamphlets, Proving the Necessity thereof* (London, 1663)

A Letter from Mr. Edward Whitaker to the Protestant Joyner Upon his Bill being sent to Oxford (London, 1681)

A Letter Written from the Tower by Mr. Stephen Colledge (the Protestant-Joyner) To Dick Janeways Wife (London, 1681)

A Lively Pourtraict of our New-Cavaliers, Commonly Called Presbyterians (London, 1661)

London Gazette

The Long Parliament Revived: Or, An Act for Continuation, and the Not Dissolving the Long Parliament (call'd by King Charles the First, in the Year 1640,) but by an Act of Parliament (London, 1660)

[Marvell, Andrew], *The Rehearsal Transpros'd; Or, Animadversions Upon a late Book, Intituled, A Preface Shewing What Grounds there are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery* (London, 1672)

Mews, Peter, *Whereas Tuesday next, being the Thirtieth day of this instant January* (Oxford, 1672)

A Narrative of the Apprehending, Commitment, Arraignment, Condemnation, and Execution of John James, Who Suffered at Tiburne, Novemb. the 26th, 1661 (London, 1662)

[Needham, Marchamont], *The Cities Feast to the Lord Protector. To the Tune of Cooke Lorrell* (London, 1661)

The newv Projector Or the Privileged Cheat (London, [1662])

Ogilby, John, *The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majestie Charles II, in His Passage through the City of London to his Coronation* (London, 1662)

Overton, Robert, *Governments Gaine & Goodnesse &c*, Taft, Barbara, "They that pursew perfection on earth...": the political progress of Robert Overton', *Gentles*,

Ian, Morrill, John, and Worden, Blair (eds.), *Soldiers, writers and statesmen of the English Revolution* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 286-303

Oxonii Lachrymae, Rachell weeping for her Children, Or, a Patheticall Relation of the present Grievances of the late famous University of Oxford (London, 1649)

P[enn], W[illiam], *The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience Once more Debated & Defended* ([London], 1670)

[Phillips, John], *New News from Tory-Land and Tantivy-Shire* (London, 1682)

[Phillips, John], *Speculum Crape-Gownorum, The Second Part. Or a Continuation of Observations and Reflections Upon the Late Sermons Of some that would be thought Goliah's For the Church of England* (London, 1682)

Reeve, Thomas, *A Dead Man Speaking Or the Famous memory of King Charles the I. Delivered in a Sermon upon the 30th of Ian: last, in the Parish Church of Waltham Abbey* (London, 1661)

[Richardson, Edward], 'A Door of Hope opened in the Valley of Achor, for the Mourners of Sion out of the North', Price, Evan, *Eye-salve for England, Or, The Grand Trappan Detected* (London, 1667), pp. 4-8

Scroggs, William, *The Lord Chief Justice Scroggs his Speech in the King-Bench The first day of this present Michaelmas Term 1679* (London, 1679)

[Sidney, Algernon], *The Very Copy of a Paper Delivered to the Sheriffs Upon the Scaffold on Tower-Hill, on Friday Decemb. 7, 1683 by Algernon Sidney, Esq.; Before his Execution there* (London, 1683)

The Speeches and Prayers of John Barkstead, John Okey, and Miles Corbet (London, 1662)

The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the late King's Judges ([London], 1660)

Stone, Samuel, *Deceivers Deceiv'd: Or, The Mistakes of Wickedness In Sundry Erroneous and Deceitful Principles, practices in our late fatal Times, and suspected still in the Reasonings of unquiet Spirits* (London, 1661)

[Stuart, Charles], *By the King. A Proclamation, For Observation of the Thirtieth day of January as a day of Fast and Humiliation according to the late Act of Parliament for that purpose* (London 1661)

The Substance of What Sr. Henry Vane Intended To have Spoken upon the Scaffold, on Tower-Hill, At the Time of Execution, Being the 14th. Of June, 1662 (London, 1662)

Sylvester, Matthew (ed.), *Reliquiae Baxterianae: Or, Mr. Richard Baxters Narrative of The most Memorable Passages of his Life and Times* (London, 1696)

[Taylor, John], *A Seasonable Lecture, Or a most learned Oration* (London, 1642)

Taylor, John, *A Svvarme of Sectaries, and Schismatics, Wherein is discovered the strange preaching (or prating) of such as are by their trades Coblers, Tinkers, Pedlers, Weavers, Sowgelders, and Chymney-Sweepers* (s. l., 1641)

Tillam, Thomas, *The Temple Of Lively Stones* (London, 1660)

[Tomkins, Thomas], *The Rebels Plea, Or, Mr. Baxters judgement, Concerning the late Wars* (London, 1660)

A Treatise of the Execution of Justice (s. l., 1663)

The Tryal of Sir Henry Vane, Kt. At the Kings Bench, Westminster, June the 2d. and 6th. 1662 ... Also his Speech and Prayer, &c. on the Scaffold (s. l., 1662)

W., J., *Some Remarks Upon a Speech Made to the Grand Jury For the County of Middlesex, Concerning the Execution of Penalties upon the Churches of Christ, Which worship God in Meeting-Houses, For their doing* (London, 1682)

[Wallis, Ralph], *Rome for good News, Or, Good News from Rome: In a Dialogue between a Seminary Priest, and a Supposed Protestant, at large* (London, [1662])

[Wallis, Ralph], *Room for the Cobler of Gloucester and his Wife* (s. l., 1668)

[Wharton, George], *Select and choice Poems Collected out of the Labours of Captain George Wharton* (London, 1661)

The Wheel of Time turning Round to the Good Old VVay; Or, The Good Old Cause Vindicated ([London], 1661)

[Wilde, Robert], *The Recantation of a Penitent Proteus, Or the Changling: As it was Acted with good Applause in St. Maries in Cambridge, and St. Pauls in London, 1663* (London, 1663)

The Wiltshire Ballad: Or, A New Song Compos'd by an Old Cavalier (London, 1680)

[Wither, George], *Vox & Lacrimae Anglorum: Or, The True English-mens Complaints to their Representatives in Parliament* (s. l., 1668)

Your humble Servant Madam: Being The flattering Courtier. Or, The Cheating Lover (London, [1662])

III – Primary Material: Printed (Post-1700)

Allen, D. H. (ed.), *Essex Quarter Sessions Order Book, 1652-1661* (Chelmsford, 1974)

Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714 (4 vols., Oxford and London, 1891), i

Andrews, Frances (ed.), *Depositions from the Castle of York, relating to offences committed in the Northern Counties in the seventeenth century* (London, 1861)

Atkinson, J. C. (ed.), *Quarter Sessions Records [North Riding of Yorkshire]* (9 vols., London, 1888), vi

Calendar of State Papers: Preserved in the Public Record Office, Domestic Series, James II, Volume II, January, 1686-May, 1687 (London, 1964)

The Church Book of Bunyan Meeting, 1650-1821 (London, 1928)

Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England. From the Norman Conquest, in 1066 to the Year 1803 (36 vols., London, 1809), v

Cockburn, J. S. (ed.), *Calendar of Assize Records: Kent Indictments, Charles II, 1660-1675* (London, 1995)

Cockburn, J. S. (ed.), *Calendar of Assize Records: Kent Indictments, Charles II, 1676-1688* (London, 1997)

Cunnington, B. Howard, (ed.), *Records of the County of Wilts, being extracts from the quarter sessions great rolls of the seventeenth century* (Devizes, 1932)

De la Bédoyère, Guy (ed.), *The Diary of John Evelyn* (Woodbridge, 1995)

Farewell Sermons of Some of the Most Eminent of the Nonconformist Ministers Delivered at the Period of their Ejection by the Act of Uniformity in the Year 1662 (London, 1816)

Foster, Joseph (ed.), *London Marriage Licences, 1521-1869* (London, 1887)

Gibson, Jeremy (ed.), *Oxfordshire and North Berkshire Protestation Returns and Tax Assessments, 1641-42* (Oxford, 1994)

Glines, Elsa F. (ed.), *Undaunted Zeal: The Letters of Margaret Fell* (Richmond, IN, 2003)

Grainger, Francis (ed.), 'James Jackson's Diary, 1650-1683', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, New Series, Volume XXI* (Kendal, 1921), pp. 96-129

Great British Record Commission, *Statutes of the Realm: From Original Records, etc.* (11 vols., London, 1819), v

- Green, Mary Anne Everett, Daniell, F. H. Blackburne, and Bickley, Francis (eds.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, May 1660-Feb. 1685* (28 vols., London, 1860-1939)
- Hardy, W. J., (ed.), *Hertford County Records, Notes and Extracts from the Sessions Rolls, 1581-1698* (4 vols., Hertford, 1905), i
- Hayden, Roger (ed.), *The Records of a Church of Christ in Bristol, 1640-1687* (Gateshead, 1974)
- Hinds, A. B. (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, 1659-1661* (38 vols., London, 1931), xxxii
- Hines, Jr., Philip (ed.), *Newdigate Newsletters: Numbers 1 through 2100 (3 January 1673/4 through June 1692)*, (s. l., 1994)
- The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons from the Restoration to the Present Time* (14 vols., London, 1742), i
- Hoad, Margaret J., and Grime, Robert P., (eds.), *Portsmouth Record Series: Borough Sessions Papers, 1653-1688: A Calendar* (Chichester, 1971)
- Hobson, M. G., and Salter, H. E. (eds.), *Oxford Council Acts, 1626-1665* (Oxford, 1933), xcv
- Hodgson, John Crawford (ed.), *Six North Country Diaries* (Durham, 1910)
- Hopkins, Pamela (ed.), *The Diary of John Jackson: Sometime Macebearer in Seventeenth Century Beverley* (Beverley, 1991)
- Howard, A. J. (ed.), *The Devon Protestation Returns 1641* (s. l., 1973)
- Howell, T. B. (ed.), *A complete collection of state trials and proceedings for high treason and other crimes and misdemeanors from the earliest period to the year 1783* (12 vols., London, 1816), v-viii
- The Indictment, Arraignment, Tryal, and Judgment, at large, Of Twenty-Nine Regicides, The Murderers Of His Most Sacred Majesty King Charles I, Of Glorious Memory* (London, 1730)
- Jackson, C. (ed.), *Yorkshire Diaries and Autobiographies in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (2 vols., Durham, 1877), i
- Jeaffreson, J. C., *Middlesex County Records* (4 vols., London, 1886-1892), iii, iv
- Keeble, N. H., and Nuttall, Geoffrey F. (eds.), *Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter* (2 vols., Oxford, 1991), ii

Kennet, White, *A Register and Chronicle, Ecclesiastical and Civil* (London, 1728)

Kenyon, J. P. (ed.), *The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge, 1966)

Kidson, Ruth M. (ed.), 'Active Parliamentarians during the Civil Wars', Staffordshire Record Society (eds.), *Collections for a History of Staffordshire, Fourth Series, Vol. II* (Shrewsbury, 1958), pp. 43-70

Latham, Robert, and Matthews, William (eds.), *The Diary of Samuel Pepys: A New and Complete Transcription* (11 vols., London, 1970-1983)

Lee, Matthew Henry (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry of Broad Oak, Flintshire, 1631-1696* (London, 1882)

Lord, George (ed.), *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714* (7 vols., New Haven, CT, 1963-75)

Luttrell, Narcissus, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714* (6 vols., Oxford, 1857), i

Macfarlane, Alan (ed.), *The Diary of Ralph Josselin, 1616-1683* (Oxford, 1991)

MacRay, W. Dunn, and Routledge, F. J. (eds.), *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers preserved in the Bodleian Library* (5 vols., Oxford, 1872-1970), v

Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 8:4 (Boston, MA, 1868)

Matthews, A. G., *Calamy Revised: Being a Revision of Edmund Calamy's Account of the Ministers and Others Ejected and Silenced, 1660-2* (Oxford, 1934)

Matthews, William, (ed.), *Charles II's Escape from Worcester: A Collection of Narratives Assembled by Pepys* (Berkeley, CA, 1966)

Moore, Susan Hardman (ed.), *The Diary of Thomas Larkham, 1647-1669* (Woodbridge, 2011)

Rosewell, S., *The arraignment and tryal of the late Rev. Mr Thomas Rosewell, for high-treason ... to which is prefixed an account of his life and death* (s. l., 1718)

Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland: Preserved at Welbeck Abbey* (10 vols., London, 1891-1931), ii

Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections* (8 vols., London, 1901-1913), i

Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Reginald Rawdon Hastings, Esq., of the Manor house, Ashby de la Zouche* (4 vols., London, 1928-47), ii

Sharrock, Roger, and Forrest, James F. (eds.), *John Bunyan, The Holy War made by Shaddai upon Diabolus* (Oxford, 1980)

Shaw, William A. (ed.), *Calendar of Treasury Books: Preserved in the Public Record Office* (32 vols., London, 1904-1957)

Spalding, Ruth, (ed.), *The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605-1675* (Oxford, 1990)

Spurr, John (ed.) *The Entering Book of Roger Morrice, 1677-1671: Volume II, The Reign of Charles II, 1677-1685*, (7 vols., Woodbridge, 2007)

Thomson, Sheila D., *The Book of Examinations and Depositions before the Mayor and Justices of Southampton 1648-1663* (Southampton, 1994)

Tibbutt, H. G. (ed.), *The Letter Books of Sir Samuel Luke, 1644-45, Parliamentary Governor of Newport Pagnell*, (London, 1963)

Turner, J. Horsfall (ed.), *The Rev. Oliver Heywood, B.A., 1630-1702; His Autobiography, Diaries, Anecdote and Event Books* (4 vols., Bingley, 1883), iii

Turner, James, *Memoirs of his own life and times* (Edinburgh, 1829)

Underhill, Edward Bean (ed.), *Records of the Churches of Christ gathered at Fenstanton, Warboys, and Hexham. 1644-1720* (London, 1854)

Winstanley, Ian G. (ed.), *The Diary of Roger Lowe of Ashton-in-Makerfield, Lancashire. 1663-1678* (Ashton-in-Makerfield, 1994)

Wood, Anthony, *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary, of Oxford, 1632-1695* (5 vols., Oxford, 1891)

Wood, Anthony, *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops who have had their Education in the University of Oxford* (4 vols., London, 1813-1820)

Worden, A. B. (ed.), *Edmund Ludlow, A Voyce from the Watch Tower, Part Five: 1660-1662* (London, 1978)

IV – Secondary Material

Achinstein, Sharon, *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge, 2003)

Adams, Beverley, 'The experience of defeat revisited: suffering, identity and the politics of obedience among Hertford Quakers, 1655-65', Durston, Christopher, and Maltby, Judith (eds.), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 249-268

Allen, David, 'Political Clubs in Restoration London', *The Historical Journal*, 19:3 (1976), pp. 561-580

Althusser, Louis, *On Ideology* (London, 1971)

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1991)

Appleby, David J., *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, polemic and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester, 2007)

Appleby, David J., 'The Restoration county community: a post-conflict culture', Eales, Jacqueline, and Hopper, Andrew (eds.), *The County Community in Seventeenth-Century England and Wales* (Hatfield, 2012), pp. 100-124

Appleby, David J., 'Veteran Politics in Restoration England, 1660-1670', *The Seventeenth Century*, 28:3 (2013), pp. 323-342

Archer, Ian W., 'Social networks in Restoration London: the evidence of Samuel Pepys's diary', Shepard, Alexandra, and Withington, Phil (eds.), *Communities in early modern England: Networks, place, rhetoric* (Manchester, 2000)

Ashcraft, Richard, *Revolutionary Politics & Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (Princeton, NJ, 1986)

Assmann, Aleida, 'Four Formats of Memory: From Individual to Collective Constructions of the Past', Emden, Christian, and Midgley, David, (eds.), *Cultural Memory and Historical Consciousness in the German-Speaking World Since 1500: Papers from the Conference 'The Fragile Tradition', Cambridge 2002* (Oxford, 2004), i

Assmann, Jan, 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', trans. by Czaplika, John, *New German Critique*, 65 (Spring-Summer, 1995), pp. 125-133

Assmann, Jan, trans. by Livingstone, Rodney, *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies* (Stanford, CA, 2006)

Atherton, Ian, 'Remembering (and Forgetting) Fairfax's Battlefields', Andrew Hopper and Philip Major (eds.), *England's Fortress: New Perspectives on Thomas, 3rd Lord Fairfax* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 95-119

Barber, Sarah, 'The formation of cultural attitudes: the example of the three kingdoms in the 1650s', Macinnes, Allan I., and Ohlmeyer, Jane, (eds.), *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbours* (Dublin, 2002), pp. 169-168

Bardle, Stephen, *The Literary Underground in the 1660s: Andrew Marvell, George Wither, Ralph Wallis, and the World of Restoration Satire and Pamphleteering* (Oxford, 2012)

Barry, Jonathan, 'Popular Culture in Seventeenth-Century Bristol', Reay, Barry (ed.), *Popular Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (London, 1985)

Beaver, Dan, 'Behemoth, or the civil war and revolution, in English parish communities 1641-82', Tyacke, Nicholas (ed.), *The English Revolution c. 1590-1720: Politics, Religion and Communities* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 129-149

Beiner, Guy, *Remembering the Year of the French: Irish Folk History and Social Memory* (Madison, WI, 2007)

Bellah, Robert N., Madsen, Richard, Sullivan, William M., Swidler, Ann, and Tipton, Steven M., *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (Berkeley, CA, 1985)

Besse, Joseph, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers. Selections* (York, 2000)

Black, J. William, 'From Martin Bucer to Richard Baxter: "Discipline" and Reformation in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century England', *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, 70:4 (December 2001), pp. 644-673

Bodnar, John, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ, 1992)

Booth, W. James, *Communities of Memory: On Witness, Identity, and Justice* (Ithaca, NY, 2006)

Bourdieu, Pierre, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge, 1977)

Boym, Svetlana, 'Nostalgia and Its Discontents', *Hedgehog Review*, 9:2 (2007), pp. 7-18

Bowen, Lloyd 'Seditious speech and popular royalism, 1649-60', McElligott, Jason, and Smith, David L. (eds.) *Royalists and Royalism during Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 44-66

Braddick, Michael J., *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (London, 2008)

Braddick, Michael J., and Walter, John (eds.), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001)

Braddick, Michael J., and Walter, John (eds.), 'Introduction. Grids of power: order, hierarchy and subordination in early modern society', Braddick, Michael J., and Walter, John (eds.), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 1-42

Burgess, Glenn, 'Radicalism and the English Revolution', Burgess, Glenn, and Festein, Matthew (eds.), *English Radicalism, 1550-1850* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 62-86

Burke, Peter, 'History as Social Memory', Butler, Thomas (ed.), *Memory: History, Culture and the Mind* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 97-113

Bywaters, David, 'Representations of the Interregnum and Restoration in English Drama of the Early 1660s', *Review of English Studies*, 60:244 (2009), pp. 255-270

Capp, Bernard, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Millenarianism* (London, 1972)

Carlton, Charles, *Going to the Wars: The Experience of the British Civil Wars, 1638-1651* (London, 1992)

Cavalli, Alessandro, 'Memory and Identity: How Memory Is Reconstructed after Catastrophic Events', Rösen, Jörn (ed.), *Meaning and Representation in History* (New York, NY, 2006), pp. 169-182

Champion, Justin, "'My kingdom is not of this world": the politics of religion after the Revolution', Tyacke, Nicholas (ed.), *The English Revolution c. 1590-1720: Politics, Religion and Communities* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 185-202.

Clark, J. C. D., *Revolution and Rebellion: State and society in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (Cambridge, 1986)

Clarke, Elizabeth, 'Re-reading the Exclusion Crisis', *The Seventeenth Century*, 21:1 (2006), pp. 141-159

Clifton, Robin, *The Last Popular Rebellion: The Western Rising of 1685* (London, 1984)

Coffey, John, and Lim, Paul C. H. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008)

Cogswell, Thomas, 'The Return of the "Deade Alive": The Earl of Bristol and Dr Eglisham in the Parliament of 1626 and in Caroline Political Culture', *The English Historical Review*, 128:532 (June, 2013), pp. 535-570

Colledge, J. J., *Ships of the Royal Navy* (2 vols., London, 1969), i

Collins, Jeffrey 'Restoration Anti-Catholicism: A Prejudice in Motion', Prior, Charles W.A., and Burgess, Glenn (eds.), *England's Wars of Religion Revisited* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 281-306

Collinson, Patrick, 'Antipuritanism', Coffey, John, and Lim, Paul C. H. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 19-33

Confino, Alon, 'Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method', *The American Historical Review*, 102:5 (December 1997), pp. 1386-1403

Connerton, Paul, *How societies remember* (Cambridge, 1989)

Cooper, Tim, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot, 2001)

Cooper, Tim, *John Owen, Richard Baxter and the Formation of Nonconformity* (Farnham, 2011)

Cox, J. Charles, *Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals. As Illustrated by the Records of the Quarter Sessions of the County of Derby, From Queen Elizabeth to Queen Victoria* (2 vols., London, 1890), ii

Cressy, David, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London, 1989)

Cressy, David, 'Remembrances of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographies of the 1640s', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68:1-2 (March 2005), pp. 257-268

Cressy, David, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640-1642*, (Oxford, 2006)

Cressy, David, *Dangerous Talk: Scandalous, Seditious, and Treasonable Speech in Pre-Modern England* (Oxford, 2010)

Cruden, Robert Peirce, *The History of the Town of Gravesend in the County of Kent, and of the Port of London* (London, 1843)

Cubitt, Geoffrey, *History and Memory* (Manchester, 2007)

Davis, David J., *Seeing Faith, Printing Pictures: Religious Identity during the English Reformation* (Leiden, 2013)

Davis, Natalie Zemon, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Cambridge, 1988)

De Certeau, Michel, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley, CA, 1984)

De Krey, Gary S. 'London Radicals and Revolutionary Politics, 1675-1683', Harris, Tim, Seward, Paul and Goldie, Mark (eds.), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 133-162

De Krey, Gary S. 'Reformation in the Restoration Crisis, 1679-1682', Hamilton, Donna B., and Strier, Richard (eds.), *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540-1688* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 231-252

De Krey, Gary S., 'Radicals, reformers, and republicans: academic language and political discourse in Restoration London,' Houston, Alan, and Pincus, Steve

(eds.), *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 71-99

De Krey, Gary S., *London and the Restoration, 1659-1683* (Cambridge, 2005)

De Krey, Gary S., *Restoration and Revolution in Britain: A Political History of the Era of Charles II and the Glorious Revolution* (Basingstoke, 2007)

Donagan, Barbara, 'Atrocity, War Crime and Treason in the English Civil War', *The American Historical Review*, 99:4 (October, 1994), pp. 1137-1166

Dixon, Rosemary, 'Sermons in Print, 1660-1700' McCullough, Peter, Adlington, Hugh, and Rhatigan, Emma (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 460-479

Duffy, Eamon, 'The Long Reformation: Catholicism, Protestantism and the multitude', Tyacke, Nicholas (ed.), *England's Long Reformation, 1500-1800* (London, 1998), pp. 33-70

Durston, Christopher, "'For the Better Humiliation of the People": Public Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving During the English Revolution', *The Seventeenth Century*, 7:2 (1992), pp. 129-149

Esser, Raingard, *The Politics of Memory: The Writing of Partition in the Seventeenth-Century Low Countries* (Leiden, 2012)

Fentress, James, and Wickham, Chris, *Social Memory* (Oxford, 1988)

Firth, Sir Charles, and Davies, Godfrey, *Regimental History of Cromwell's Army* (2 vols., Oxford, 1940)

Fleming, Michael, 'Phillippe Golledge: Another Oxford Musical Instrument Dealer?', *The Galpin Society Journal*, 61 (April 2008)

Foucault, Michel 'An Interview with Michel Foucault', trans. by Jordin, Martin, *Radical Philosophy*, 11 (Summer 1975), pp. 24-29

Freist, Dagmar, *Governed by Opinion: Politics, Religion and the Dynamics of Communication in Stuart London, 1637-1645* (London, 1997)

Gallagher, Gary W., 'Introduction' in Gallagher, Gary W., and Nolan, Alan T. (eds.), *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History* (Bloomington, IN, 2000)

Geertz, Clifford, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz* (New York, NY, 1973)

Gentles, Ian, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638-1652* (Abingdon, 2007)

Gilbert, Davies, *Parochial History of Cornwall* (4 vols., London, 1838), iii

Gille, Zsuzsa, 'Postscript', Todorova, Maria, and Gille, Zsuzsa (eds.), *Post-Communist Nostalgia* (New York City, NY, 2010), pp. 279-289

Glăveanu, Vlad and Yamamoto, Koji, 'Bridging History and Social Psychology: What, How and Why', *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46:4 (2012), pp. 431-439

Glover, Stephen, and Noble, Thomas (eds.), *The History of the County of Derby* (2 vols., Derby, 1829), i

Goffman, Erving, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Harmondsworth, 1971)

Gouk, P. M., 'Music', Tyacke, Nicholas (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV: Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 621-640

Greaves, Richard L. 'The Tangled Careers of Two Stuart Radicals: Henry and Robert Danvers', *The Baptist Quarterly*, 29:1 (January 1981), pp. 32-43

Greaves, Richard L., *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663* (Oxford, 1986)

Greaves, Richard L., *Enemies Under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664-1677* (Stanford, CA, 1990)

Greaves, Richard L., *John Bunyan and English Nonconformity* (London, 1992)

Greaves, Richard L., *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688-1689* (Stanford, CA, 1992)

Greaves, Richard L. and Zaller, Robert (eds.), *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century* (3 vols., Brighton, 1983)

Greenberg, Janelle, and Martin, Laura, 'Politics and Memory: Shanborn's Case and the Role of the Norman Conquest in Stuart Political Thought', Nenner, Howard (ed.), *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain: Essays Presented to Lois Green Schworer* (Rochester, NY, 1997)

Griffiths, Paul, Fox, Adam, and Hindle, Steve, (eds.), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1996)

Griffiths, Paul, Fox, Adam, and Hindle, Steve, 'Introduction', Griffiths, Paul, Fox, Adam, and Hindle, Steve, (eds.), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 1-9

Haigh, Christopher, *English Reformations* (Oxford, 1993)

Halliday, Paul D., *Dismembering the Body Politic: Partisan Politics in England's Towns, 1650-1730* (Cambridge, 1998)

- Hanshall, J. H., *The history of the county palatine of Chester* (s. l., 1823)
- Harris, Tim, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and politics from the Restoration until the exclusion crisis* (Cambridge, 1987)
- Harris, Tim, 'The problem of "popular political culture" in seventeenth-century London', *History of European Ideas*, 10:1 (1989), pp. 43-58
- Harris, Tim, 'Party Turns? Or, Whigs and Tories Get Off Scott Free', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 25:4 (Winter 1993), pp. 581-590
- Harris, Tim, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715* (London, 1993)
- Harris, Tim, 'The Legacy of the English Civil War: Rethinking the Revolution', *The European Legacy*, 5:4 (2000), pp. 501-514
- Harris, Tim, 'Understanding popular politics in Restoration Britain', Houston, Alan, and Pincus, Steve (eds.), *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 125-153
- Harris, Tim, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms* (London, 2005)
- Harris, Tim, Seward, Paul and Goldie, Mark (eds.), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford, 1990)
- Hebdige, Dick, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (London, 1979)
- Henning, Basil D. (ed.), *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1660-1690* (3 vols., London, 1983)
- Hill, Christopher, *God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell* (Harmondsworth, 1972)
- Hill, Christopher, *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution* (London, 1980)
- Hill, Christopher, *Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (London, 1984)
- Hill, Christopher, *A Turbulent, Seditious and Factious People: John Bunyan and his Church, 1628-1688* (Oxford, 1988)
- Hill, Christopher, 'Republicanism after the Restoration', Hill, Christopher, *England's Turning Point: Essays on 17th Century English History* (London, 1998), pp. 61-73
- Hirsch, Marianne, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust* (New York City, NY, 2012)

Hirst, Derek, 'Remembering a Hero: Lucy Hutchinson's *Memoirs of her Husband*', *English Historical Review*, 119 (2004), pp. 682-91

Hobsbawm, Eric, and Ranger, Terence (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983)

Hodgkin, Katharine, and Radstone, Susannah, 'Introduction: Contested pasts', Hodgkin, Katharine, and Radstone, Susannah (eds.), *Memory, History, Nation: Contested Pasts* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2003), pp. 1-21

Hopper, Andrew, 'The Farnley Wood Plot and the Memory of the Civil Wars in Yorkshire', *The Historical Journal*, 45:2 (2002), pp. 281-303

Hopper, Andrew *'Black Tom': Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution* (Manchester, 2007)

Hopper, Andrew, *Turncoats and Renegades: Changing Sides during the English Civil Wars* (Oxford, 2012)

Houston, Alan, and Pincus, Steve (eds.), *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001)

Hughes, Ann, 'A "lunatick revolter from loyalty": the Death of Rowland Wilson and the English Revolution', *History Workshop Journal*, 61 (Spring, 2006), pp. 192-204

Hughes, Ann, 'Men, the "public" and the "private" in the English Revolution', Lake, Peter, and Pincus, Steven (eds.), *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 191-212

Hughes, Ann, *Gender and the English Revolution* (Abingdon, 2012)

Hutton, Ronald, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford, 1985)

Hutton, Ronald, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford, 1989)

Irwin-Zarecka, Iwona, *Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1994)

Jenkins, Philip, "'The Old Leaven": the Welsh Roundheads after 1660', *The Historical Journal*, 24:4 (1981), pp. 807-823

Jenkinson, Matthew, *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II, 1660-1685* (Woodbridge, 2010)

Johns, Adrian, 'Coleman Street', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 71:1 (March 2008), pp. 33-54

Johnson, Nuala C., 'The contours of memory in post-conflict societies: enacting public remembrance of the bomb in Omagh, Northern Ireland', *Cultural Geographies*, 19:2 (Nov. 2011), pp. 237-258

Johnston, Warren, *Revelation restored: the apocalypse in later seventeenth-century England* (Woodbridge, 2011)

Jones, J. R., *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-1683* (London, 1961)

Jovchelovitch, Sandra, 'Narrative, Memory and Social Representations: A Conversation Between History and Social Psychology', *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46:4 (2012), pp. 440-456

Kansteiner, Wulf, 'Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies', *History and Theory*, 41:2 (May 2002), pp. 179-197

Keblusek, Marika, 'Wine for Comfort: Drinking and the Royalist Experience', 1642-1660', Smyth, Adam, (ed.), *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 55-68

Keeble, N. H., *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Leicester, 1987)

Keeble, N. H., *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Malden, MA, 2002)

Kemp, Geoff, 'L'Estrange and the Publishing Sphere', Jason McElligott (ed.), *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 47-90

Kenyon, John, *The Popish Plot* (London, 1972)

King, Nicola, *Memory, Narrative, Identity: Remembering the Self* (Edinburgh, 2000)

Kishlansky, Mark, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (London, 1996)

Knights, Mark, 'London's "Monster" Petition of 1680', *The Historical Journal*, 36:1 (March 1993), pp. 39-67

Knights, Mark, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81* (Cambridge, 1994)

Knights, Mark, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2005)

Knights, Mark, 'The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of the Parties', *The Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 68:1-2 (March, 2005), pp. 353-373

Kuzmanić, Marja, 'Collective Memory and Social Identity: A social psychological exploration of the memories of the disintegration of former Yugoslavia', *Horizons of Psychology*, 17:2 (2008), pp. 5-26

Lacey, Andrew *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge, 2003)

Lake, Peter, 'Anti-popery: the Structure of a Prejudice', Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (eds.), *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642* (Harlow, 1989), pp. 72-106

Lake, Peter, and Pincus, Steven (eds.), *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England* (Manchester, 2007)

Lake, Peter, and Pincus, Steven, 'Rethinking the public sphere in early modern England', Lake, Peter, and Pincus, Steven (eds.), *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 1-30

Lamont, William M., *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution* (London, 1979)

Lamont, William M., 'Angels or Green Aprons? "Popular Toryism" in late 17th Century England', *History Workshop*, 27 (Spring 1989), pp. 188-193

Lamont, William M., 'Richard Baxter, "Popery" and the Origins of the English Civil War', *History*, 87:287 (2002), pp. 336-348

Lim, Paul Chang-Ha, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter's Puritan Ecclesiology in Its Seventeenth-Century Context* (Leiden, 2004)

Lindesmith, Alfred R., Strauss, Anselm L., Denzin, Norman K., *Social Psychology* (New Jersey, NY, 1988)

Lindley, Keith, *Fenland Riots and the English Revolution* (London, 1982)

Lindley, Keith, 'London and popular freedom in the 1640s', Richardson, R. C., and Ridden, G. M. (eds.), *Freedom and the English Revolution: Essays in history and literature* (Manchester, 1986), pp. 111-150

Macgillivray, Royce, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague, 1974)

Magliocco, David, *Samuel Pepys, the Restoration Public and the Politics of Publicity* (PhD Thesis, Queen Mary, University of London, 2014)

Major, Philip (ed.), *Literatures of exile in the English Revolution and its aftermath, 1640-1690* (Farnham, 2010)

Major, Philip, "'A poor exile stranger": William Goffe in New England', Major, Philip (ed.), *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640-1690* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 153-166

Manley, Gordon, 'Central England temperatures: monthly means 1659 to 1973', *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 100 (1974), pp. 289-405

Mannheim, Karl, 'The sociological problem of Generations', Kecskemeti, Paul (ed.), *Essays on the sociology of knowledge by Karl Mannheim* (London, 1952), pp. 286-320

Marshall, Alan, *Intelligence and Espionage in the Reign of Charles II, 1660-1685* (Cambridge, 1994)

Marshall, Peter, '(Re)defining the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies*, 48:3 (2009), pp. 564-586

Matthew, H. C. G., and Harrison, Brian (ed.), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: From the Earliest Times to the Year 2000* (61 vols., Oxford, 2004)

Mayers, Ruth E., *1659: The Crisis of the Commonwealth* (Woodbridge, 2004)

McCall, Fiona, *Baal's Priests: The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution* (Farnham, 2013)

McCall, Fiona, 'Children of Baal: Clergy Families and Their Memories of Sequestration during the English Civil War', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76:4 (Winter 2013), pp. 617-638

McElligott, Jason, and Smith, David L. (eds.), *Royalists and royalism during Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010)

McGlone, Robert E., 'Deciphering Memory: John Adams and the Authorship of the Declaration of Independence', *The Journal of American History*, 85:2 (September 1998), pp. 411-438

McShane Jones, Angela 'Roaring Royalists and Ranting Brewers: The Politicisation of Drink and Drunkenness in Political Broadside Ballads from 1640 to 1689', Smyth, Adam (ed.), *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 69-87

McShane, Angela, "'Ne sutor ultra crepidam": Political Cobblers and Broadside Ballads in Late Seventeenth Century England', Fumerton, Patricia, Guerrini, Anita, and McAbee, Kris (eds.) *Ballads and Broadsides in Britain, 1500-1800* (Farnham, 2010)

McShane, Angela, 'Broadsides and Ballads from the beginnings of print to 1660', Raymond, Joad, (ed.), *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture: Volume 1, Britain and Ireland to 1660* (Oxford, 2011)

McShane, Angela, *Political Broadside Ballads of Seventeenth-Century England: A Critical Bibliography* (London, 2011)

- Miller, John, *Popery and Politics in England: 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1973)
- Miller, John 'Public Opinion in Charles II's England', *History*, 80:260 (1995), pp. 359-381
- Miller, John, *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Harlow, 2000)
- Milton, Anthony, 'Censorship and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England', *Historical Journal*, 41 (1998), pp. 625-51
- Milton, R. 'The Unscholastic Statesman: Locke and the Earl of Shaftesbury', Spurr, John (ed.), *Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury, 1621-1683* (Farnham, 2011)
- Misztal, Barbara A., *Theories of Social Remembering* (Maidenhead, 2003)
- Monod, Paul Kléber, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1993)
- Montaño, John Patrick, *Courting the Moderates: Ideology, Propaganda, and the Emergence of the Party, 1660-1678* (Newark, DE, 2002)
- Morrill, John, 'Introduction', John Morrill (ed.), *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s* (London, 1992), pp. 8-14
- Morrill, John, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (Harlow, 1993)
- Morton, Adam, and Lewycky, Nadine, 'Introduction', Lewycky, Nadine, and Morton, Adam, (eds.), *Getting Along? Religious Identities and Confessional Relations in Early Modern England – Essays in Honour of Professor W. J. Sheils* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 1-27
- Mosse, George L., *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (New York, NY, 1990)
- Muddiman, J. G., 'Sidelights on Macaulay and the Rye House Plot', *Notes and Queries*, 161 (December 1931), pp. 417-418
- Munns, Jessica, 'Accounting for Providence: Contemporary Descriptions of the Restoration of Charles II', Doll, Dan and Munns, Jessica (eds.), *Recording and Reordering: Essays on the Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Diary and Journal* (Cranbury, NJ, 2006), pp. 102-121
- Nenner, Howard (ed.), *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain: Essays Presented to Lois Green Schworer* (Rochester, NY, 1997)
- Nenner, Howard, 'The Trial of the Regicides: Retribution and Treason in 1660', Nenner, Howard (ed.), *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain: Essays Presented to Lois Green Schworer* (Rochester, NY, 1997), pp. 21-42

Neufeld, Matthew, *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge, 2013)

Neufeld, Matthew, 'Introduction: Putting the Past to Work, Working through the Past', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76:4 (Winter 2013), pp. 483-497

Nichols, John Gough, *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica* (8 vols., London, 1843), viii

Norbrook, David, 'Memoirs and Oblivion: Lucy Hutchinson and the Restoration', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 75:2 (Summer 2012), pp. 233-282

Olick, Jeffrey K. and Robbins, Joyce, 'Social Memory Studies: From "Collective Memory" to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24 (1998), pp. 105-140

Olick, Jeffrey K., Vinitzky-Seroussi, Vered, and Levy, Daniel (eds.), *The Collective Memory Reader* (Oxford, 2011)

Ollard, Richard, *Pepys, A Biography* (London, 1974)

Orihel, Michelle, "'Treacherous Memories" of Regicide: The Calves-Head Club in the Age of Anne', *The Historian*, 73:3 (2011), pp. 435-462

Palmer, Alfred Neobard, *A History of the Older Nonconformity of Wrexham and its Neighbourhood* (Wrexham, 1889)

Passerini, Luisa, *Fascism in Popular Memory: The Cultural Experience of the Turin Working Class* (Cambridge, 1984)

Passerini, Luisa (ed.), *Memory and Totalitarianism* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2005)

Patterson, Annabel, *Reading between the Lines* (London, 1993)

Peacey, Jason, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004)

Peacey, Jason, "'The good old cause for which I suffer": The Life of a Regicide in Exile', Major, Philip (ed.), *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640-1690* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 167-180

Peacey, Jason, 'Radicalism Relocated: Royalist Politics and Pamphleteering of the Late 1640s', Hessayon, Ariel, and Finnegan, David (eds.), *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth Century English Radicalism in Context* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 51-68

Peacey, Jason 'Sir Edward Dering, Popularity, and the Public, 1640-1644', *The Historical Journal*, 54:4 (December 2011), pp. 955-83

Peacey, Jason, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution* (Cambridge, 2013)

Pearson, Roberta, 'Custer Loses Again: The Contestation over Commodified Public Memory', Ben-Amos, Dan, and Weissberg, Liliane (eds.), *Cultural Memory and the Construction of Identity* (Detroit, MI, 1999), pp. 176-201

Peters, Erin, *Commemoration, Oblivion, and Cultural Memories: Print Culture in Restoration England, 1658-1666* (PhD thesis, University of Worcester, forthcoming)

Peters, Kate, 'Quakers and Print Culture in the 1650s', Knoppers, Laura Lunger (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 567-589

Pincus, Steve, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven, CT, 2009)

Popular Memory Group, 'Popular memory: theory, politics, method', Johnson, Richard, McLennan, Gregor, Schwarz, Bill, and Sutton, David (eds.), *Making Histories: Studies in history-writing and politics* (London, 1982), pp. 205–252

Portelli, Alessandro, 'Uchronic Dreams: Working Class Memory and Possible Worlds', *Oral History*, 16:2 (Autumn 1988), pp. 46-56

Potter, Lois 'The royal martyr in the Restoration: national grief and national sin', Corns, Thomas N. (ed.), *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1999). pp. 240-248

Poynting, Sarah, 'Deciphering the King: Charles I's Letters to Jane Whorwood', *The Seventeenth Century*, 21:1 (2006), pp. 128–40

Preston, Paula Sampson, 'The Severed Head of Charles I of England: Its Use as a Political Stimulus', *Winterthur Portfolio*, Volume 6 (1970), p. 1-13

Price, F. G. Hilton, *The Signs of Old Lombard Street* (London, 1902)

Radstone, Susannah, and Hodgkin, Katharine, 'Regimes of Memory: An Introduction' Radstone, Susannah, and Hodgkin, Katharine (eds.), *Memory Cultures: Memory, Subjectivity and Recognition* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2003), pp. 1-22

Rahn, B. J., 'A Ra-ree Show – A Rare Cartoon: Revolutionary Propaganda in the Treason Trial of Stephen College', Korshin, Paul J. (ed.), *Studies in Change and Revolution: Aspects of English Intellectual History, 1640-1800* (Menston, 1972)

Reece, Henry, *The Army in Cromwellian England, 1649-1660* (Oxford, 2013)

Ricoeur, Paul, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Chicago, IL, 2004)

- Ricoeur, Paul 'Memory-Forgetting-History', Rüsen, Jörn (ed.), *Meaning and Representation in History* (New York, NY, 2006), pp. 9-19
- Richardson, R. C., *The Debate on the English Revolution* (London, 1977)
- Rigby, S. R., *Marxism and History: A Critical Introduction, Second Edition* (Manchester, 1998)
- Roy, Ian 'Royalist reputations: The Cavalier ideal and the reality', McElligott, Jason, and Smith, David L. (eds.), *Royalists and royalism during Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 89-111
- Rüsen, Jörn (ed.), *Meaning and Representation in History* (New York, NY, 2006)
- Sandall, Simon, 'Representing Rebellion: Memory and Social Conflict in Sixteenth-Century England', *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46:4 (2012), pp. 559-568
- Sawday, Jonathan, 'Re-writing a revolution: history, symbol, and text in the Restoration', *The Seventeenth Century*, 7:2 (1992), pp. 171-199
- Schivelbusch, Wolfgang, *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery*, trans. by Chase, Jefferson (London, 2003)
- Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven, CT, 1990)
- Scott, Jonathan, 'Radicalism and Restoration: the Shape of the Stuart Experience', *The Historical Journal*, 31:2 (1988), pp. 453-467
- Scott, Jonathan, 'England's Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot', Harris, Tim, Seward, Paul and Goldie, Mark (eds.), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 107-131
- Scott, Jonathan, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677-1683* (Cambridge, 1991)
- Scott, Jonathan, *England's troubles: Seventeenth-century English political instability in European context* (Cambridge, 2000)
- Seaward, Paul, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge, 1988)
- Seaward, Paul, *The Restoration* (Basingstoke, 1991)
- Sharp, Buchanan, 'Popular political opinion in England, 1660-1865', *History of European Ideas*, 10:1 (1989) pp. 13-29

Sharpe, J. A., "Last Dying Speeches": Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in Seventeenth-Century England', *Past & Present*, 107 (May 1985), pp. 144-167

Sharpe, Kevin, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven, CT, 2000)

Sharpe, Kevin "So Hard a Text"? Images of Charles I, 1612-1700', *The Historical Journal*, 43:2 (June 2000), pp. 383-405

Shepard, Alexandra, and Withington, Phil (eds.), *Communities in early modern England: Networks, place, rhetoric* (Manchester, 2000)

Smyth, Adam, (ed.), *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 2004)

Southcombe, George and Tapsell, Grant, *Restoration Politics, Religion, and Culture: Britain and Ireland, 1660-1714* (Basingstoke, 2010)

Spadafora, David, *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New Haven, CT, 1990)

Spurr, John, *England in the 1670s: 'This Masquerading Age'* (Oxford, 2000)

Spurr, John, 'Later Stuart Puritanism', Coffey, John, and Lim, Paul C. H. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 89-105

Spurr, John (ed.), *Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury, 1621-1683* (Farnham, 2011)

Spurr, John 'Shaftesbury and the Seventeenth Century', Spurr, John (ed.), *Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury* (Farnham, 2011)

Starn, Randolph, 'Meaning-Levels in the Theme of Historical Decline', *History and Theory*, 14:1 (February, 1975), pp. 1-31

Stewart, Bryon S., 'The Cult of the Royal Martyr', *Church History*, 38:2 (June 1969), pp. 175-187

Stewart, Horace, *History of the Worshipful Company of Gold and Silver Wyre-Drawers: and of the Origin and Development of the Industry which the Company Represents* (London, 1891)

Stoyle, Mark, *Loyalty and locality: popular allegiance in Devon during the English Civil War* (Exeter, 1994)

Stoyle, Mark 'Memories of the Maimed: The Testimony of Charles I's Former Soldiers, 1660-1730', *History* 88:290 (2003), pp. 204-226

Stoyle, Mark, 'Remembering the English Civil Wars', Gray, Peter, and Oliver, Kendrick (eds.), *The memory of catastrophe* (Manchester, 2004), pp. 19-30

Stryker, Sheldon, and Burke, Peter J., 'The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63:4 (December 2000), pp. 284-297

Tapsell, Grant, *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85* (Woodbridge, 2007)

Tonkin, Elizabeth, *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History* (Cambridge, 1992)

Toscano, Alberto, *Fanaticism: The Uses of an Idea* (London, 2010)

Tuveson, Ernest Lee, *Millennium and Utopia: A Study in the Background of the Idea of Progress* (Berkeley, CA, 1949)

Tyacke, Nicholas (ed.), *The English Revolution c. 1590-1720: Politics, Religion and Communities* (Manchester, 2007)

Urry, William, and Bunce, Cyprian Rondeau, *The Chief Citizens of Canterbury: A List of Portreeves (Prefects, Prepositi) from A.D. 780 until c. 1100 of Prepositi (Bailiffs) from the 12th Century until 1448 and of Mayors from 1448 until 1978* ([Canterbury, 1978])

Vallance, Edward 'Preaching to the Converted: Religious Justifications for the English Civil War', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 65:3-4 (2002), pp. 395-6

Vallance, Edward, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1553-1682* (Woodbridge, 2005)

Vansina, Jan, 'Memory and Oral Tradition', Miller, Joseph C. (ed.), *The African Past Speaks: Essays on Oral Tradition and History* (Folkestone, 1980), pp. 262-279

Wagar, W. Warren, 'Modern Views of the Origins of the Idea of Progress', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 28:1 (Jan.-Mar., 1967), pp. 55-70

Walsham, Alexandra, *Charitable hatred: Tolerance and intolerance in England, 1500-1700* (Manchester, 2006)

Walter, John, *Understanding Popular Violence in the English Revolution: The Colchester Plunderers* (Cambridge, 1999)

Walter, John, 'Public transcripts, popular agency and the politics of subsistence in early modern England', Braddick, Michael J., and Walter, John (eds.), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 123-148

Warner, Michael, *Publics and Counterpublics* (New York, NY, 2002)

Wedgwood, C. V., *The Trial of Charles I* (London, 1964)

- Wigfield, W. MacDonald, *The Monmouth Rebels* (Gloucester, 1985)
- Williams, Sheila, 'The Pope-Burning Processions of 1679, 1680 and 1681', *The Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 21:1-2 (Jan.-Jun. 1958), pp. 104-118
- Withington, Phil, 'Company and sociability in early modern England', *Social History*, 32:3 (August 2007), pp. 291-307
- Withington, Phil, and Shepard, Alexandra, 'Introduction: communities in early modern England', Shepard, Alexandra, and Withington, Phil (eds.), *Communities in early modern England: Networks, place, rhetoric* (Manchester, 2000), pp. 1-15.
- Wood, Andy, 'Custom, Identity and Resistance: English Free Miners and their Law, c.1550-1800', Griffiths, Paul, Fox, Adam, and Hindle, Steve, (eds.), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 209-264
- Wood, Andy "Poore men woll speke one day": Plebeian Languages of Deference and Defiance in England, c.1520-1640', Harris, Tim, (ed.), *The Politics of the Excluded, c.1500-1850* (Basingstoke, 2001), pp. 67-98
- Wood, Andy, *Riot, Rebellion and Popular Politics in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 2002)
- Wood, Andy, *The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2007)
- Wood, Andy, 'The queen is a goggyll eyed hoore': gender and seditious speech in early modern England', Tyacke, Nicholas (ed.), *The English Revolution c. 1590-1720: Politics, Religion and Communities* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 81-94
- Wood, Andy *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2013)
- Woolf, Daniel, 'Memory and Historical Culture in Early Modern England', *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, 2:1 (1991), pp. 283-308
- Woolf, Daniel, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture: 1500-1730* (Oxford, 2003)
- Woolf, Daniel, 'Afterword: Shadows of the Past in Early Modern England', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76:4 (Winter 2013), pp. 639-650
- Woolrych, A. H., 'The Good Old Cause and the Fall of the Protectorate', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 13:2 (1957), pp. 133-161
- Worden, Blair, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (London, 2001)

Wrightson, Keith, *English Society: 1580-1680* (London, 1982)

Wrightson, Keith, 'The Politics of the Parish in Early Modern England', Griffiths, Paul, Fox, Adam, and Hindle, Steve, (eds.), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 10-46

Zook, Melinda, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England* (University Park, PA, 1999)

V – Other Material

'Levellers Day' <<https://levellersday.wordpress.com/>> (16 April 2015)

New Worlds. 'Episode 4', *New Worlds* (Channel 4, 22 April 2014).