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Abstract

This thesis explores the ways the British Civil Wars were remembered in England between the execution of Charles I in January 1649 and the return of the Purged Parliament in December 1659. While over the last decade the mental afterlife of Britain’s major domestic conflicts has become an area of significant scholarly interest, existing studies have focused almost exclusively on the period after 1660. This thesis redresses this imbalance and provides the first detailed study of the memorial culture of England’s republican interval.

Uniquely, among studies of this kind, this thesis considers attempts to frame the public memory of the recent past, both by the governments and their opponents, alongside evidence of what diverse ordinary people actually were remembering. It broadens the field of study beyond the traditional focus on printed histories and memoirs, deploying a varied and innovative source base that includes court records, petitions, diaries, civic records, and material culture, as well as a wide range of printed texts. In so doing, it reveals the myriad ways that the events of 1642 to 1651 were remembered, the various purposes that these recollections served, and the diverse communities of memory that operated in 1650s England.

These findings contribute to broader theoretical debates about the nature of early modern memory. By emphasising the sheer multiplicity of ways that the bloody recent past was perpetuated in the present, and the complexity of the relationship between public and personal scripts, this thesis presents a more complete and nuanced picture of the memory of catastrophic events in early modernity than has hitherto been articulated. Further, by situating the experience of 1650s England in relation to other post-civil war states, this thesis has been able to identify several similarities between the memorial culture of early modern England and those of post-civil war states in modernity.
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Introduction

At Woolwich in 1655 an eighty-gun ship was launched onto the waters of the Thames for the first time. Designed by Francis Sheldon, the ship was 131 feet in length at the keel, making her four feet longer than the Sovereign, previously the largest ship in the republican fleet.¹ According to contemporary newsbooks, ‘great Numbers of people, and persons of Honor’ came to watch this ‘most stately Vessel’ embark on her first voyage.² She was called the Naseby, after the Parliament’s victory against Charles I and his forces at the Battle of Naseby in June 1645. A mere five years later, however, the Naseby and her sister ships – amongst others, the Worcester, the Marston Moor, and the Dunbar, also named after notable Parliamentarian victories – found themselves besieged by tailors and painters who were ‘at work cutting out some pieces of yellow cloth into the fashion of a crown and “C. R.”’ to display as a flag ‘instead of the State’s arms’.³ The fleet was being prepared for a trip to the continent, from whence they would return with Charles II, restored King of England, as their cargo. The ship Charles himself sailed upon was the Naseby: by the end of the year, she had been rechristened the Royal Charles.

In many ways, the fate of the Naseby encapsulates the fate of the whole nation between 1649 and 1679. Following the execution of Charles I and the establishment of the Commonwealth, the political nation were tasked not only with defending and managing the fledgling state, but with controlling the meaning of those bloody events that had brought the republic into being. The government needed to decide how Britain’s Civil Wars should be interpreted, understood, and, ultimately, remembered by their citizens. The naming of a prestigious warship after a Parliamentarian victory suggests that remembering and glorifying the Parliament’s Civil War successes came to be one way of projecting an image of the republic’s military prowess. Yet with the advent of the Restoration, the republic’s interpretation of the recent past was essentially reversed. Just as the Naseby transitioned to the Royal Charles, so the return of Charles II meant the creation of a whole new framework of public memory – one that, in spite of the theoretical strictures of the 1660 Act of Oblivion,

² A perfect diurnall of some passages and proceedings of, and in relation to, the armies in England and Wales, no. 279, 9-16 April 1655 (London, 1655; Thomason / 126:E.832[5]), p. 4291; The weekly intelligencer of the Commonwealth faithfully communicating all affairs both martial and civil, no. 400, 10-17 April 1655 (London, 1655; Thomason / 126:E.832[6]), p. 336.
presented the Parliament’s puritan members as the villains of the piece and the Restoration as a glorious deliverance.

In recent years this latter story – that of the Restoration regime’s efforts to control the public memory of Britain’s domestic conflicts, and its relative success in doing so – has received significant scholarly attention. By contrast, the rich memorial culture of England’s republican interval has been almost entirely overlooked. This thesis redresses this imbalance and argues that study of the memory of the wars during the Commonwealths and Protectorates has some significant implications, not only for our understanding of the politics and society of 1650s England, but for our understanding of early modern memory and the experience of post-civil war states more generally.

i. The Memory of the British Civil Wars

The Kings most Excellent Majesty taking into His Gratious [sic] and Serious consideration the long and great Troubles Discords and Warrs that have for many Yeares past bee in this Kingdome […] Out of a hearty and pious Desire to put an end to all Suites and Controversies that by occasion of the late Distractions have arisen and may arise betweene all His Subjects […] That any and all manner of Treasons, Misprisions of Treason, Murthers Felonies Offences Crimes Contempts and Misdemeanors Councelled Commanded Acted or done since the first day of January in the yeare of our Lord One thousand six hundred thirty seaven by any person or persons before the twenty fourth day of June in the yeare of our Lord One thousand six hundred and sixty other then the persons hereafter by name excepted […] be Pardoned Released Indempnified [sic] Discharged and put in utter Oblivion.5

The 1660 Act of Indemnity and Oblivion was an attempt to control which aspects of Britain’s revolutionary past were to be remembered, and which were better left forgotten. The intention was to conciliate all but a handful of regicides to the Restoration regime in return for the suppression of pro-Parliamentarian expressions of dissent. It was an aspiration that was made feasible, in part, by the broad spectrum of political factions that had supported

---


Charles II’s return, including many who had previously been loyal to the republics. The motives of such groups were diverse, and doubtless strengthened in some cases by the political instability that followed the death of Cromwell in 1658. While the support of many Presbyterians and other moderate revolutionaries stemmed in large part from Charles’ apparent support for the toleration of reformed Protestantism, members of the New Model Army, once some of the main proponents of the regicide, responded favourably to promises of the payment of arrears and permission for its members to pursue trades without having to serve statutory periods of apprenticeship.

Vengeance for the events of the previous two decades was to be meted out through the public execution of thirteen surviving regicides and the dismemberment of those who, like Cromwell, had not lived to see their just desserts served. Thereafter, the restored monarch would ‘bury all Seeds of future Discords and remembrance […] in His owne Breast’, and expected his subjects to do likewise. However, consigning the events of the recent past to oblivion proved to be a desire more easily served in statute than in reality. The monarchy may have been restored, but all was not as it had been before, and the new regime was faced with a tricky balancing act between the competing impulses of retribution and reconciliation, commemoration and oblivion, remembering and forgetting.

By 1661, fears of anti-government plots, the actual rebellion of the Fifth Monarchists, and the resentment that many Royalists harboured at seeing the ‘rebels’ of the 1640s and 1650s go unpunished had led many people to disregard the stipulations of the 1660 Act. Instead, a form of ‘partial remembering’ took hold in which memories of the wars, and of the dangers posed by radical Protestantism and Catholicism in particular, became a lens through which contemporary political issues were played out. It is this process of the partial failure of oblivion, and the subsequent politicisation of the events of the 1640s and 1650s, that has been the focus of the bulk of scholarship on memories of the Civil Wars to date.

---

9 Statutes, v, p. 226.
11 The term is Matthew Neufeld’s. See Neufeld, *The Civil Wars after 1660*, p. 2.
The first significant effort to wed a growing historiographical interest in memory with the aftermath of the Civil Wars was undertaken by Jonathan Scott. Scott argued that far from marking a turning point in British history, the ‘birthplace of a new era’, the Restoration period continued to be dominated by a preoccupation with the experiences of revolution, and that it was this traumatic past that determined the shape of contemporary political affairs. More specifically, he claimed that the politicians of the post-1660 period were ‘prisoners’ of the recent past, their traditional (English, post-Reformation) fears of popery and tyrannical government fusing with their fears of renewed revolution to create a polity constrained by memories of the 1640s and 1650s – or, as Scott phrased it, ‘public memory governed Restoration politics much more surely than Charles II’.

Subsequent scholars have broadly accepted Scott’s claims about the enduring influence of memories of the Civil Wars and Interregnum on the politics of the Restoration state. However, some historians have questioned his interpretation of Restoration politicians as ‘prisoners’, wholly constrained by the ghosts of the recent past, rather than as imprisoners; that is, as agents with the power to shape the form these spectres took, and to utilise them accordingly. Tim Harris, for example, has argued that the Restoration regime often chose to stir up the spectres of the revolutionary period in order to garner support for Charles II in times of political difficulty. He explores the ways in which the experience of revolution influenced the restored regime’s approach toward managing ‘opinion out of doors’ and suggests that Charles’ supporters not only learnt from the experience of the early 1640s the need to engage with and conciliate, rather than suppress, crowd opinion, but also deliberately deployed arguments that recalled the events of the revolutionary period. During the


16 Ibid., pp. 504-505.
Exclusion Crisis, for example, much Tory propaganda likened their Whig opponents to the political enemies of Charles I, and reminded people of how much they had suffered at their hands during the 1640s and 1650s. In this respect, the events and issues of Charles II’s reign were not in and of themselves ‘Xerox copies’ of the early Stuart period, as Scott had contended, but supporters of the Restoration regime often made considerable efforts to present them as such.

In the most comprehensive study of memories of the British Civil Wars to date, Matthew Neufeld has built on Harris’ interpretation, illuminating the ways in which memories of the recent conflicts were deployed for political purposes in the period between the Restoration and the accession of George I. At the heart of Neufeld’s thesis is the contention that memories of the wars after 1660 were largely a means of commending and justifying, or contesting and attacking, the Restoration settlements. He argues that, initially, ‘officially sanctioned’ histories of the wars presented puritan-inspired resistance as the cause of the conflict in an effort to justify the exclusion of religious dissenters (a multifarious group he refers to collectively as the ‘puritan impulse’) from political and religious life. However, Neufeld also shows that, as the years progressed, war memories became a lens through which debates over more general political issues were played out. Particular emphasis is placed on the end of the Licensing Act in 1679 and the subsequent rise of ‘historical parallelism’ – that is, the reinterpretation of memories of the wars as a means of influencing contemporary political debate, usually from competing Whig and Tory perspectives. Other historians have extended this line of inquiry into the eighteenth century and beyond, exploring the diverse ways in which memories of the wars and their central actors have reflected contemporary purposes and concerns.

---

17 Ibid., pp. 504-508.
20 Ibid., pp. 87-167.
All of the studies I have discussed thus far are primarily concerned with the utilisation of memory by social and cultural elites. Indeed, as Neufeld explicitly states, his study is concerned not with what individuals remembered or forgot about the recent past, but with the ‘political nation’s answer to the question of remembering and forgetting’. This focus is reflected in the choice of source material, with printed works, and histories in particular, forming the bulk of the evidentiary base. Though these scholars devote a great deal of attention to the authorial intention behind texts, and their role as speech acts within the context of wider political debates, they are not concerned with the reception of the works they consider, or with the memories of ordinary men and women more broadly.

Increasingly, however, historians have also begun to explore popular memory – the recollections of those men and women who were not politicians, pamphleteers, or gentry elites. The first historians to adopt this approach to the aftermath of Britain’s domestic conflicts were Mark Stoyle and Andrew Hopper, the former in a study of the relief petitions of maimed Royalist soldiers in Devon, and the latter in an account of a northern Parliamentarian uprising, the Farnley Wood Plot (1663). This interest in the memories of ordinary people and subcultures of memory has gained momentum over the last five years,

22 Neufeld, The Civil Wars after 1660, p. 5. Similarly, in her study of popular print produced by the Restoration government and its supporters, Erin Peters states that she is ‘less concerned with what individuals in this period remembered or forgot about the past as with the ruling regime’s […] use of the past for their present purposes’. See Peters, Commemoration and Oblivion, p. 2.


25 As Tim Harris has shown, there is a danger of over mischaracterisation and oversimplification when distinguishing between elite and popular culture. See Tim Harris, London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 15-20. In this thesis the term ‘popular’ is used, following David Underdown, and, more recently, Lloyd Bowen, to refer to those below the gentry rank. This is not to suggest that all popular memories formed a homogenous mass, nor that popular and elite memories did not intersect and interact. Rather, the term is simply intended to act as a conscious counter weight to those studies that focus on public memory and political elites at the expense of the experiences of more ordinary people. See David Underdown, Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. vii; Lloyd Bowen, ‘Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism, 1649-60’, in Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum, ed. by Jason McElligott and David Smith (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), pp. 44-66, esp. pp. 46-47.

leading Neufeld to identify what he believes to be a ‘shift of subject and [of] approach’ within the field of early modern memory studies.27

It is certainly true that much recent scholarship on early modern memory has been less concerned with efforts to frame public memory, and more concerned with non-elite, and even non-textual, reconstructions of the past. For example, through study of what initially appears to be a traditional elite historical source, the Walker manuscripts (from which John Walker wrote his famous Tory history, The Sufferings of the Clergy during the Grand Rebellion, 1642-1660), Fiona MacCall has reconstructed not Walker’s own attempts to frame the past, but the memories of ejected Anglican clergy, their families, and their communities.28 Similarly, Edward Legon has utilised records of seditious speech to excavate the currents of counter-memory that operated in Restoration England, illuminating the ways in which former Parliamentarians could construct their own memories of the wars and, in so doing, resist the dominant narrative of Cavalier ‘partial remembering’.29

Most recently, Ann Hughes has approached the financial accounts of wartime payments and losses, drawn up by local communities for the Parliamentarian administration during the mid-to-late 1640s, as receptacles of memory. In these seemingly functional accounts, Hughes has identified details that were superfluous in strict accounting terms, but which personalised encounters and allowed civilians to recount the experience of war.30 In 2013, Andy Wood bemoaned that studies of early modern memory were ‘almost monolithically elitist in their focus’.31 While there is still significantly more work that needs to be done in order to fully illuminate the nature and diversity of popular memories – a task to which this thesis contributes – it is not at all clear that Wood’s lament remains as applicable five years later.

29 Legon, ‘Remembering Revolution’.
There does, however, remain one significant lacuna in our understanding of the ways in which people, both elite and more ordinary, remembered the British Civil Wars. To date, almost all studies of the mental afterlife of Britain’s domestic conflicts have focused on the period after 1660. Memories of the wars between 1649 and 1659, by contrast, particularly in England, Wales, and Scotland, remain almost entirely uncharted territory. There are diverse potential explanations for this neglect of the memorial culture of the Commonwealth and Protectorate regimes. At first glance, it is tempting to attribute it to a lack of source material. The operation and record keeping of some administrative structures was significantly disrupted by armed conflict, and it is likely that Bulstrode Whitelocke was not the only person whose private papers were thrown on the fire on the eve of the Restoration. However, as Sean Kelsey notes, the lack of sources available for the period of the Commonwealth is ‘a commonplace with some substance but far less significance than is often supposed’. While some record-generating bodies, such as the ecclesiastical courts, did cease to function during the 1640s and 1650s, these years also saw the creation of a wealth of new administrative structures, from the Committee for Compounding with Delinquents to the Indemnity Committee, each with its own paper trail of plentiful surviving source material. While identifying sources that provide a window into the memories of ordinary people is undoubtedly challenging, there is no significant reason why this challenge should prove any more insurmountable for the years before 1660 than for the period that followed. Moreover, the survival of printed material for the 1650s is exceptional, in large part thanks to the bibliophilic tendencies of George Thomason.

More plausibly, the absence of scholarly enquiries into the memory of the wars during the 1650s may be the result of deeper historiographical influences. Both David Underdown and Blair Worden’s seminal works, on Pride’s Purge and the Rump Parliament, respectively, adopt an interpretative framework which is predicated upon the future failure of the

---

32 Memory of the wars in Ireland has fared somewhat better, not least because memories of violence during the 1641 Irish rebellion and Cromwell’s Irish campaigns have been understood as having a central role in the formation of new, relatively cohesive Irish Catholic and Irish Protestant identities. See Toby Barnard, ‘The Uses of 23 October 1641 and Irish Protestant Celebrations’, The English Historical Review, 106.421 (1991), 889-920; Sarah Covington, ‘The Odious Demon from Across the Sea: Oliver Cromwell, Memory and the Dislocations of Ireland’, in Memory before Modernity, ed. by Pollmann et al, pp. 149-164; Michael O’Siochru and Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.), Ireland: 1641, Contexts and Reactions (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013); John Gibney, The Shadow of a Year: The 1641 Rebellion in Irish History and Memory (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2013).


Commonwealth. In particular, Worden’s focus on why the Commonwealth disintegrated pre-disposes his reading of the period to one where the collapse of the regime was an inevitability, hampering any exploration of how contemporaries navigated political and discursive renewal. Similar readings dominate much traditional literature on the British republics, and it is only comparatively recently that historians have begun to approach the Interregnum regimes, not as aberrations doomed to failure, but as political solutions that exhibited much constitutional and political creativity, and which had the potential to provide a lasting settlement.

Even the term ‘Interregnum’, from the Latin ‘between reigns’, demarks the 1650s as a brief bump in the road on the way to a monarchical constitutional settlement. In recent years, some scholars have begun to use the term ‘post-revolutionary’, rather than ‘Restoration’, to describe the period after 1660, in an effort to acknowledge that despite the return of a Stuart king to the throne, all was not exactly as it had been before. A similar move with regard to the word ‘Interregnum’ has not caught on for the 1650s. However, from here on in this thesis will dispose of this term in favour of the less prescient ‘republics’, or, when greater specificity between the regimes before and after 1653 is required, the Commonwealths and the Protectorates. This is not intended as an endorsement of the republican credentials of the regimes of the 1650s, in the constitutional and theoretical senses of the term. Rather, it is meant only as an effort to counter the impression that the governments of the 1650s were a homogenous and ultimately doomed collective, and to remind us that they are worthy of detailed study on their own terms and in their own right. To put it simply, to contemporaries the Restoration was not a foregone conclusion; therefore, as historians, we should not allow our knowledge that the 1650s was a decade bookended by the rule of two Charles Stuarts to influence our analysis. It is with these points in mind that this thesis approaches the question of how successive regimes, their opponents, and their citizens remembered the wars. As a result, it is not only a contribution to our understanding of the memory of the British Civil Wars, but to the scholarship of the English republics.

36 See, for example, Kelsey, Inventing a Republic; Sarah Barber, Regicide and Republicanism: Politics and Ethics in the English Revolution, 1646-1659 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998); Patrick Little and David Smith, Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
37 Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, ‘Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England’, in The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England, ed. by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 1-30.
Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the neglect of memory prior to the Restoration is the result of a tendency among historians of the post-1660 period to view the 1650s as part of a cohesive revolutionary experience, stretching from 1637 to 1660. George Southcombe and Grant Tapsell tellingly state that the 1660s were ‘watched over by the ghosts of the civil wars and interregnum’, without delineating what, if any, were the differences between the two.38 Indeed, in studies as diverse as Neufeld’s, Peters’, and Legon’s many of the memories which are analysed are actually recollections of the period of republican rule, rather than the period of armed combat.39 This lack of analytical clarity is made more problematic when we consider that many people who had supported the Parliament during the wars became disillusioned with the republican state and ultimately favoured the Restoration. In such cases, the ways in which people remembered the wars and the republics were unlikely to be one and the same – hence those Parliamentarian supporters who, by 1659, felt that the ‘good old cause’ for which they had fought had been betrayed.40 In short, memories of the wars and memories of the republican regimes are two distinct subjects that should not be casually elided. To give a modern parallel, study of the memory of World War II is clearly not the same as studying memories of living in a post-war state, nor have historians treated them as such.

Moreover, those few studies that have touched on the memory of the Civil Wars during the 1650s have tended to note its absence, giving scholars the impression – erroneously, as this thesis will show – that there are few memorial practices to study. John Morrill, Kevin Sharpe, and Ronald Hutton have all commented on the republics’ failure to establish a public holiday commemorating the wars, and Hutton has found little evidence of collective celebration of the events of the wars during the 1650s more generally (and certainly less than for the period after the Restoration).41 Maija Jansson has also drawn attention to a failed memorial project – a painting that would have decorated the Banqueting House at Whitehall with scenes from the wars, proposed by three Dutch artists between 1649 and 1653. The painting did not go ahead,

39 Neufeld, The Civil Wars after 1660; Legon, ‘Remembering Revolution’; Peters, Commemoration and Oblivion.
40 Barber, Regicide and Republicanism, p. 99.
she argues, not only due to financial pressures and questions of artistic taste but also because ‘still shattered by the recent devastation of war, and with no prior artistic tradition of military themes, England was not ready for images of battle scenes either as memorials or as artworks’.42 Charles Carlton has gone even further, arguing that after the fighting had ceased most English citizens ‘wanted to put the animosities of war behind them’, and that, as result, many participants ‘developed almost a form of amnesia’ both of their own wartime deeds and those of others.43 As evidence, he notes a relative absence of war poetry, plays, and paintings, and a handful of marriages between Parliamentarian and Cavalier families, most famously the union of Thomas Fairfax’s daughter Mary to the Royalist George Villiers, the second Duke of Buckingham.44

Often, the aforementioned studies have utilised a rather narrow interpretation of what qualifies as a commemorative act. In order to capture early modern memories of war adequately, we must broaden our understanding of what constitutes a memorial practice beyond the collective commemorations, war memorials, and public solemnities we are accustomed to observing in modernity. In a recent study of the commemorative practices surrounding Fairfax’s battlefields, Ian Atherton has recognised the need to engage with a wider selection of materials and includes in his source base records of the spoken word and a wide range of physical objects.45 Atherton primarily uses this material to situate the memory of the Civil Wars in the context of long-term trends in the commemoration of battlefields from the late Middle Ages to the eighteenth century. For example, he suggests that the removal of purgatory as a theological tenet during the Reformation meant that the commemoration of war shifted from stone to paper, as there was no longer any theological

44 His claim about the absence of literature concerned with the Civil Wars is itself questionable. For studies of the impact of the wars on, and their depiction in, literature see Nigel Smith, Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994); David Norbrook, Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Claude J. Summers and Ted Pebworth (eds.), The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1999).
need for structures that allowed people to pray for the souls of the dead at sites of battle. Atherton’s work offers both an interesting theory of the evolution of memorial practices surrounding battlefields and an appreciation of the wide variety of artefacts that might be considered memory work. Even so, he touches on memory of the wars during the republics only fleetingly.

Indeed, to date, the only study that has considered the ways in which the wars were remembered during the 1650s has been conducted by Alice Hunt. In a short article on republican print culture, Hunt explores the ways the 1640s were represented in several histories and poems, primarily Thomas May’s *A Breviary of the History of the Parliament of England* (1650) and Andrew Marvell’s *Upon Appleton House* (1651). She argues that, even for writers who attempted to tackle the subject, the horrors of the nation’s recent past often remained unrelatable. However, as Hunt herself acknowledges, this piece is narrow in scope. It considers only a small fraction of printed texts and makes no attempt to explore the ways these works were received or their interaction with other, non-textual, forms of commemoration. Moreover, Hunt’s emphasis on the unrelatability of war means that – like Carlton and Jansson – she is rather more inclined to dwell on the absence of Civil War memories than on their presence. Hunt’s piece is an important call to arms for historians to explore in more depth the ways the men and women of republican England recalled the bloody recent past – a call which this thesis seeks to answer – but it only scratches the surface of the rich memorial culture of 1650s England.

In outlining the current state of the historiography, it is not the intention of this thesis to diminish the importance of the works aforementioned. On the contrary, the following chapters will draw upon many of these studies in order to offer points of comparison between memory in the 1650s and memory after the Restoration. Nonetheless, this thesis will also seek to challenge two of the main assumptions that underlie much of this work: first, that memories of the wars are best approached from the standpoint of the Restoration, when recollections of the entire revolutionary period can be considered as a whole; second, that the memory of the conflicts during the republics is best characterised by its absence. Instead, it argues that the Commonwealth and Protectorate governments made concerted, if sometimes
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46 Ibid., pp. 105-117. See also Ian Atherton and Peter Morgan, ‘The Battlefield War Memorial: Commemoration and the Battlefield Site from the Middle Ages to the Modern Era’, *Journal of War and Culture Studies*, 4.3 (2011), 289-304.

47 Alice Hunt, ‘Les memoires republicaines des guerres civiles anglaises dans les années 1650’, *XVIIe Siecle*, 2.2 (2017), 253-268. Thanks are due to Dr Hunt for sharing an English translation of this piece.
inconsistent, efforts to frame the public memory of the turbulent recent past, and that these narratives were deployed, contested, and rejected by the multifarious communities of memory that operated in republican England.

ii. Memory, Catastrophe and Early Modernity

While the primary aim of this thesis is to address the absence of enquiries into the memory of the British Civil Wars during the republican regimes, a second endeavour is to explore what these findings suggest about the nature of early modern memory and the commemoration of internecine conflict both within and beyond early modernity.

The increasing historical interest in the mental afterlife of Britain’s domestic conflicts forms part of a burgeoning scholarly concern with the subject of memory more generally. This so-called ‘memory turn’ has been attributed to a range of factors, most commonly features of post-modernity that have apparently generated an anxiety about our ability to remember. For Pierre Nora, it is the ‘acceleration of history’ that is largely responsible: the increasing velocity with which the life circumstances of individuals and groups are formed and transformed in the modern world have caused people to lose their grasp on their place in historical time.48 John Gillis likens the current preoccupation with memory to Funes’ fall, and argues that the fragmentation of personal identity coupled with the development of new technologies obliges people to keep track of a plethora of collective memories, while at the same time granting the potential to capture and preserve a seemingly infinite quantity of life experiences.49 These developments have, he claims, engendered a new self-consciousness about our capacity to remember. Whatever the cause, it is certainly true that the last three decades has seen a flourishing of literature on memory, and the memory of the two World Wars and the Holocaust in particular – as Patrick Finney notes, these subjects have ‘lain at the heart of the broader memory project’.50

Though the origins of memory studies lie in modern historical scholarship, there is now a growing literature on the nature and structure of memory before 1800. Much of this work has focused on people’s understanding and use of the concept of the past. For example, in his 2013 publication, *The Memory of the People*, Andy Wood provides a study of agrarian custom in England that is also a study of early modern memory. Drawing on records of litigation, he shows that customal memory was highly important to the people of early modern England, not least because these recollections could be deployed, often effectively, to legitimate claims to rights, spaces, and resources in the present. Wood also argues that the study of custom reveals much about the structure of early modern memory more generally. In particular, he claims that the local acted as the locus of popular memory throughout the period.

As Wood emphasises, his conclusion that the local was the most important site within which popular memory was constructed ‘conflicts’ with Daniel Woolf’s assessment of remembrance in early modern England. In a study of English ‘historical culture’, broadly conceived as the cognitive web of relations between past, present, and future, Woolf has argued that the period between 1500 and 1700 saw the accession of an increasingly national understanding of
the past, often at the expense of local or vernacular histories and memories. Though the contrasts between Wood and Woolf’s conclusions are perhaps not as sharp as Wood himself paints them to be – Woolf makes more concessions than Wood acknowledges to the fact the impact of national senses of the past could be spotty, especially lower down the social scale – and are, in any case, partially the result of their different foci and source material, it does raise intriguing questions about the nature of early modern memory. For example, in the context of the British Civil Wars, what was the relationship between printed narratives and people’s own memories? Did the national or the local function as the main locus of war memory? These are among the questions which this thesis considers.

While Wood and Woolf’s work has done much to illuminate how the men and women of early modern England understood and remembered the past, their focus is on the use of the past generally, rather than the ways in which memories of a specific, catastrophic event were structured. As a result, the kinds of memory under consideration are substantively different from the type which concern this thesis. Though historians of modern memory have been acutely concerned with the mental afterlife of war and other catastrophic events, it is only relatively recently that historians have begun to probe the ways in which the people of early modernity remembered such incidents, particularly in their immediate aftermath. Nevertheless, in addition to those studies that are specifically concerned with the memory of the British Civil Wars (outlined above, pp. 20-30), there is now a growing body of research into memories of catastrophic events both in early modern England and elsewhere in Europe.

For example, in his study of the 1549 Kett’s rebellion in eastern England, Andy Wood includes a chapter on the afterlife of this event in both public and popular memory. He shows
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56 I use the term ‘catastrophic’ in preference to ‘traumatic’ in order to avoid prefiguring the impact an event had upon either individuals or collectives. ‘Trauma’ implies a negative or destabilising reaction to an event, while ‘catastrophe’ refers simply to the scale of an event. Thus, following Alessandro Cavalli, by a ‘catastrophe’ I mean any event, either man-made or natural, that caused significant disruption or destruction, usually of life and property. See Alessandro Cavalli, ‘Memory and Identity: How Memory is Reconstructed after Catastrophic Events’, in *Meaning and Representation in History*, ed. by Jorn Rusen (New York, NY: Berghahn Books, 2006), pp. 170-181. For an excellent analysis of some of conceptual and methodological problems that arise when conceiving of collective memories as trauma, see Wulf Kansteiner, ‘Finding Meaning in Memory: a Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies’, *History and Theory*, 41.2 (2002), 179-197. For discussion of the importance of historical and contextual specificity when discussing trauma, see Neil Smelser, ‘Psychological Trauma and Cultural Trauma’, in *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, ed. by Jeffrey Alexander, Ron Eyerman, Bernhard Giesen, Neil J. Smelser, and Piotr Sztompka (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004), pp. 31-59.
that historical writing was mobilised to provide a narrative of the rebellion that legitimated governmental authority and demonised the rebels. These texts, most notably Richard Woods’ translation of Alexander Neville’s Latin history of 1575, placed the rebellion in the context of previous failed uprisings, equating Kett’s rebels with a familiar storehouse of tales about the sinfulness of rebellion and the violent chaos that constituted popular politics. With a readership consisting primarily of the urban citizenry, authors emphasised those elements of the rebellion that would have seemed most fearful to wealthy householders, such as the invasion and destruction of domestic property.

However, Wood also emphasises the extent to which ordinary people were able to resist public narratives and cultivate their own counter-memory of the actions of Kett and his supporters. He outlines some of the main ways ordinary people remembered the rebellion, most often in the context of imagining a potential repeat or the valorisation of the rebels and their actions. He also argues that another common response was a desire to forget the ‘commotion time’. The support for this claim is thinner, not least because Wood derives his evidence of popular memories almost wholly from records of seditious speech, material which clearly privileges a particular kind of recollection: the public, vocal, and resistive. For similar reasons, Wood is not able to explore the way narrative recollections of this event were structured by ordinary people. Despite these limitations, Wood’s study offers a valuable insight into the ways the people of sixteenth-century East Anglia resisted the authorities’ efforts to impose a public narrative upon a dramatic local event.

By contrast, in his study of Civil War memory in the post-1660 period, Matthew Neufeld has stated that the reading public would ‘learn the lessons’ government sanctioned writings offered, and ‘embrace the principles they exemplified’. Similarly, Erin Peters commenced her study of Royalist print culture with the assertion that ‘the majority is usually content to remember in the manner prescribed by the dominant frame of reference’. Yet the evidence for these claims remains elusive, not least because neither Neufeld nor Peters have attempted to gauge the public or personal impact of the printed texts they consider. Uniquely, this thesis explores the republican regimes’ efforts to frame the memory of Britain’s bloody recent past.

---

58 Ibid., pp. 221-222.
59 Ibid., p. 209.
60 Ibid., p. 214.
61 Neufeld, The Civil Wars after 1660, p. 25.
62 Peters, Commemoration and Oblivion, p. 2.
alongside the recollections of the wider populace. As a result, it is able to explore the relationship between public and personal memory. It demonstrates that while some individuals’ memories were influenced by interpretations circulating in wider public discourses, people also had the capacity to subvert, reject, and contribute to public scripts.

In the course of research into the memory of catastrophic events in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe, scholars have also emphasised the variations that could exist in cultures of memory, not least along geographic lines. The Dutch historian Marianne Eekhout, for example, has explored the way in which the peat barge incident of 1590 (in which Dutch soldiers were smuggled into a castle held by the Italians using a peat barge as a Trojan horse) was commemorated in the city of Breda. She argues that by choosing to remember this event – an attack of national significance, with only slim connections to the local area – Breda diverged from the memorial culture of other Dutch cites such as Haarlem and Leiden, which chose to remember events of explicitly local import, usually sieges. Eekhout’s study shows that local memorial cultures did not arise as a matter of course, nor did they necessarily follow the same path. Memorial practices could vary, and were, in some cases, the result of the actions of a significant stakeholder; in Breda’s case, the appointment of a new magistrate.

Similarly, Philip Benedict has demonstrated that the confessional identity of French cities influenced the extent to which the French Wars of Religion were publicly commemorated. He shows that in cities with a significant Huguenot presence, the clauses of the Edicts of Pacification that prohibited Catholic commemorative processions were generally applied in an effort to prevent outbreaks of violence. The same was not true of overwhelmingly Catholic cities, such as Poitiers and Chartres.

To date, scholars of the British Civil Wars have given little consideration to the ways in which memories of the wars differed across England, or to different communities of memory more generally – at least, not beyond identifying distinctly Royalist/Parliamentarian and

---

63 Marianne Eekhout, ‘Celebrating a Trojan Horse: Memories of the Dutch Revolt in Breda, 1590-1659’, in Memory Before Modernity, ed. by Pollmann et al, pp. 129-147.

Whig/Tory patterns of remembering in the mid-to-late seventeenth century.65 By contrast, this thesis will show that the different wartime experiences of localities across England generated subtle variations in cultures of memory. Thus, by answering empirical questions about when, why, and how the Civil Wars were remembered during the 1650s this thesis also contributes to wider scholarly debates concerning the nature of early modern memory, and the memory of catastrophic events in particular.

Indeed, many of the issues that are explored in this thesis have also detained historians concerned with the memory of civil war in more recent periods. In this respect, this thesis can be situated not only within studies of early modern memory, but in relation to a literature that is concerned with recollection and reconciliation in post-civil war states more generally. Within this now expansive field, two modern conflicts loom particularly large: the Spanish and the American Civil Wars.66

In a study of the former, Michael Richards has explored the Franco regime’s efforts to impose a narrative of the events of the Civil Wars after 1939. He shows how an interpretation of this conflict as a ‘Holy War’ and a ‘crusade against communism’ was maintained for over two decades, forming the basis of the political legitimation of the Franco state.67 The past was simplified in order to portray monarchism as part of an outdated tradition, one which led to the catastrophe of war, while the blame for the conflict itself was laid entirely at the feet of the republic. Richards argues that the process of state-building precluded reconciliation, as the moral and religious superiority of the victors was used to confer political capital. Under

65 For two notable exceptions, see Marks Stoyle’s observations on memories of the wars in Cornwall and Ian Atherton’s discussion of local politics and commemorations. Mark Stoyle, WestBritons: Cornish Identities and the Early Modern British State (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002), pp. 157-174; Ian Atherton, ‘Commemorating the English Revolution: Locality and Place’ (unpublished paper, Remembering Revolutions Conference, Institute of Historical Research, London, 17 June 2017). Thanks are due to Dr Atherton for sharing a copy of this paper with me.


the pressure of this monolithic narrative and state repression all but a minority of the defeated adopted a form of self-silencing and deliberate amnesia.68

By contrast, in the quite different historical and political context of the American Civil War, where the victory of the north maintained the existing state structure rather than creating a new one, historians have identified a different pattern of memory. Here, the victorious Unionists did not succeed in imposing their memory of the wars on the southern states, who continued to maintain a distinctly pro-Confederate version of events.69 In part, this duality of memory cultures may have been the result of the geographic concentration of both the defeated and the victors. However, it was also a consequence of Unionist efforts at reconciliation, which sought the reintegration of the Confederates into a unified state.70 While there has been a tendency for historians to overemphasise and somewhat romanticise the healing power of reconstruction and reconciliation, there is no doubt that it precluded the direct suppression of the southern states’ memory practices, particularly as these were led primarily by women’s organisations and carefully couched around the remembrance of the dead.71

Such studies offer potential points of comparison with the ways civil wars were remembered in pre-modern states. Early modernists have tended to contest the modernity of many of the phenomena that modern historians have regarded as constitutive of modern memory culture – the discovery of the self, the rise of print media, the emergence of the nation state – and to ask what, if anything, is distinct about early modern memory.72 Yet, as Judith Pollmann has noted, while historians are increasingly revealing the complexity of people’s engagement with the past before 1800, they are yet to offer ‘anything like an alternative view of what […]

might constitute the similarities and differences between early modern and modern memory’. 73

This thesis contributes to this task by considering not only the memorial culture of the republics, but also some of the ways that this compares with the experiences of other post-civil war societies. It shows that many of the challenges that confronted the republican governments are issues that continue to detain states in the modern day, and argues that there are some marked parallels between the experiences of early modern England and modern post-civil war states. To this extent, the present thesis can be read both as a geographically and temporally bound case study of war memory and as a contribution to work on the memory and commemoration of civil conflict both within and beyond early modernity.

iii. The Methodology and Materials of Memory

Thus far in this introduction, the term ‘memory’ has been used relatively freely, with little reflection on its meaning as a theoretical concept. To a significant extent, such linguistic vagary has been borne of necessity, for to delineate every way that this term has been understood even within the bounds of recent historical discourse would necessitate a full-length study of its own. However, as has doubtless at times been apparent, the rising prominence of memory in academic discourse has not been accompanied by a corresponding consensus around its meaning. Even scholars who are broadly supportive of the so-called ‘memory turn’ have at times been troubled by the ‘non-paradigmatic, transdisciplinary, centreless’ quality of the exercise, while its critics have used this lack of specificity to dismiss memory as ‘the most impoverished concept to come down the academic pike in a long time’. 74

Though such diversity may also be part of the field’s strength – the ‘promiscuous terminological tumble a sign of creative excitement’, as Wood colourfully phrases it – these variations can have important ramifications for the way historians approach memory, their research questions, sources, and, ultimately, their conclusions. 75 It certainly does not relieve scholars of the obligation to define their terms, for as Geoffrey Cubitt wisely observes, ‘a

73 Ibid., p. 5. Pollmann has made the first substantial effort to answer this question in her recent book, Memory in Early Modern Europe, though her discussion of civil war is restricted to oblivion acts. See Judith Pollmann, Memory in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).
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word may be allowed to mean many things, but it is usually unwise to allow it to mean all of them simultaneously. In order to define the term ‘memory’ as it is used in this thesis, it is first necessary to outline the theoretical and methodological approach to memory from which this definition is derived. The section that follows provides an outline of the theoretical framework that grounds this thesis, working definitions of its key terms, and an explanation of the implications that these have had for the selection and organisation of its source material.

This thesis adopts an intersubjectivist approach to memory. The main assumption that underpins this approach is that, though it is individuals who remember, remembering is more than just a personal act. Memory is also social, because every act of recollection takes place in a social context and exists through its relationship with what is shared with others. Memory is prompted by social cues, employed for social purposes and in social environments, ordered by socially constructed norms and patterns, and articulated in a language that is socially shared and created. Thus, an intersubjectivist approach advocates the study not just of individual acts of memory, but of the social contexts in which memories are embedded and the conditions that make common remembering possible, including, but by no means limited to, rituals, languages, and sites of memory. Amos Funkenstein likens this relationship between social scripts of memory—often referred to as collective memory—and individual memory to the relationship between language (langue) and speech (parole) formulated by Ferdinand de Saussure: collective memory provides the menu of types of recollection from which an individual person can construct their memory, just as language provides the bricks from which a person may assemble a particular speech act.

While this thesis does not employ the phrase collective memory (for reasons outlined below, see p. 40), it approaches memory from the same theoretical starting point as those scholars who do. All memory is mediated by social context, and groups of people share frameworks and scripts of remembrance, if not their specific individual experiences. It is an approach that owes a large debt to the work of Maurice Halbwachs and, in particular, his rejection of Freudian and other purely psychological accounts of memory in favour of an approach that

emphasises the connection between social groups and memory. Halbwachs’ seminal insight was that all memories are constructed and defined by a person’s social identity and social group. From this, he developed a theory of memory in which each social group constructs a version of its own past, its collective memory, which in turn determines both what is memorable and how it will be recalled by its members.

However, though it provides the cornerstone of most contemporary intersubjectivist approaches to memory, Halbwachs’ theory is problematic in a number of ways. For a start, it is somewhat incomplete. At no point does Halbwachs provide a concrete definition of collective memory, and, as a result, his theory is often dismissed as ‘woolly’ and lacking clarity. More significantly, owing largely to its Durkheimian, functionalist roots, his account overemphasises the stability of memory within a group. This has left his theory open to two main criticisms. First, that by explaining individual memories as the product of group identity, Halbwachs subsumes individuals and their agency beneath their social context. As James Fentress and Chris Wickham put it, the Halbwachian subject appears as an ‘automaton, passively obeying the interiorised collective will’. It is to avoid such connotations, and to avoid giving the (misleading) impression that individuals are akin to agentless plankton, swept on the tides of a sprite-like group identity, that I eschew the term collective memory in this thesis.

The second criticism is that, by assuming a fixed, functional collective identity which ensures solidarity and continuity, Halbwachs’ provides an account of memory that is essentially conflict free. He gives no sense of the ways in which memory may function as an ideological, repressive resource, or the extent to which subaltern groups may resist it. It is this latter criticism that has animated many more recent intersubjectivist approaches to memory,
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particularly the presentist and popular memory schools. In what follows I will provide a brief outline of these two approaches, before defending the dynamics of memory approach that is adopted in this thesis.

The central tenet of the presentist approach is that the past is moulded to suit present dominant interests. While the functionalist tradition is alive to the fact that groups remember collectively and selectively, the presentist approach delineates precisely who is responsible for this selection: people in political power, who utilise memory to serve their own self-interest. Perhaps the most famous historical application of this approach has been undertaken by Eric Hobsbawn and Terence Ranger. In a study of nineteenth-century Europe, Hobsbawn argued that the emergence of mass politics necessitated the construction of new traditions and memories, often in the form of mass communal rituals, that could inculcate new beliefs and legitimate new institutions. For example, he contended that the revival of royal ritualism in Britain in this period was a deliberate counterweight to the potential dangers of popular democracy.

However, while the presentist perspective raises the important point that memories are often the product of power relations, it does not tackle the question of how far memories from above can be imposed successfully or consider why some memories come to enjoy widespread adoption while others do not. It is these questions that are the principal concern of the popular memory school. Taking much of their early inspiration from Michel Foucault’s conceptualisation of counter-memory, scholars of this approach seek to analyse the construction of memory from the bottom up as well as the top down. They are concerned with the relationship between powerful elites’ attempts to shape memory and resistive groups’ own, alternative narratives. This perspective has drawn historical attention to the fact that memory cultures cannot be straightforwardly reduced to the interpretations propagated by elites, and has brought questions of conflict and power to the forefront of memory studies. Its influence is clearly visible in Wood’s study of custom, in which he emphasises that customal memory acted as a safe sphere in which members of the lower
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social orders could challenge and contest the power of elites. Customal memory was an arena in which rival understandings of the past, derived from conflicting interests, were played out.\(^{88}\)

However, one unfortunate side effect of treating memory purely as a symptom of political relations has been to stunt explorations of memory in areas where power dynamics may not be as evident. As Alon Confino states, there has been ‘a tendency to reduce memory, which is fundamentally a concept of culture, to the political’.\(^{89}\) A reluctance to approach all memories through the lens of the political is one of the key features of the dynamics of memory approach. It is this perspective which is applied throughout this thesis. The dynamics of memory approach, while by no means denying the importance of politics in the construction of memory, assumes that people may keep the past alive for reasons that are not necessarily instrumental. Memory may serve a range of purposes, and this approach is cautious about ascribing manipulative motives in advance.\(^{90}\)

Another key feature of the dynamics of memory perspective is its desire to explore not only self-conscious acts of commemoration, traditionally conceived, such as monuments and collective rituals, but also the subtler ways the past may be remembered in the present; the psychological, linguistic, and political processes that keep the past alive without necessarily intending to do so. Such an approach clearly lends itself to the desire to move away from memory as the study of only fairly self-evident, conventional memorial practices and towards some of the less obvious facets of memory, such as narrative representations of the past, material cultures, and diverse speech acts.

Michael Schudson’s study of memories of the Watergate scandal in America ably demonstrates the rewards of such an approach.\(^{91}\) By choosing Watergate as his subject Schudson selected an event which, by his own admission, initially appears to have had relatively little impact on American memorial culture. Most Americans do not talk about Watergate, did not experience it directly, and it has not been enshrined in formal state sanctioned commemorative practices, such as monuments or anniversary days. Yet, in spite of this, Schudson identifies numerous ways in which Watergate continues to be remembered.
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\(^{90}\) Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, p. 68.

in American life, and the multiple vehicles which propagate these memories, many of which the presentist and the popular approaches would be unlikely to capture. For example, he suggests that Watergate changed the vocabulary of politics, and, in doing so, left an ongoing legacy in American discourse whereby it is easier to describe different types of governmental corruption.\textsuperscript{92} Indeed, the suffix ‘-gate’ has itself become a short hand which is attached to diverse scandals, and, in this way, people continue to evoke and remember the spectre of Watergate in the present.

To approach memory within the dynamics of memory framework requires a broad definition of memory, one capable of capturing the multifarious ways in which the past may endure in the present. Thus, in this thesis, I define memory as the means by which the past, as something meaningfully connected to the present, is sustained and developed within individuals and cultures.\textsuperscript{93} This is a deliberately inclusive definition, and not an altogether uncontroversial one. It certainly does not conform to much general usage of the term, in which there must be a direct connection between a memory and an individual personal experience. Some scholars have rejected such a broad conception of memory for this reason, arguing that ‘memory is the mental faculty by which we preserve or recover our pasts, and also the events recovered. Without that link – now reaching back to then – you may have an image of the past in your mind, but it isn’t a memory but something else’.\textsuperscript{94} They criticise scholars for using memory to ‘describe what are really different ways of knowing about the past’, for conflating memories with what might more commonly be called representations.\textsuperscript{95} This concern, even when it is not shared by historians, has often not been tackled by them.\textsuperscript{96} Despite the prominence of ‘memory’ in their book titles, neither Neufeld or Pollmann make any sustained attempt to justify non-personal recollections as part of the material of memory. Yet, to paraphrase Schudson, I would maintain that it is the understanding of memory deployed in this thesis that has it right, and general usage that has it wrong.\textsuperscript{97} For a start,

\textsuperscript{93} This is a subtle variation of the definition of memory deployed by Geoffrey Cubitt, dispensing only with his stipulation that the connection needs to be ‘conscious’. See Cubitt, \textit{History and Memory}, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{96} The historian Sarah Foot, for example, has insisted on restricting memory to accounts of personal recollection only. See Sarah Foot, ‘Remembering, Forgetting and Inventing: Attitudes to the Past in England at the End of the First Viking Age’, \textit{Transactions of the Royal Historical Society}, 9 (1999), 185-200.
\textsuperscript{97} Schudson, \textit{Watergate in American Memory}, p. 51.
general usage also deploys the term memory to refer to events that a person did not directly experience, as well as those that they did. Barbara Misztal gives the example of licence plates in Quebec which proudly declare ‘I remember’, though the owner presumably does not purport to personally remember the state’s colonial past. More importantly, however, to say that an event, such as the Battle of Gettysburg in America, has a place in memory is not to say that people directly recall it. What is meant is simply that, through diverse processes and media, some kind of awareness of the battle has become widespread among Americans. To characterise these kinds of awarenesses of past events as representations, rather than as memories, deprives them of some of their purpose and power. For such representations are not just neutral descriptions; they are often attempts to influence people’s memories, or the results of earlier efforts to do so, and, as such, should be understood as a kind of memory work. A nineteenth-century preacher giving a sermon who evokes the events of the American Civil Wars is as much promulgating a version of the past as he is reciting something he may, or may not, have experienced himself. Susan Broomhall captures the difficulty of making a clear-cut distinction between memories and representations when she notes that ‘at some level, all written accounts are acts of memorialisation, where decisions are made about what to include and what to leave out’.

Further, by treating all evocations of the past that are connected to the present as manifestations of memory, one avoids the necessity of making any claims about the truth status of individual accounts. If I describe my experience at the anti-war protests in London in 2007 but embellish this by recalling, falsely, that I chained myself to some railings in Downing Street, presumably what we have here is, in popular terms, a lie or a misrepresentation and not a memory. In such cases, it is difficult to see how my false account differs in any substantive way from a representation of the event given in a television drama, simply by virtue of my having been present. Neither account provides the link of ‘now reaching back to then’ that Hynes requires for a description to be a memory. As historians, our interest in memories may stem as much from their falsehoods as their truths, and, by viewing all accounts of the past as forms of memory, my approach does not depend on our ability to attest to their veracity.
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Indeed, if only a person who experienced an event may be said to remember it, this renders the notion of second-generation memory and postmemory an impossibility. Such a restrictive understanding of memory problematizes numerous historical accounts, not least the many studies that are concerned with the memory of the Holocaust and the extent to which the children of Holocaust victims grow up with ‘inherited memories’ of these events.\(^{100}\)

However, to utilise such a broad conception of memory is not to say that memory does not take different forms. It is for this reason, and to lend the concept greater analytical traction, that I also utilise some narrower sub-categories of memory. ‘Personal memory’ is used to refer to any account of past events or circumstances that carries a trace of autonoetic awareness – that is, the relaying of what is presented as an autobiographical experience.\(^{101}\) ‘Public memory’ is used to refer to efforts by a group or disposition of power to select and organise representations of the past for their own ends, or to influence individuals’ own interpretations.\(^{102}\) ‘Vernacular memory’ means efforts to frame memory that take place on a local scale.\(^{103}\) A ‘community of memory’ is simply a group that appears to share a common version of past events, often attempting to socialise others into this account of what should be remembered and how.\(^{104}\) Clearly these are extremely broad-brush, porous categories, and this thesis deals with all of them at various points and to differing degrees. Together with the dynamics of memory approach, they provide a theoretical and methodological framework with which to tackle the slippery subject of memory.

The approach to memory outlined above has some significant implications for the source material which is deployed in this thesis, for to capture such a diverse range of memorial practices requires an equally varied source base. Scholars of memory have often suffered from what Schudson terms ‘drunk-looking-for-his-car-keys-under-the-lampost’ syndrome: the tendency to look for memory only in self-conscious public memory sites, not because that is necessarily where they will find what they are looking for, but because that is where illumination makes looking most convenient.\(^{105}\) Similarly, one of the challenges that


\(^{101}\) Cubitt, *History and Memory*, pp. 69-70.

\(^{102}\) This is based on the definition given by Nancy Wood. See Nancy Wood, *Vectors of Memory: Legacies of Trauma in Postwar Europe* (Oxford: Berg, 1999), p. 2.


\(^{104}\) For examples of communities of memory see Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, pp. 15-19.

confronts historians of early modern memory is the need to expand the materials of memory to encompass the literary and the non-textual, the momentous and the quotidian, both elite and popular narrations, rather than relying solely on the printed histories and memoirs of elites that are most easily accessible. In an effort to capture the multiplicity of ways the events of Britain’s Civil Wars were remembered in the 1650s, this thesis makes use of a varied and innovative source base. This includes hitherto unexplored aspects of 1650s culture, such as almanac chronologies and veterans’ commemorations, as well as printed texts, court records, petitions, diaries, civic records, and material culture.

The use of such a wide range of sources also has other advantages. Not least, it prevents this thesis falling prey to the ‘one-hand clapping’ problem. This is a shorthand for the criticism that by focusing on only one manifestation of memory – usually elite, public memory – historians risk painting an incomplete, and possibly even misleading, picture of memorial culture. It is an accusation that has been levelled at Neufeld’s work in particular, with fellow historians arguing that his decision to focus almost solely on the content of printed histories, and not on their reception in wider society, leads him to present an impoverished, one-sided view of Restoration memory. While no study will ever be entirely comprehensive – and this thesis clearly has many blind spots of its own, not least memories of the wars outside the English border – I attempt to combine efforts to shape public memory with evidence of what individual people and communities across the social spectrum actually were remembering.

Chapter one analyses the diverse ways in which the officials and supporters of the Commonwealth and Protectorate governments sought to influence and control which aspects of the previous decades should be remembered, and how, and which were better left forgotten. It argues that though the republican regimes did not enshrine a national commemorative occasion, in other respects they made concerted efforts to remember the Civil Wars. Moreover, this chapter suggests that when the governments’ memorial practices did exhibit inconsistency or ambivalence, this was less because the regimes of the 1650s were simply ‘not ready’ or not willing to commemorate the wars, as scholars such as Jansson and Hutton have suggested, and more often the result of changes in the political climate and the

challenges posed by a paradoxical desire to achieve both reconciliation and remembrance. It was this latter memorialising impulse that generally won out. As a result, remembrance was actually a far more ingrained part of 1650s republican culture than forgetting.

Chapter two explores the ways in which the republics’ opponents sought to shape the public memory of Britain’s domestic conflicts in printed material. The first two sections explore different facets of Royalist memory, while the third section examines the ways memory was deployed by some of the Parliament’s former allies, with emphasis on the Levellers and the ‘good old cause’. It argues that in contrast to the period immediately following the Restoration, when the authorities largely succeeded in erasing rival memories of the recent past from public view, opposition memories were a significant feature of the print culture of the 1650s, both more and less overtly. Further, it suggests that these counter-narratives had some important implications for contemporary politics, the shape of memory after 1660, and the Restoration settlement, not least the exclusion of the ‘puritan impulse’ from civil and ecclesiastical affairs, a decision which was heavily influenced by the Royalist memory culture of the previous decade.

The third chapter shifts the focus away from efforts to shape public memory, and, through a careful reading of a large quantity of legal records, illuminates one of the shadowiest corners of our understanding of early modern memory: the recollections of ordinary citizens. The first two sections examine memories of Civil War service, while the third section explores the ways people remembered wartime events. Together, they show that the memory of the turbulent recent past remained alive in the minds and discourses of citizens throughout the 1650s, and that these recollections could be deployed to serve a range of purposes, from statements of identity to expressions of political disapprobation. It emphasises that though, to some extent, people’s memories were influenced by public discourses and government legislation, individuals also had the capacity to subvert, reject, and even contribute to public scripts. It also demonstrates that though people’s memories were not restricted to local events, an area’s particular wartime experience could influence both the events that people chose to recall and the way these were remembered, tracing some of the geographic variations in cultures of memory across England.

Chapter four explores the ways in which theatres of war acted as sites of memory during the English republics. It argues that the absence of war memorials on Britain’s Civil War battlefields did not necessarily mean that the sites of the domestic conflicts were straightforwardly reabsorbed into the landscape, and shows that places of war acted as receptacles of, and prompts for, diverse forms of memory throughout the 1650s. This chapter’s findings complicate some existing theories about the historical development of commemorative practices, and particularly the suggestion, advanced most convincingly by Ian Atherton and Philip Morgan, that the seventeenth century witnessed a large-scale shift from soil to ink as the main medium of memory. It argues that by viewing commemorative practices in the context of long-term historical trajectories, historians of commemoration have obscured those moments when the physical was, in spite of the absence of specific war memorials, a powerful site of memory.

The fifth and final chapter explores the ways in which individuals chose to narrate, structure, and recall their own wartime experiences, and those of their family, during the 1650s. The first part of the chapter analyses the memoirs of two Royalist veterans, Sir Hugh Cholmley and Sir Richard Grenville, while the rest is dedicated to a statistically significant collection of surviving war narratives: the petitions of maimed Parliamentarian soldiers and war widows. It emphasises the power of forgetting as a narrative device, the similarities – and differences – between Parliamentarian and Royalist recollections, and the ways in which women’s stories might foreground their own wartime agency. It also considers the extent to which public scripts influenced personal memory and argues that the boundary between these two categories was often highly porous.

Taken as a whole, the contribution this thesis makes to the field of early modern studies is three-fold. First, it extends an area of major academic interest by tackling the hitherto neglected empirical question of how the British Civil Wars were remembered prior to the Restoration, demonstrating that memories of the conflicts in this period are not best characterised by their absence. Second, it expands the field of early modern memory beyond its traditional focus on printed histories and elite memoirs and shows that the use of a more diverse and imaginative range of sources can enrich, and also challenge, our understanding of early modern memorial culture. Third, it interacts with and informs theoretical debates about

---

the nature of early modern memory and the experience of post-civil war states, both within and beyond early modernity.
Chapter One

Republican Recollections

In January 1649, Charles I, King of England, was found guilty of treason against his own people, and, on the 30th of that month, executed at Whitehall. Upon the scaffold he turned to his companion, Dr William Juxon, and uttered the word ‘Remember’. He was not, however, the only figure who perceived the importance of controlling the memory of this momentous event, or the turbulent decade that had preceded it. In the precarious political climate of the fledgling Commonwealth, the interpretation of the recent past had a direct bearing on the politics of the present, and, as the axe fell, the new regime was faced with the task of presenting both the King’s death and the transactions of the bloody Civil Wars in a favourable light. This chapter analyses the ways in which the officials and supporters of the republics sought to control the public memory of the wars between 1649 and 1660. To do so, it draws on a wide range of printed material, from government declarations and licensed newsbooks to almanacs and ballads.

Analysing print culture, and particularly ephemeral print, is not always straightforward. Much pro-government propaganda was not directly commissioned by the authorities, and, as Jason Peacey has shown, official involvement in the production of printed material was a sliding scale, from texts produced by order of parliament to works where only extensive ‘grubbing in the archives’ might reveal the complex web of patrons and writers that led to their publication. Attributing authorship to anonymous or initialled texts is seldom possible, and even contemporary claims to authorship do not necessarily guarantee the writer’s identity. Political allegiances were not static, and an author’s perspective might shift for personal, economic, or political reasons over the course of the decade. Though this chapter has,

1 Anon., King Charls his speech made upon the scaffold at Whitehall-Gate, immediately before his execution, on Tuesday the 30 of Jan. 1648 (London, 1649; Thomason / E.540[17]), p. 13.
2 Jason Peacey, Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), pp. 25-27. Some historians have taken issue with the use of the term ‘propaganda’ in the context of the early modern period. Joad Raymond, in particular, argues that it is a term loaded with the connotations of twentieth-century dictatorships and, as such, that its use is anachronistic. However, following Jason McElligott, I use propaganda simply to refer to print that attempted to propagate a particular political opinion or doctrine, and not to imply any specific relationship between a particular text and the authorities. It is used interchangeably with other terms that convey a similar meaning, if only for the sake of variation. See Jason McElligott, Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), pp. 9-11 and Joad Raymond, ‘Introduction’, in News Networks in Seventeenth-Century Britain and Europe, ed. by Joad Raymond (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), pp. 1-13.
3 The well-known astrologer Edward Pond, for example, appears to have authored almanacs until 1700, apparently unimpeded by the small matter of his death in 1629. Joad Raymond, ‘Pond, Edward (d. 1629)’, ODNB < https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/22489> [accessed 5 October 2016].
wherever possible, taken into account the author, publisher, and bookseller that produced a particular work, the meaning of individual texts has also been deduced from their content and the political context in which they performed.\footnote{This latter point is particularly important, as the political volatility of the period meant that a text could take on a different meaning in a changed political climate. See, for example, Jason Peacey’s discussion of Gilbert Mabbott’s account of the King’s trial in Jason Peacey, ‘Reporting a Revolution: A Failed Propaganda Campaign’, in The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I, ed. by Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), pp. 162-176.} This approach owes much to J. G. A. Pocock’s emphasis on the importance of textual intention, not least his scepticism about the feasibility of reconstructing authorial intentions as something that may exist independent of the text in which they are articulated.\footnote{J. G. A. Pocock, Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 4-28.}

The chapter traces each of the main facets of republican public memory in turn, drawing attention to the similarities and differences between successive regimes, the political purposes served by memory, and also some of its problems and paradoxes. It shows that though successive governments chose not to establish an annual memorial occasion, in other respects the regimes and supporters of the republics made concerted, if sometimes inconsistent, attempts to commemorate the Civil Wars. More specifically, it demonstrates that while the content of these efforts was often a response to a particular political moment, there were themes that came to dominate republican public memory, forming the drumbeats of memorial culture. In particular, the culpability of the King for the wars, the providential nature of Parliamentarian victories, and the cruel and untrustworthy actions of the Scots recurred in diverse accounts and periods.

Further, this chapter suggests that when republican commemorative practices did exhibit inconsistency or ambivalence, this was less because the regimes of the 1650s were ‘not ready’ to memorialise the Civil Wars, as scholars such as Maija Jansson have suggested, and more often a result of changes in the political climate and the challenges posed by a paradoxical desire to achieve both reconciliation and remembrance.\footnote{Maija Jansson, ‘Remembering Marston Moor: The Politics of Culture’ in Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown, ed. by Susan D. Amuseen and Mark A. Kishlansky (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 225-268 (p. 268); Ronald Hutton, The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year 1400-1700 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 221.} Despite some efforts to forget the actions of individual Royalists, and thus achieve a wiping of the slate, it was this latter, memorialising impulse that generally won out: as a result, remembering was actually a far more ingrained part of 1650s republican culture than forgetting.
i. ‘The author of England’s calamity’: History, Memory, and the Causes of the Civil Wars

The warning Sir Walter Raleigh offered to the would-be historian that should he ‘follow truth too neare the heelles, it may happily strike out his teeth’ was not heeded by contemporaries of the Civil Wars. As soon as hostilities commenced, authors began to produce historical accounts that sought to steer the way these events would be interpreted by their fellow citizens. As the historian Thomas May put it, the purpose of historicising the Civil Wars was ‘to put some Englishmen in minde of what hath passed heretofore, such Englishmen as in all these time of trouble, have had (to the great mis-fortune of the Common-wealth) very treacherous memories’. In other words, people could not be relied upon to recall the transactions of the recent past in an appropriate manner and required satisfactory, politically favourable, accounts to guide their recollections. This section offers an analysis of historical narratives of the wars produced in support of the Commonwealth and Protectorate regimes, with particular emphasis on accounts of the causes of the conflict.

---

9 [Thomas May], The changeable Covenant. Shewing in a brief series of relation, how the Scots from time to time have imposed upon England, by their false glosses, and perverse interpretations of the Covenant (London, 1650; Thomason / E.613[11]), p. 1.
10 By a ‘historical narrative’, I mean any attempt to narrativise, explain, or selectively structure the events of the past. This is a broad definition which necessarily includes not only what we may recognise as full-length, formal histories, but also much ephemeral print. ‘Supportive’ accounts have varying connections to the central authorities (or lack thereof). What they share, however, are narratives of events that were supportive of the Parliamentary victory and at least one of the resulting regimes. Relative to historical accounts of the 1640s and 1660s, narratives of the Civil Wars published during the republics, full-length or otherwise, have received little sustained scholarly attention. What attention they have received has been largely dedicated to the work of Thomas May in isolation. There are no scholarly articles that deal with republican histories in the 1650s more generally. See J. G. A. Pocock, ‘Thomas May and the Narrative of Civil War’, in Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England, ed. by Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 112-136; Gary Rivett, ‘“Make Use of Both Things Present and Past”: Thomas May’s Histories of Parliament, Printed Public Discourse and the Politics of the Recent Past, 1640-1650’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Sheffield, 2010). For studies of Thomas May as a writer more generally see David Norbrook, ‘Lucan, Thomas May and the Creation of a Republican Literary Culture’, in
Authors of lengthy histories were usually quite explicit that their main concern was to impart a particular version of events to their audience, both present and future. As ‘S. Carrington’, author of a history of the life and times of Oliver Cromwell, phrased it, such accounts might serve as ‘so many living Monuments, not to be defaced by Times Violence nor Envy’. Full-length historical works were not, however, the only genre that allowed writers to construct historical narratives; efforts to historicise the wars were also common in more ephemeral print. During the wars, newsbook and pamphlet accounts of political machinations and battles poured off the press, and political declarations often set recent events in historical context, making the line between history and other printed genres highly permeable.

Authors of long-form histories appear to have been keenly aware of the threat that popular print could pose to their authority over the past. When, in 1649, John Leycester drew an explicit contrast between ‘Mercurius, Aulicus and divers others of that gang, [who] have baited their hookes withall to catch silly simple souls’ and a ‘historicall relation’, such as he had produced, he was hoping to reassure his readers of the greater veracity and intellectual scope of his work over and above cheap print. It was a distinction that some authors of shorter works also acknowledged, in theory if not in practice. The author of a 1650 tract, printed by the pro-regicide bookseller Giles Calvert, began with an apology that he was ‘wanting Experience and Learning to derive any knowledg from antiquated Times or Histories, for the fashioning this into an elegant and polite work’. Nevertheless, apparently undaunted by these limitations, they went on to provide a narrative which they claimed ‘set down the beginnings and first entrance’ of the wars.

In fact, some of the first concerted efforts to frame the memory of the wars in the context of the new republican state appeared in ephemeral print, and particularly material produced in
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11 S. Carrington*, The History of the Life and Death of his Most Serene Highness, Oliver late Lord Protector wherein, from his cradle to his tomb, are impartially transmitted to posterity, the most weighty transactions foreign or domestique that have happened in his time, either in matters of law, proceedings in Parliaments, or other affairs in church or state* (London, 1659; Wing / C643), sig. A4r.

12 John Lycester, *The civill warres of England briefly related from His Majesties first setting up his standard 1641, to this present personall hopefull treaty: with the lively effigies and eulogies of the chief commanders* (London, 1649; Wing / R1428), sig. B1r. This text was a republication and extension of Josiah Ricraft’s work *Survey of England’s Champions, and Truths Faithfull Patriots* (London, 1647; Wing / R1436).

13 ‘S.W.’, *The constant man’s character. Intended to be sent first as a letter from a gentleman in the country, to a gentleman his esteemed friend and countryman, a Member of the House of Commons* (London, 1650; Thomason / E.595[7]), p. 1.

14 Ibid.
support of the King’s trial and execution. Both the act erecting the High Court of Justice and the trial charges themselves offered potted histories of the causes of the wars, presenting a version of events in which responsibility was laid firmly at the King’s door. The charges included both an account of how Charles had ‘out of a wicked Design, to erect and uphold himself an unlimited and Tyrannical power […] Trayterously and maliciously levyed War’, and also a list of the battles between the King and Parliament, through which he ‘hath caused and procured many thousands of free-people of the Nation to be slain’. This interpretation of the wars was partially borne of legal necessity. The case that the court brought against the King turned on his having broken a fundamental bond of trust with his people by failing to govern in accordance with the law. This was evidenced by his deliberate levying of a war against them, contrary to his obligations to the public good. It was therefore necessary to demonstrate that Charles himself had been responsible for the outbreak of war. However, this account also proved a useful way of justifying the new political situation in which England now found herself and of legitimating the formation of the Commonwealth state. As a result, similar causal accounts proliferated in ephemeral print in the period following the regicide and the establishment of the republic.

The pamphlet *A Declaration of the Parliament of England*, printed by order of parliament in March 1649, was typical. This text purported to provide a ‘short view of some passages’ from the late King’s reign and began by listing the various ways that, over the course of the 1630s and early 1640s, Charles had attempted to ‘awe us [i.e. the people of England] into Slavery’. It dwelt at some length on the King’s decision to desert the Parliament in order to
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16 Ibid., pp. 3-4, 6.


18 Anon., *A Declaration of the Parliament of England, expressing the grounds of their late proceedings, and of settling the present government in a way of a free state* (London, 1649; Thomason / E.548[12]). For other similar accounts from the years 1649 to 1652 see Anon., *A word to Mr. Wil. Prym Esq; and two for the Parliament and Army* (London, 1649; Thomason / E.537[16]); John Redingstone, *Plain English to the Parliament and army, and to the rest of the people* (London, 1649; Thomason / E.538[4]; ‘S.W.’, *The constant man’s character*; Anon., *The none-such Charles his character extracted, out of divers original transactions, dispatches and the notes of severall publick ministers, and councellours of state as wel at home as abroad* (London, 1651; Thomason E.1345[2]); Anon., *The life and reigne of King Charles or, the pseudo-martyr discovered* (London, 1651; Thomason / E.1338[2]); John Vicars, *A brief review of the most material Parliamentary proceedings of this present Parliament, and their armies, in their civil and martial affairs* (London, 1652; Thomason / E.693[2]); William Lilly, *Monarchy or no Monarchy in England* (London, 1651; Thomason / E.638[17]).

19 Anon., *A Declaration of the Parliament*, pp. 6-7 (p. 7).
raise forces in the north of England, culminating in his declaration of war in 1642, an act which ‘all men have too sad cause with much grief to remember’. Finally, it provided an account of the events of the wars themselves, with particular emphasis on the bloodthirstiness and cruelty displayed by the King. This was a common technique in republican accounts, with the tale of Charles ordering that the provisions around the Oxford garrison be burnt, in order to starve his people, an especially popular choice. Evoking memories of atrocities committed during the wars helped to buttress a particular account of its causes, as well as reminding readers of the cruelty of the King and the Royalist party more generally. The declaration concluded with an explanation as to why, as a result of these events, the Parliament had ‘judged it necessary to change the Government of this Nation from the former Monarchy […] into a Republique’. In short, because the untrustworthy and tyrannous actions of the late King, which had culminated in a declaration of war against his own people, demonstrated the necessity of removing the monarchy in order to safeguard the liberties of the English people.

This causal account – in which public liberties had been threatened by monarchical misrule – also came to dominate more formal historical accounts of the origins of the wars, not least the first original, full-length history favourable to the Commonwealth to be published after the regicide, Thomas May’s *A Breviary of the History of the Parliament of England* (1650). Of all the book-length histories published during the 1650s, this text comes the closest to being the official version of events. Although there is no conclusive proof that it was commissioned by the Parliament, there is certainly evidence which suggests as much. At the very least, it was produced with their approval. Following May’s death in November 1650, the Parliament ordered that a committee should ‘think of some fit person to succeed in carrying on the history written by Mr May’, a turn of phrase which implies that May’s work up to that point had been produced under its auspices. May had also undertaken several other Parliamentary
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20 Ibid., p. 10.
21 ‘A cruelty not to be paralleld by Infidell, Heathen, or pagan King’ was how John Cook described the incident. See John Cook, *King Charls his case: or, An appeal to all rational men, concerning his tryal at the High Court of Justice* (London, 1649; Thomason / E.542[3]), p. 16. For another reference to this story see Sir Edward Peyton, *The Divine Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts: or, a short history of the rise, reign, and ruine thereof* (London, 1652; Thomason / E.1291[1]), p. 81.
24 CSPD, xv, p. 1. There was no further mention of the appointment of his successor until October 1651, when another committee was ordered to ‘consider of some fit person to write the history of these times and to take care and oversight thereof, and to consider likewise of a fit encouragement for the person or persons employed,
commissions, including the publication of the royal letters captured at Naseby in *The King’s Cabinet Opened* (1645), and in July 1650 he had been selected to translate the Parliamentary declaration against the Scots into Latin.25

The first part of May’s account was dedicated to explaining the causes of the first Civil War, and provided a lengthier exposition of many points that had already been articulated on a more piecemeal basis elsewhere. Two inter-related claims took centre stage. First, May asserted that the authority of parliament and, consequently, the liberties of the people, had been infringed and threatened under Charles I. Second, he averred that the culpability for these transgressions lay squarely with the King, as opposed to his ‘evil counsellors’ or any other third party.26 By emphasising the numerous ways in which Charles had posed a threat to parliamentary authority, May subtly implied that parliament had possessed this kind of authority to begin with, and that by threatening parliament the King had also threatened the liberties of the people, against which only parliament could offer a defence. He also demonstrated, less subtly, that the outbreak of war had been a direct result of the Charles’ tyrannical actions and that the King was therefore culpable for all the bloodshed that followed.

May’s interpretation enabled him to justify both the trial and execution of the King and the power which the Parliament now wielded at the helm of the fledgling republic. The discussion of the correct workings of a mixed constitution that had dominated May’s 1647 text, *The History of the Parliament of England*, was replaced by an account in which only parliament was truly capable of defending the liberties of the people.27 Religious concerns, though not entirely absent, were restricted to a vague desire on the part of Parliament to preserve the Protestant religion and as further evidence of Charles’ ‘designes’, particularly his supposed desire to infiltrate his kingdoms with popery.28 It was through this explanatory lens that May interpreted the individual events that had led up to the outbreak of hostilities. Thus, both the King’s tardiness in denouncing the Irish as rebels in 1641 and his sale of the Crown Jewels in 1642 were evidence that the war had been ‘designed by the King’, and much

---

was made of the fact that it was Charles who had first raised his standard. The Lord Keeper’s removal of the seal from the Parliament in 1642, meanwhile, was presented as a theft, yet another illegal act of tyranny committed by the King, to be added to the imposition of Ship Money, illegal taxes, and the dissolution of parliaments. In fact, the great seal was part of the legal authority conferred on a monarch, and, as Gary Rivett notes, May’s decision to present its removal as a crime was one of his greater ‘overmanipulations’, albeit one entirely consistent with the kind of story he sought to tell about the causes of the war. In essence, the Breviary, like many other historical accounts produced during the early years of the Commonwealth, told the story of the conflict as one of an untrustworthy and tyrannical monarch waging war on his subjects, leaving the Parliament with little choice but to oppose him. Or, as May succinctly put it, the King was ‘the Chief offender, the raiser of the whole War, and author of Englands calamity’.

Despite their prevalence, the tone and emphasis of king-blaming accounts could differ, even where the narrative thrust was similar. Some authors, for example, chose to place the actions of the late King in a longer historical trajectory, presenting Charles I as only one in a line of tyrannical kings, albeit the most offensive. In so doing, these authors confronted head-on any suggestion that the actions of Charles I, as an individual, could be divorced from the office of king as an institution, a separation that left the door open for the accession of Charles II. If monarchy had, by its very nature, produced an entire line of corrupt Norman kings, it was impossible that Charles II could be trusted to act as a constitutionally limited and lawful ruler.

---

30 Ibid., p. 63.
32 For other full-length histories that take this approach, albeit with some differences in emphasis, see Lilly, Monarchy or no Monarchy and Peyton, The Divine Catastrophe. Lilly, for example, when discussing Ship Money, deviates from May’s account into a discussion of how, in his personal experience, this tax was actually somewhat less than Parliamentary assessments; but, in any case, the broad explanatory arc was distinctly similar.
33 May, Breviary, p. 214.
34 See, for example, Peyton, The Divine Catastrophe, pp. 122-125. It is a sentiment which was echoed in verse by the poet George Wither: ‘What could, we have expected, from a King / So wilful, and so false, in every thing? / Or, from the Offspring, of a Generation / So long time, rooted in Prevarication’. See George Wither, The British Appeals, with Gods mercifull replies on behalf of the Commonwealth of England contained in a brief commemorative poem, composed for a memoriall of some of those many signall mercies lately vouchsafed to this republike (London, 1651; Wing / W3143A), p. 28.
For similar reasons, many republican propagandists also sought to emphasise the potential for tyranny in the person of Charles II himself, both as a consequence of hereditary and as a result of his involvement in the wars. In the early years of the Commonwealth, Charles Stuart was often referred to as ‘Son to the late Tyrant’. In September 1650, a particularly vitriolic edition of the licensed newsbook *Mercurius Politicus* reported that Charles II had contracted consumption, claiming that the young Prince ‘spits bloud; but not so fast (I suppose) as hee and his Father spilt it’, a turn of phrase that highlighted the Prince’s participation in the conflict. Even as late as 1654, the anonymous author of a tract that sought to defend Cromwell’s Protectorate chose to remind their readers that Charles Stuart had been ‘bred up in blood, in the midst of debauched Armies, and drank a large draft of that which his Father drew from the sides of these three Nations’. Other writers combined an account of Charles I’s culpability for the wars with the powerful notion of blood guilt. This concept had ancient roots and derived from the widespread belief that the unjust shedding of blood polluted those responsible. While such pollution did not necessarily require retribution, there was a series of biblical texts which suggested that blood guilt did demand earthly vengeance, in order to prevent the whole land becoming defiled. Thus, if Charles I was entirely responsible for the Civil Wars, he was also responsible for the unjust deaths of thousands of men and women, a crime for which he should be punished, blood for blood.

Theories of blood guilt permeated the thought and writings of members of the New Model Army in particular. At the famous prayer meeting held at Windsor Castle on 29 April 1648, those members of the army that were present concluded that the ongoing miseries of the nation were the result of continued negotiation with ‘that man of blood’ Charles I. Indeed, it was partially the fear of repeating this error that drove the army to purge the Parliament in
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36 Anon., *A proclamation for the discovery and apprehending of Charlts Stuart, and other traytors his adherents and abettors* (London, 1651; Thomason / 669.f.16[25]); Anon., *The true manner of the crowning of Charles the Second King of Scotland, on the first day of January, 1650. Together with a description of his life, and throne; and a cleare view of his court and counsel* (London, 1651; Thomason / 669.f.15[81]).


38 Anon., *A True account of the late bloody and inhumane conspiracy against His Highness the Lord Protector, and this Commonwealth* (London, 1654; Thomason / E.813[22]), p. 19.

39 See, for example, Genesis IX.6 and Numbers XXXV.33. For further discussion of the concept of ‘blood guilt’ and its relationship to the regicide see Patricia Crawford, ‘Charles Stuart, That Man of Blood’, *Journal of British Studies*, 16.2 (1977), 41-61.

1648 and advocate the execution of the King in 1649.\(^{41}\) When narrating the causes of the wars, these men tended to emphasise not only the culpability of the King but also his consequent blood guilt and the theological imperative of his execution. As an army declaration published in 1650 stated, they believed that Charles I was ‘a man guilty of [shedding] more Innocent Blood in England, Ireland and Scotland, even of those he ought to have preserved […] then any of his predecessors’ and fearing that the ‘high Displeasure of God would fall upon them if they had not done it did bring to Justice and cause to be executed, the said King’.\(^{42}\) Even when this biblical notion of blood guilt was not made explicit, republican writers often described the death and destruction wrought by the wars in emotionally evocative terms, before going on to remind readers that it was the King who had been the cause. In 1650, one writer pondered whether there was ‘any one Family or Kindred throughout the three Kingdoms, that yeelds not a Father, Mother, Brother, Sister, or a Kinsman, whose tears have not cryed to Heaven for the infinity of blood spilt through his [Charles I’s] willfulness, or for the wounds, or losse of Limbs of so many throughout the Land…?’\(^ {43}\)

Thus, despite the Parliament’s professed desire for ‘an oblivion of all Rancor, and ill will occasioned by the late troubles’, during the period of the Commonwealth both the government and its supporters attempted to inculcate a public memory of the wars in which culpability lay with the King. Parliament was absolved of blame, and the new state settlement was justified.\(^{44}\) Even if it was true that the evil actions of Charles I had ‘been writ out in deep Characters of Blood […] such] that they will not suddenly be worn out of the Peoples Sense, much less of their Memory’, the very act of restating these apparently unforgettable events was a way of memorialising them, and, crucially, of memorialising them in a way that legitimated the Commonwealth state.\(^ {45}\) King-blaming narratives were, if nothing else, politically expedient.

Further, by laying the blame for the wars almost exclusively on Charles’ head – while simultaneously relieving him of it – the state’s supporters were engaged in a process of establishing and containing exactly who should be held responsible, as well as legitimating

\(^{41}\) Barber, *Regicide and Republicanism*, p. 99.  
\(^{42}\) Anon., *A declaration of the army of England, upon their march into Scotland* (London, 1650; Thomason / E.607[20]), pp. 5-6.  
\(^{43}\) Anon., *The life and reigne of King Charles*, p. 180.  
\(^{44}\) Anon., *A Declaration of the Parliament*, p. 25.  
the regicide and justifying the dismantling of the monarchy. If Charles I was indeed the ‘author of all our miseries’ then there was no need to extend punishment and retribution beyond his person and that of a handful of his most notorious generals, thus facilitating the reconciliation of former Royalists into the republican state. As we shall see in section iii, the reconciliation and reintegration of former enemies was a policy attempted by successive republican governments, albeit with varying degrees of success. To some extent, then, remembering the *causes* of the wars was a commemorative practice that was supportive of, rather than at odds with, the Commonwealth’s desire for oblivion, if only because it created a narrative in which one figure could embody all responsibility for the wars.

As the decade progressed, printed histories that outlined the causes of the wars became less prevalent. In part, this may simply be because, as the years advanced, the fate of the King gradually ceased to be a live political issue, and, as a result, demonstrating that he had been responsible for the conflicts became a less pressing concern. However, it may also be because by the later 1650s, and under a Protectorate regime which had seen multiple parliaments dissolved, to emphasise too heavily the importance of parliamentary authority, and the evils of encroaching upon it, would no longer necessarily appear a straightforwardly supportive political narrative. In a petition printed in 1654, opponents of the Protectorate made it clear that they considered the King’s treatment of his parliaments a key principle over which the wars had been fought, one that had been betrayed by the dissolution of the Little Parliament and the implementation of the Instrument of Government.46 Such critiques endured for the remainder of the decade, and came to form a central tenet of the printed discourses of the Commonwealth men, particularly during the unsettled years of 1658 and 1659.47

Presumably aware that many of their former allies were already pulling on these threads, narratives of the wars that were produced by supporters of the Protectorate contained a subtle shift in emphasis. While accounts produced prior to 1653, such as May’s *Breviary*, often dwelt on the King’s infringement of, and the powers invested in, parliament, later accounts tended to emphasise that though the wars had been caused by the King’s tyranny, it was not


47 For an example of this material which reinterprets the history of the causes of the wars see ‘J. S.’, *The continuation of this session of Parliament, justified; and the action of the Army touching that affair defended; and objections to both answered; according to the best rules of law, reason, and just-preserving policie* (London, 1659; Thomason / E.983[10]).
primarily the freedom of parliament but liberties, broadly couched, that were at stake.\textsuperscript{48} Though Charles was still responsible for the war, it was not necessarily his actions against his parliament that provided the main evidence of his tyranny, nor was this body the only institution that could safeguard the people. As the anonymous author of the 1654 tract, \textit{A True State of the Case of the Commonwealth} put it

we never fought against the King, as King; nor for the Parliament or Representative consider’d purely as such: But we took up Arms against the King because he demeaned himself as a Tyrant, and had projected a wicked designe of introducing his own Will and Power above Law; and for the Parliament or Representative, because it seemed to be the likeliest and best means (as Affairs then stood) to prevent those manifold evils which threatened the kingdom, and to preserve the Liberties of the People.\textsuperscript{49}

The clear implication was that institutions besides a parliament – including, presumably, a Protectorate – might be equally capable of protecting the liberties of the people.

The evocation of the events that had led to Civil War also endured in a very particular, if often overlooked, form of historical material: the almanac.\textsuperscript{50} Published annually, almanacs were astronomical guides to the planetary movements of the coming year. However, they also contained information on a range of other useful subjects, from dates of fairs to medical notes, and they usually included a chronicle of notable historical events. These chronicles took one of two forms: a ‘chronology of memorable things’, which recorded the number of years that had elapsed since various notable incidents occurred, and calendrical insertions, whereby important events appeared in the main calendar on the date they had taken place, alongside planetary motions.\textsuperscript{51} During the 1650s, events that immediately preceded the

\textsuperscript{48} See, for example, George Smith, \textit{Gods unchangeableness: or Gods continued providence, in preserving, governing, ordering and disposing of all creatures, men, actions, counsels and things} (London, 1655; Thomason / E.824[4]), p. 19. One notable exception was the first part of John Rushworth’s \textit{Historical Collections}, submitted in manuscript form to the Council of State in 1657 and published in 1659. According to Rushworth, after he had ‘perused, ordered, and compared my Printed and Manuscript Relations of the First Year of that [the Long] Parliament’, he found that they ‘pointed at, and were bottomed upon some Actions of the late Kings, in dissolving four preceding Parliaments’. However, as Rushworth’s account only ran up to 1629 it was sufficiently temporally distant to avoid accusations of overtly critiquing Protectoral rule. John Rushworth, \textit{Historical collections of private passages of state Weighty matters in law} (London, 1659; Wing (2nd ed.) / R2316A), sig. B2r.

\textsuperscript{49} Anon., \textit{A true state of the case of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging; in reference to the late established government by a Lord Protector, and a Parliament} (London, 1654; Thomason / E.728[3]) [my emphasis], p. 5.

\textsuperscript{50} For a lengthier discussion of the representation of the recent past in the almanacs of the 1650s see Imogen Peck, “‘A chronology of some memorable accidents’: The Representation of the Recent Past in English Almanacs, 1648-1660”, \textit{Historical Research} (forthcoming 2018).

\textsuperscript{51} For an example of each see William Eland, \textit{Hemerologium astronomicum in annum aerae Christianae MDCLVI. Or An almanack for the year of Christ 1656} (London, 1656; Wing / A1649), sig. C1v; Schardanus Rider, 1654, \textit{Merlinus Cambro-Britannus. Or the British Merlin demonstrating the true revolution of the year} (London, 1654; Wing / A2243A), sig. B5r.
outbreak of hostilities and the main military engagements of the wars themselves made frequent appearances in chronicles of both types. Indeed, in many cases, the political and military upheavals of the recent past were significantly over-represented. John Rowley’s chronology featured 25 incidents, of which 13 related to the turbulent events of the 1640s and early 1650s: the beginning of the Long Parliament; the executions of Strafford, Laud, Charles I, Hamilton, Holland, and Capel; the Irish rebellion; the King leaving the Parliament; the raising of the King’s standard; and battles at Edgehill, Newbury, York, Naseby, and Dunbar.52

Despite taking the form of lists, almanac chronologies were not necessarily politically neutral. For example, in his almanac for 1654 the Royalist Richard Fitzsmith related how ‘his late Majestie (to avoid the insolence of the Tumults) left Whitehall, 1641’, while Francis Pigot described the same event as ‘The K. leaves Parliament and betakes himselfe to the assistance of the Northern Coast’.53 While Fitzsmith’s account implied that Charles’ actions were both necessary and justified, Pigot’s conformed far more closely to the king-blaming narratives explored above, whereby the King deliberately chose to desert the Parliament in order to raise forces in the north. The political implications of the subtleties of language within these lists were not lost on contemporaries. Francis Perkins continued to reprint his chronology from the 1650s after the Restoration, but he carefully re-worked the way these events were couched. ‘Colchester taken, and Lucas and Lisle shot to death’ from the 1655 edition, for example, became ‘Colchester taken, brave Lucas and Lisle shot to death’ in 1662.54

During the seventeenth century, almanacs were among the most popular printed products in England. Bernard Capp has estimated that in the 1660s (the earliest period for which detailed evidence survives) sales averaged around 400,000 copies annually, a figure which suggests that around one in three families bought an almanac each year.55 As a result, they were a

52 John Rowley, Katoptron, sive, Speculum perspicuum uranicum, or, A glasse wherein you may behold the various motions [...] of the coelestiall bodies in this yeare (London, 1652; Wing / A2305), sig. C4r.
53 Richard Fitzsmith, Syzygiasticon instauratum: or, An almanack & ephemeris for the year of our Lord God, 1654 (London, 1654; Thomason / E.1500[1]), sig. C4r; Francis Pigot, An almanack for the yeare of our Lord God, 1657 (London, 1657; Wing / A2119), sig. A5r. [my emphasis].
54 Francis Perkins, A new almanack and prognostication for the year of our Lord God 1655 (London, 1655; Wing / A2070), sig. B8r; Francis Perkins, A new almanack and prognostication for the year of our Lord God 1662 (London, 1662; Wing / A2076), sig. C1r.
highly commercial enterprise, their content driven primarily by market concerns.\textsuperscript{56} When combined with the fact that historical lists were not essential for astronomical or astrological calculations, this suggests that the incorporation of chronologies that enumerated Civil War events was a response to consumer demand. Several almanac compilers chose to advertise the inclusion of a history of revolutionary events on their title page. John Gadbury’s 1658 almanac proudly announced that it came ‘with a succinct Chronologie of The most Remarkable Accidents that have happened in this Island of Great Britain, since the commencement of our late […] Divisions’, and when the Royalist astrologer George Wharton attempted to omit a chronology and ‘such other trumperies’ from his almanac they were re-inserted by his printers.\textsuperscript{57} John Vicars, author of a popular Civil War history published in 1652, expressed quite explicitly his belief that there was a market for memory, declaring that his tract allowed ‘any man [who] will be informed of any remarkable passage, he may turne to the year, and so see in some measure, in what Moneth thereof it was accomplished’.\textsuperscript{58}

Printed material which historicised the wars was not, therefore, entirely the product of top-down forces. While the supporters of successive republican regimes produced historical material that would buttress the legitimacy of the newly formed state, there was also a desire, among some people at least, to purchase and utilise these historical relations. The republics’ efforts to historicise the events of the wars did not exist independent of a readership for this kind of material – a readership that was significant enough to prompt the republication of May’s \textit{Breviary} in 1655, as well as the production of numerous Civil War almanac chronologies. If the republics were willing to remember the events that caused the wars, so too were at least some of the wider population, regardless of whether or not they accepted the republics’ preferred version of events.

Of course, many historical relations did not restrict themselves, as we have in this section, to narrations of the causes of the war; writers also undertook the task of recording the various military engagements and explaining their outcomes. In this latter endeavour, pro-republic accounts, both ephemeral and full-length alike, often resorted to the same explanatory

\textsuperscript{56} Capp, \textit{Astrology and the Popular Press}, pp. 23-65.  
\textsuperscript{57} John Gadbury, \textit{Prognostikon, or, An astrological prediction of the various changes likely to occur in most parts of Europe this present year 1638} (London, 1658; Wing / A1781), sig. A1r; Capp, \textit{Astrology and the Popular Press}, p. 45. See also George Wharton, \textit{No Merline, nor Mercury: but a new almanack after the old fashion, for the year of our redemption, 1648} (Unknown, 1648; Thomason / E.1198[2]), sig. A1r.  
\textsuperscript{58} John Vicars, \textit{A brief review of the most material Parliamentary proceedings of this present Parliament, and their armies, in their civil and martial affairs} (London, 1652; Thomason / E.693[2]), sig. A1r.
framework: providence. It is to the role that providence played in the memory of the Civil Wars that this chapter will now turn.

ii. ‘Great Deliverances’: Providence and Civil War Memory

Preaching to Parliament the day after Charles I’s execution, the minister John Cardell called on his audience to ‘Remember but the wonders (I had almost said, the miracles) of this last Summer […] what a wonderful, what a sudden, what an unexpected, what an unparalleld [sic] deliverance, did the Lord work out for you’. 59 What Cardell was suggesting was that the Parliamentarian victories of 1648, and the outcome of the wars more generally, should be understood, and remembered, as acts of God. The sermon was subsequently published by the order of Henry Scobell, parliamentary clerk, a sign that the Parliament endorsed Cardell’s message and wished to disseminate it to the public. Nor was this interpretation of the turbulent recent past restricted to the Parliament’s preferred preachers: providence was an explanatory framework that dominated many pro-republic accounts.

Even the authors of lengthy histories, who often took the time to consider the military and strategic advantages of each side, used providence to explain the outcome of both individual battles and the wars as a whole. Thomas Peyton, for example, attributed the fall of the Stuart dynasty to ‘heavenly providence punishing sinners for sin’, while ‘Carrington’ confidently asserted that the successes which had been achieved by the Parliamentarians should be viewed not as ‘the handy-work of Politick men or of Humane Force, but as the most eminent works of Providence’. 60 Writers made much of the disadvantages Parliament had faced before some major victories, often providing a counter-factual narrative of what might have happened had it not ‘otherwise pleased God’. 61 This technique helped to emphasise that a particular victory had been God’s doing, for all terrestrial odds were stacked against it.

Providential explanations of the outcome of the wars were in keeping with a wider tendency in early modern England to view seemingly worldly events as part of a God-given plan. If God had a design for the world then all things which happened on earth served this divine purpose, and people worked hard to detect the hand of God and its meaning in both their own

60 Peyton, The Divine Catastrophe, pp. 70-71; ‘Carrington’, The Life and Death of his most serene highness, Oliver, p. 29.
61 May, Breviary, p. 90.
affairs and political life. Hardship was not necessarily a sign of God’s wrath; it could also be a form of trial by which the Lord tested His truest believers, while ease could suggest God had abandoned a person to their sinful impulses. Providence was, as Alexandra Walsham phrases it, ‘a set of rose-coloured spectacles’ through which both glories and disasters could be seen as signs of divine favour. By interpreting the Parliamentarian victories as a sign of God’s blessing, authors presented the Parliament’s military successes as a sign of the justness of their cause (which, if He directed all things, must be God’s cause too). It was not the only interpretation available. For some Royalists, the Parliamentarian victory and the establishment of the republic were better understood as a punishment inflicted by God.

Others believed that God had allowed the Parliament to triumph only so that their ‘wickednesse, and the peoples folli in being seduced by them […] might bee made knowne to the World’, and that appropriate chastisement would eventually follow. Providential favour was, however, a straightforward and potentially appealing explanation, not least because there was an enduring connection in early modern thought between military success and godly approbation.

The relationship between providence and memory ran deeper than simply offering people a way to understand and remember battles. Crucially, it also gave them a reason to do so. If the Parliamentarian victories were indeed signs of God’s favour, this placed a corresponding onus on English citizens not to forget them. There were three main reasons for this: first, a duty to show gratitude to God; second, an obligation to communicate God’s favours to future generations; and third, a fear that failure to show adequate appreciation for God’s mercies would result in divine punishment or the withdrawal of favour. All three were evoked by the minister George Newton in a sermon delivered on 11 May 1653, the eighth anniversary of the second siege of Taunton, and which it is worth quoting at length:

Such a deliverance [i.e. the relief of Taunton] must have such a remembrance, it must have some memorial answerable to it […] though we cannot reckon all the mercies of the Lord, his dayly and hourly mercies, because

---


64 See, for example, Henry Hammond, To the right honourable, the Lord Fairfax, and his counsell of warre: the humble addresse of Henry Hammond (London, 1649; Thomason / E.540[18]), pp. 4-5.

65 Anon., The Scotch souldiers lamentation upon the death of the most glorious and illustrious martyr, King Charles (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.560[15]), p. 20.

indeed they are without number, yet we must be exact in numbring and setting down his Golden and his Silver mercies. Such a deliverance as this, with all the circumstances of it, must not be forgotten by us [...] let us think upon it, let us indevor to perpetuate the praise of God, let us use some means or other to transmit it to posterity, to make succeeding generations know what God had done for this Land [...] let the fear of the great God of heaven be upon us the remainder of our dayes, let us consider why he hath preserved us, not to be instruments of his dishonor, but monuments of his praise.67

Here, Newton was exhorting his congregation (and, following the sermon’s publication, a wider audience as well) to remember the events of the Civil Wars as evidence of God’s mercy towards them, and to transmit this memory to future generations.68 There are similar references to the duty of remembrance in sermons delivered on other days of thanksgiving. After the Parliament’s victory at the Battle of Worcester, John Owen told his audience that they should ‘for ever keepe alive in your Hearts, a faithful Acknowledgement of his Grace’, while Joseph Caryl stated that ‘to walk thankfully for mercies received is the ready way to have deliverances renewed’.69

As Owen’s call for the memory of the recent past to be kept ‘for ever alive’ suggests, remembrance was not a duty to be reserved only for designated days. In his commemorative poem The British Appeals, a verse which dwelt on many of the Parliament’s ‘great deliverances’, the poet George Wither was quite explicit that this text was intended not just to mark the 30 January thanksgiving day but to encourage the ‘better performance of the Duty intended after the Day is past, by bringing to remembrance many of these mercies’.70 For Wither, at least, and perhaps for Parliament too – the poem was printed at the request of William Lenthall, the speaker of the House of Commons – remembrance of the victories God had granted the Parliament should be an ongoing process. Similarly, the anonymous author of

67 George Newton, A sermon preached the 11. of May 1652. In Taunton, upon the occasion of their great deliverance, received upon that day (London, 1652; Thomason / E.670[13]), pp. 19-24.
69 John Owen, The advantage of the kingdome of Christ in the shaking of the kingdoms of the world: or Providentiall alterations in their subserviency to Christ's exaltation. Opened, in a sermon preached to the Parliament Octob. 24. 1651 (Oxford, 1651; Thomason / E.643[25]), sig. A2v; Joseph Caryl, The oppressor destroyed. As it was delivered in a sermon at Pauls Septem. 21. 1651. Preached before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, the Right worshipfull the aldermen and the sheriffs his brethren (London, 1651; Thomason / E.643[4]), n.p.
70 Wither, The British appeals, sig. A3v. He also expressed similar sentiments in a poem dedicated to the Parliament’s victories in Ireland. See George Wither, Carmen eucharisticon: a private thank-oblation, exhibited to the glory of the lord of hosts, for the timely and wonderfull deliverance, vouchsafed to this nation, in the routing of a numerous Army of Irish rebells before Dublin, by the sword of his valiant servant, Michael Jones, Lieutenant-Generall for the Parliament or England (London, 1649; Thomason / E.572[6]).
England’s apology, for its late change (1651), when recounting the Battle of Naseby, wrote that this event ‘cannot, it must not be forgotten […] and the place itselfe will be made immortall to all posterity’.

The use of the term ‘must not’ implies that the commemoration of this victory was an imperative, something that people owed to God as the result of His divine intervention.

The journal of Nicholas Pearson, clerk for the parish of St Mary’s in Beverley, indicates some awareness of the memorial obligations that the Parliament’s providential victories had placed upon English citizens. Pearson described the Battle of Naseby as one ‘never to be forgotten’, a phrase which, when viewed in the wider context of the relationship between providence and memory, may have had active as well as rhetorical significance, and after the victories at Pontefract, Scarborough, Bridgewater, and Exeter he noted that he should ‘Tell ye [God’s] mercies to generations to come forever’.

A satirical pamphlet published in 1649 critiqued this memorialising impulse, ridiculing the Commonwealth for their belief that they ‘cannot but transmit the memory of these Mercies to Posterity that the Generations to come may praise the Lord’.

The idea that divine mercies generated a duty to remember was not, of course, entirely new. The annual commemoration of the foiling of the gunpowder plot on 5 November was rooted in a similar desire to remember the grace that God had shown to the nation. What is noteworthy, however, and has been somewhat overlooked by historians, is the extent to which the Parliament’s victories were interpreted by their supporters as events which required ongoing remembrance, as part of a person’s duty to God.

All of which is not to say that remembering the Parliament’s victories in providential terms could not also prove politically useful – though, as we shall see, the deployment of

---

71 Anon., Englands apology, for its late change: or, A sober perswasive, of all disaffected or dissenting persons, to a seasonable engagement, for the settlement of this common-wealth (London, 1651; Thomason / E.623[12]), p. 6.
72 Edmund Hope, A Puritan Parish Clerk: A Commentary on Current Events Made in the Registers of St Mary’s Church, Beverley, by Nicholas Pearson, Parish Clerk, 1636-1653 (Beverley: Wright and Hoggard, 1950), pp. 11, 9. Indeed, this is one potential interpretation of the very purpose of the journal, in which Pearson jotted down, alongside the records of burials and deaths, records of the events of the Civil Wars, including a list of ‘Deliverances which God hath given to England against the wicked Company of Counsellors’ which ran from August 1643 to 1645. See pp. 10-12.
75 In 1985, Blair Worden argued that the ubiquity and predictability of providential thinking in early modern England had often caused historians to overlook it. Though several studies into early modern providence have been conducted since, most notably Alexandra Walsham’s, Providence in Early Modern England, the relationship between providence and the commemoration of the Civil Wars has received relatively scant scholarly attention. See Blair Worden, ‘Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England’, Past and Present, 109.1 (1985), 55-99.
providence was not entirely unproblematic. During the Commonwealth, wartime successes were utilised as evidence of both the justness of the Parliament’s cause and the legitimacy of the republic. A Parliamentary declaration from 1649 explained how, by granting victories, God had ‘determined very much in favor’ of their cause, both militarily and politically. Similarly, the author of the tract *Remarkable Observations of Gods Mercies* (1651), an anonymous ‘Well-wisher of the Common-Wealth’s prosperity’, penned a potted history of the Parliament’s wartime successes and concluded that these victories ‘may serve as an undeniable evidence of Gods especiall Care and good Will, for the conservation of this Government’. The author of *England’s Apology* (1651) clearly stated that his purpose in reminding readers of the military favour God had shown the New Model Army was to ‘perswade men to acquiesce in what God hath done for this Nation’. There were also several lists, published by the pro-Commonwealth printer Robert Ibbitson, that detailed the providential victories that the Commonwealth had achieved in Scotland and Ireland. That several bore the imprimatur of the parliamentary clerk Henry Scobell suggests that the government exhibited some enthusiasm for perpetuating the memory of these successes.

A similar impulse animated the work of several Commonwealth poets, most notably George Wither and Payne Fisher. As David Norbrook has shown, the political climate of the 1650s posed literary as well as political challenges for these writers, not least the task of finding an alternative to the demonstrative style of poetry and rhetoric that were now indelibly linked to

---

78 Anon., *Englands apology, for its late change: or, A sober perswasive, of all disaffected or dissenting persons, to a seasonable engagement, for the settlement of this common-wealth. Drawne from the workings of providence* (London, 1651; Thomason / E.623[12]), p. 1.
79 Anon., *A history or brief chronicle of the chief matters of the Irish warres. With a perfect table or list of all the victories obtained by the Lord Generall Cromwell Governour Generall of Ireland and the Parliaments forces under his command there* (London, 1650; Thomason / E.608[15]); Anon., *A perfect table of one hundred forty and five victories obtained by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and the Parliaments forces under his command, since his excellency was made governor generall by the Parliament of England from Wednesday August i 1649. to March the last, 1650* (London, 1650; Thomason / 669.f.15[26]); Anon., *A perfect list of all the victories obtained by the Lord General Cromwel from the time that his excellency was made Captain General and Commander in Cheif of the Parliament forces in England, Ireland, and Scotland (against Charles Stuart King of the Scots, and his forces in the three nations) to this present time* (London, 1651; Thomason / 669.f.16[27]); Anon., *A perfect list of all the victories obtained by the Lord General Cromwel from the time that his excellency was made Cap. Gen. and Commander in Cheif of the Parliament forces in England, Ireland, and Scotland (against Charles Stuart King of the Scots, and his forces in the three nations) to this present time; with other eminent actions* (London, 1652; Thomason / 669.f.16[38]). Robert Ibbitson also printed the pro-Commonwealth newsbooks *Perfect Occurrences of Every Daies journal in Parliament* and *A perfect collection of Exactt passages of Parliament*, as well as many of the tracts that supported and defended the regicide.
the monarchy. Nevertheless, in spite of this hurdle, both Wither and Fisher produced verses that sought to remind people of the Parliament’s divine successes. Wither’s *The British Appeals* provided a poetic account of ‘those many signall mercies lately vouchsafed to this republike’, spanning the period from the siege of Gloucester to the Battle of Dunbar, while Fisher’s *Irenodia Gratulatoria* (translated into English by Thomas Manley as *Veni, Vidi, Vici*) focused primarily on the victories in Scotland and Ireland. Fisher’s work secured him several payments from the Council of State, and in 1652 the Committee of Examinations was ordered to consider some employment for him, in light of his ‘good service’. It was even suggested that Manley’s translation should be placed on the school curriculum.

Unlike Wither’s work, which abstained from the praise of personalities, the central figure in Fisher’s panegyric was Cromwell, and, though addressed to the Council of State, it was very much a celebration of Cromwell’s providential victories. In part, this may have been the result of the difficulties that de-personalising the panegyric form, a poetic style that traditionally praised a specific individual, posed. In part, however, the contrast between Wither and Payne’s work reflected a deeper ambivalence within the Commonwealth regime over the prominence that should be given to an individual, and particularly to the figure of Oliver Cromwell. On some occasions, the Commonwealth government seemed enthusiastic about linking military victories to the figure of Cromwell, and certainly rather more keen than Cromwell himself. When deciding on the imagery for a commemorative medal to mark the Battle of Dunbar, the government chose to have Cromwell’s image on one side and the Parliament on the other, despite the Lord General’s plea that they should ‘spare the having my effigies in it’ (see fig. 1). On other occasions, they appear to have been somewhat more cautious about feting a particular individual. As Sean Kelsey notes, neither The Brief Relation, licensed by the secretary to the Council of State, or Several Proceedings, the

82 TNA SP 18/31 f. 1, SP 25/66 f. 381.
83 Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, p. 238.
officially sanctioned version of events in Parliament, made any mention at all of Cromwell’s return from Ireland or his triumphal entry into London after Worcester, in which his success was quite deliberately shared with the Speaker.  

The political potential of remembering Civil War victories is discernible in many of the more symbolic acts of the republican state. Though Kelsey has convincingly shown that the Commonwealth government made concerted attempts to shape their image through ceremony and public works, historians have hitherto overlooked the role that memory of wartime victories played in many of these acts and the way in which this contributed to a wider memorial discourse. The naming of prestigious ships after Parliamentarian victories, for example, reminded people of the state’s God-given military successes, and these ships were often launched in elaborate ceremonies that attracted large crowds. In 1651, the government christened a forty-eight-gun warship the Worcester, after their decisive victory over Charles II. Other ships named after successful engagements soon followed, including the Plymouth,  

86 Despite being a staunch Royalist, Isabella Lady Twysden recorded in her journal that on 14 September 1651 she went to see ‘the great ship’, while John Evelyn noted that he witnessed the launching of new ships in March 1652 and again in March 1655. See BL Add MS 34172 f. 22; Austin Dobson (ed.), The Diary of John Evelyn, 3 vols (London: Macmillan, 1906), ii, pp. 53, 101. For newsbook reports of ship launches see A perfect diurnall of some passages and proceedings of, and in relation to, the armies in England and Wales, no. 279, 9-16 April 1655 (London, 1655; Thomason / 126:E.832[5]), p. 4291; The weekly intelligence of the Commonwealth faithfully communicating all affairs both martial and civil, no. 400, 10-17 April 1655 (London, 1655; Thomason / 126:E.832[6]), p. 336.
Preston, and Bristol in 1653, the Gloucester, Torrington, Newbury, Lyme, Bridgewater, Marston Moor, Nantwich, Taunton, and Tredagh in 1654, the Naseby in 1655, and the Dunbar in 1656.\(^8^7\) Those that survived until the Restoration were subsequently renamed, somewhat ominously in the case of the Newbury, which was rechristened the Revenge.\(^8^8\) The colours of the Scottish armies captured at Preston, Dunbar, and Worcester hung in Westminster Hall for the duration of the 1650s, and the visibility of this public commemoration of victory was enhanced by its prominence in printed reports. *Mercurius Politicus* described in detail the images that appeared on these colours, which included King Charles ‘the head cut off, the Neck streaming out Blood, and a Sword lying by, with this Motto [Think upon 't'].\(^8^9\) Even as late as 1660 writers referred to the ‘colours in Westminster Hall’, an image so famous it apparently required no further elaboration.\(^9^0\)

Another physical reminder were the medals struck after the Battle of Dunbar, which, in addition to images of Cromwell and Parliament, also featured the caption, ‘The Lord of Hosts’.\(^9^1\) These were designed partially as a reward for the soldiers who had served in this engagement, but also as a ‘remembrance of God’s mercy’ more generally.\(^9^2\) Once again the impact of this public act was amplified by newsbook reports, which ensured that awareness of these objects was disseminated to a wider audience than just the men who received them.\(^9^3\) Though the large scale artwork proposed by Peter Lely, George Geldorp, and Sir Balthazar Gerbier was never commissioned, the government did support Payne Fisher’s effort to produce an engraving of the victory at Dunbar (fig. 2), a decision which suggests that the use of images as memorials was not as intrinsically problematic as some historians have been wont to suggest.\(^9^4\)
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\(^8^8\) Ibid.


\(^9^1\) See Fig 1.

\(^9^2\) *Mercurius Politicus*, 5-12 September 1650, p. 223.

\(^9^3\) Ibid.

\(^9^4\) In particular, Jansson, ‘Remembering Marston Moor’, in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, ed. by Amuseen and Kishlansky pp. 225-268. This engraving was intended to be part of an illustrated history, and the authorities granted the enterprise significant support, both practical and financial. Fisher never finished the history, but he presented the image to Cromwell during the Protectorate. See C. H. Firth, ‘The Battle of Dunbar’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 14 (1990), 19-52 (pp. 21-22).
It is no coincidence, however, that many of the examples provided above dwelt on the victories of the third Civil War, as opposed to those of 1642 to 1648. In contemporary republican accounts, the third Civil War was characterised as a war against the Scots as a whole, rather than against the King, the Covenanters, or the Royalists more generally, despite the fact that the army that entered England in 1651 was led by Charles II himself. Charles, when he was referred to at all, was called the ‘Scots King’ or ‘King of Scots’, and the mobilisation of forces in England was described as a ‘Scottish invasion’, by Scotch soldiers. In light of this Scottified third Civil War, the government’s enthusiasm for remembering these victories, in particular, becomes more explicable. By presenting the divine mercies of
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95 See, for example Anon., *Another victory in Lancashire obtained against the Scots by Major General Harrison, and Col lonel Lilburn* (London, 1651; Thomason / E.641[14]); Anon., *Anglia libera ta, or, The rights of the people of England maintained against the pretences of the Scottish king as they are set forth in an Answer to the Lords Ambassadors propositions of England* (London, 1651; Wing / A3178); *J. L.*, *Old sayings and predictions verified and fulfilled touching the young King of Scotland and his gued subjects* (London, 1651; Thomason / 669.f.16[13]); Anon., *A list of the princes, dukes, earls, lords, knights, generals, major generalls, &c. and colonells, of the Scots Kings party slaine and taken prisoners* (London, 1652; Thomason / 669.f.16[29]). For a similarly Scottified portrayal of the third Civil War in the histories of the decade see ‘Carrington’, *The Life and Death of his most serene highness, Oliver*, p. 83; Lilly, *Monarchy or no Monarchy*, p. 48; May, *Breviary*, p. 210; Anon., *The Perfect Politician*, p. 200.
1649 to 1651 as victories against a foreign enemy, the Commonwealth were able to remind people of the favour God had shown their cause without dwelling on the internal divisions of the first and second wars. In the context of state-building, presenting the third Civil War as the first of the republic’s successful engagements against a foreign enemy served a useful unifying purpose, one that demonstrated the ongoing favour which God had bestowed on the new English state. That said, though efforts to memorialise the victories of the third war were more prevalent in government acts, recollections of victories over the Royalist party during the first and second wars were never entirely absent, and they continued to feature in works penned by the government’s supporters.

Indeed, recalling the Parliament’s providential victories proved a flexible rhetorical device, one that could be deployed for purposes beyond the legitimation of the state. In 1649, for example, the memory of God’s military favours was deployed in an effort to persuade soldiers to join the war in Ireland – as one anonymous pamphleteer wrote, ‘the cause you fight is for the same […] and God you know hath owned the Cause by many signall Victories’. However, such flexibility also meant that providential explanations were ripe for potential subversion, and, though the Commonwealth had made ample use of providential memory, this did nothing to guard against its co-option by those defending the dissolution of the Purged Parliament in the summer of 1653.

In a speech to the newly formed Little Parliament in July of that year, Cromwell sought to justify the forcible dissolution of the previous body by recounting ‘that Series of providence[s] […] from the beginning of our Troubles to this very day’, arguing that the previous government had failed to deliver such ‘good things, which might by honest men have been judged a return fit for such a God’. That is, the previous Parliament had tarried too long in implementing the reforms for which the Parliamentarian army had fought, and for which God had shown His favour. The army, though divided over the decision that the new parliament should be selected by the Council of Officers rather than by election, produced material which advanced similar arguments. For example, the anonymous author of the 1653 pamphlet *The Army no usurpers* sought to remind members of the army of the favours that...
God had shown to them during the Civil War and the hardships they had suffered during the conflict, before concluding, somewhat polemically, that the Purged Parliament had sought to 'reap all the sweet fruits of these mens losses, of their blood and limbs, of their precious friends slain in the service'.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, near identical arguments were deployed against the Little Parliament and in defence of the First Protectorate Parliament when it sat just over a year later.

Under the Protectorate, the dilemma that the Commonwealth governments had faced over the extent to which wartime victories should be linked to a particular individual became less salient. The appointment of Oliver Cromwell as Lord Protector in December 1653 meant that it was no longer problematic for writers to make an explicit link between Cromwell and the Parliament’s military victories. As a result, texts which recalled the successes which Cromwell had been granted on the battlefield abounded, with many writers connecting these signs of divine favour to his legitimacy as Lord Protector. The anonymous tract *Protection persuading subjection* (1654), produced by Henry Hills, printer to both the Council of State and to Cromwell, was fairly typical. The text began by asserting that its purpose was to prove that Cromwell was ‘the most apt, able, and best deserving person’ for the position of Lord Protector, a task in which the memory of Cromwell’s God-given military victories played a central role. These successes demonstrated that there was ‘a divine presence walking along with him [Cromwell] in all his waies’. By defeating enemies ranging from the ‘trayerous Scots’ to the ‘Rebellious Revolters’ and even the ‘Hogen Moden Hollanders’, Cromwell had shown himself to be an instrument of God’s divine will. They also apparently demonstrated his ‘wisdom and valour, vertue and piety’ and other civil virtues that marked Cromwell out as a suitable head of state, an interpretation that echoed the Machiavellian notion that military success could denote personal virtues. Though Cromwell himself had initially expressed some misgivings about becoming the figurehead for the Parliament’s Civil War victories – quite literally, in the case of the Dunbar medal –
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98 Anon., *The Army no usurpers, or The late Parliament not almighty and everlasting: shewing, that the present army in their former opposing, and late dissolving of the Parliament, have done nothing contrary to law, but according to equity* (London, 1653; Thomason / E.697[13]), p. 2.
102 Ibid., p. 8.
103 Ibid., p. 21.
104 Ibid., p. 8.
fearing that such earthly glorification would detract from an appreciation of the role of God, texts that sought to remind readers of the military favour that the Lord had bestowed on Cromwell were produced in some quantity under the Protectorate.105

Providence also lay at the heart of what is perhaps the most visible, and has certainly been the most studied, commemorative practice of the period: days of thanksgiving. Forbidden by Archbishop Laud in 1635 unless ordered by the King, the practice of holding thanksgiving days reasserted itself during the Civil Wars. Both sides allocated particular days as special occasions on which people were expected to give thanks to the Lord for His assistance during a military engagement.106 During the 1650s, successive regimes continued to hold thanksgivings to mark new military victories, and, in 1651, the Commonwealth government declared that 30 January, the anniversary of the king’s execution, would be a day of thanksgiving for the ‘wonderful Mercies and signal Salvations’ of the preceding years.107 However, one of the most intriguing features of republican memorial culture – one which has often been cited as evidence of the republican regimes’ failure to adequately commemorate the wars – was the absence of an annual national day to mark the outcome of the Civil Wars, a republican equivalent to 30 January or 29 May after the Restoration.108 The closest the republics came to establishing such an occasion was the proposal, introduced to Parliament on 6 September 1651, that 3 September, the anniversary of the victories at Dunbar and Worcester, should be made an annual day of commemoration and thanks.109 However, this motion was ultimately abandoned, and though much was made in print of the providential

105 For other examples see ‘E. W.’ [Edmund Waller], A panegyrick to my Lord Protector, of the present greatness and joint interest of His Highness, and this nation (London, 1655; Thomason / E.841[2]), p. 7; John Moore, Protection proclaimed (through the loving kindness of God in the present government) to the three nations of England, Scotland, and Ireland: wherein the government established, in the Lord Protector and his council, is proved to be of divine institution (London, 1655; Thomason / E.860[5]).


107 Anon., An act for setting apart Thursday the thirtieth day of January 1650 for a day of publique thanksgiving: together with a declaration of the grounds and reasons thereof (London, 1651; Thomason, E.1061[33]), p. 1271. For further discussion of the significance of this thanksgiving and the anniversary of the King’s execution during the 1650s see Imogen Peck, ‘Remembering – and Forgetting – Regicide: The Commemoration of the 30 January, 1649-1660’, in Remembering Queens and Kings in Early Modern England and France: Reputation, Reinterpretation, Reincarnation, ed. by Estelle Paranque (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming 2019). For discussion of local commemoration days see chapter four, pp. 186-200.


significance of this shared date it was only allocated as a day of thanksgiving on one subsequent occasion, in 1657 (see below, p. 78).

The reasons for the failure of the proposal are not recorded, and historians have generally assumed that it was jettisoned because of fears over its sheer unpopularity. There is clearly some evidence to support this interpretation, not least the fate of the monthly fast day, introduced by Parliament in 1645, and abolished four years later due to poor observance. The thanksgiving on 30 January 1651 engendered not only apathy but outright hostility. George Holdroyd, the minister for Foston in Derbyshire, was reported to the authorities for preaching a subversive sermon in which he said, variously, that ‘it was rather a day of mourning’, ‘there was nothing now, but cuttinge of throats’, and the ‘slaughtering and killing one another of our [bre]thren was no cause of rejoycinge. The previous year, the Royalist press had branded the anniversary of the King’s death ‘St Traytors Day’ and ‘Saint Regicides Day’, while according to The Man in the Moon a pair of fairground performers in Smithfield marked the day with a skimmington ride, in which they impersonated Fairfax and his wife.

However, careful study of the broader memorial culture of the republics suggests another possible explanation: that the authorities were aware of the challenges that such a permanent memorial might pose to their broader attempts at state-building. That is, the proposal for an annual, national commemoration was abandoned not only because it would have been unpopular (though this was probably true), but also because it would conflict with other political goals, and particularly with efforts to achieve internal reconciliation. In a speech to Parliament in 1654, Cromwell made explicit the tension he perceived between remembering the victories of the wars and the desire for peace and conciliation. He stated that though he was tempted to remind his audience of the ‘Transactions […] of the Providence of God’ during the wars, he would not do so, for fear that this would contradict the Parliament’s goal of achieving ‘Healing, and Setling’ – as he put it, ‘remembering Transactions too particularly, perhaps instead of healing […] may set the wound fresh a bleeding’. In other words,

110 Hutton, The Rise and Fall of Merry England, p. 221.
111 Ibid., p. 213.
112 TNA ASSI 45/4/1/96, ASSI 45/4/1/97, ASSI 45/4/1/94.
113 The Man in the Moon, no. 42, 6-14 February 1650 (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / 91:E.593[8]), p. 330; The Man in the Moon, no. 41, 30 January-6 February 1650 (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / 91:E.592[4]), p. 323; The Man in the Moon, no. 40, 23-31 January (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / 90:E.590[12]), p. 314. For further examples of opposition to government efforts at commemoration see chapter three, pp. 177-180.
114 Anon., His Highnesse the Lord Protector's speeches to the Parliament in the painted chamber, the one on Munday the 4th of September; the other on Tuesday the 12. of September 1654 (London, 1654; Thomason / E.812[11]), pp. 3, 5.
though the ‘Dispensations of God’ had been ‘stupendious’, and were undoubtedly worthy of remembrance, to actually recall them would not be conducive to engendering the peaceful settlement of the state.\(^{115}\) Nor was this the only time that such a paradox was expressed. In *A True account of the late bloody and inhumane conspiracy*, a pamphlet that sought to condemn the 1654 plot against Cromwell, its anonymous author lamented that this event had forced them to recount the ‘signall Acts of Providence and Preservation in times past’, not least those ‘Triumphs over the common Enemy in the open field’.\(^{116}\) This ‘remembrance of former differences’ was ultimately undesirable, however, for it served to ‘hinder’ the peaceful settlement of the state, stoking the animosities which had been wrought by the Civil Wars.\(^{117}\)

However, we are left with another puzzle: if the republican regimes (and especially the Lord Protector) were, to greater or lesser degrees, aware that remembering the providences of Civil War was antithetical to a concomitant desire for reconciliation, why was the commemoration of these victories in other mediums so common, even during the Protectorate? In part, the answer lies in the religious duty that a providential understanding of wartime victories imposed upon the republics’ supporters. That is, remembrance was, to some extent, a theological imperative, a demand which for some trumped a desire for reconciliation. In part, however, it can be found by considering *when* memories of providence were particularly likely to be deployed directly by the state, namely, in times of political transition or acute instability. We have already noted the utility of providential memory in legitimating the Commonwealth, justifying the dissolution of the Purged Parliament, and in the implementation of the Instrument of Government. Even under the Protectorate itself the evocation of providential memories – by the government, at least, if not always by its supporters – was most common in the aftermath of rebellion or other threats to the state. For example, in March 1657, and despite his previous ambivalence, Cromwell gave a speech to the lord mayor, the aldermen, and common-council of London in which he chose to evoke the ‘great deliverances’ of ‘the whole course and progress of the late warrs’.\(^{118}\) In September of the same year, he declared 3 September to be a day of thanksgiving for ‘calling to minde the

\(^{115}\) Ibid., p. 3.

\(^{116}\) Anon., *A True account of the late bloody and inhumane conspiracy against His Highness the Lord Protector, and this Commonwealth; for the subversion of the present government thereof, and an involving this nation in blood* (London, 1654; Thomason / E.813[22]), p. 3.

\(^{117}\) Ibid., p. 4.

\(^{118}\) Anon., *A Discovery made by his Highnesse the Lord Protector, to the Lord Mayor, aldermen, and common-councell of the City of London, on Friday, March the 12. 1657. Concerning the new attempts and designs of Charles Stewart and his party, both at home and abroad, to imbroile this nation againe in a new war, and to imbrew it in blood* (London, 1658; Thomason / E.1644[21]), p. 3.
memorable Mercies’ which the Lord had shown to England at Dunbar and Worcester. The context of the first act was the discovery of a large-scale conspiracy by Royalists, while the thanksgiving of September 1657 came following months of uncertainty over the future of the state after Cromwell was offered the crown in February, an offer which he did not refuse until the end of May.

In short, the commemoration of Civil War victories posed the republican governments with a dilemma. On the one hand, their commemoration was theatrically necessary and often politically useful; on the other, it necessitated revisiting the divisions of the internecine conflict. Successive republican regimes were thus attempting to navigate a tricky course between the necessity of memory and the desirability of reconciliation. It is this tension that goes much of the way to explaining some of the latent inconsistencies in republican memorial policy. In this respect, the republican governments were neither unready for commemoration, nor were they too fearful to initiate it. Rather, they were confronting a question that continues to detain states in the modern day: is there an obligation to remember civil strife, or is it better left forgotten? That, ultimately, providential memories of the wars persisted throughout the decade was the result of a failure to definitively answer this question, coupled with the prioritisation of short-term political expediency over longer-term visions of reconciliation. It is this same tension between the desire for reconciliation and the need for political security which explains many of the inconsistencies in the ways the republics remembered – and forgot – the wartime service of individuals.

iii. Remembering - and Forgetting - Civil War Service

The High Court of Justice that tried the King was initially established solely for this purpose, with a supposed lifespan of only a month. Immediately following Charles’ death, however, its term was extended to enable it to try several of his leading supporters. One of the main demands of the army at the time of Pride’s Purge had been vengeance not only upon the King, but upon the leaders of the uprisings of 1648 too, a desire which the Purged Parliament acceded to. In these trials, the concept of treason as ‘breach of trust’ which had underpinned the King’s trial was in turn deployed against some of his leading supporters, resulting in the
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119 An Order by the Protector appointing 3 Sept as a Day of Public Thanksgiving for the victories at Dunbar and Worcester (London, 1657; Thomason / 669.f.20[65]), n.p.; TNA SP 25/78 f. 105.
execution of three noblemen as traitors.\textsuperscript{121} Stern punishments were not only meted out to steadfast Royalists. The resumption of hostilities in 1648, by Royalists but also by some of the Parliament’s former supporters, led to increasingly severe punishments for individuals who had been denounced as turncoats. This trend continued in the early years of the republic with the execution of several former Parliamentarians for high treason.\textsuperscript{122}

In the trials of those officers charged with involvement in the second Civil Wars, as in the King’s, memories of the wars played a central role. Conviction turned on the evidence of a person’s wartime actions and service, meaning it was necessary to recount the transactions of the war. At the trial of Lord Goring, the witnesses who were produced to attest to the death of several Parliamentarians at Colchester recalled that the accused had been responsible for, amongst other things, ‘the shooting of poisoned bullets, boiled in copperas’ and the ‘cruel usage of prisoners’.\textsuperscript{123} Memory also played a symbolic role in the way the executions themselves were dramatized. The Earl of Derby, captured after the Battle of Worcester and executed for treason in October 1651, was put to death upon a scaffold erected ‘within 2 or 3 yards of the place, where […] he slew Captain Boutel’ and built from the timber of his own house at Lathom, which had been garrisoned against the Parliament and twice besieged during the wars.\textsuperscript{124} Captain Browne Bushell, meanwhile, was executed as a turncoat in March 1651, and the authorities deliberately delayed his execution to coincide with the eighth anniversary of his betrayal of Scarborough Castle.\textsuperscript{125}

Efforts to publicly evoke wartime misdemeanours did not necessarily pass uncontested. The tradition of the last speech given upon the scaffold offered the condemned a final opportunity to frame their actions for posterity, and these addresses rarely exhibited the contrition that

\textsuperscript{122} Examples include Colonel John Morris and Christopher Love. See Howell, State Trials, iv, p. 1250 and v, p. 43. For an excellent discussion of the treatment of individual side-changers, and also the cultural meaning of the term turncoat, see Andrew Hopper, Turncoats and Renegadoes: Changing Sides During the English Civil Wars (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 179-206, 157-178. For a discussion of the presentation of side-changing in two Royalist memoirs see chapter five, pp. 226-234.
\textsuperscript{123} Howell, State Trials, iv, p. 1211.
\textsuperscript{124} Mercurius Politicus, no. 72, 16-23 October 1651 (London, 1651; Thomason / 99:E.643[24]), p. 1151; Anon., The Earle of Darby’s speech on the scaffold, immediately before his execution at Bolton in Lancashire, on Wednesday, October 15: 1651 (London, 1651; Thomason / E.643[12]), p. 3
could usually be expected from perpetrators of less political crimes. The transmission of last words was difficult for the republic to contain, particularly in the printed pamphlets that invariably followed. At his execution in March 1649, the Earl of Holland commented that his speech ‘would not reach the people, in regard the Guard compassed the Scaffold’, but his words reached a far larger audience after his death when they were published alongside the execution speeches of the Duke of Hamilton and Lord Capel. The Commonwealth authorised their own accounts of scaffold speeches, often supplemented with a rather critical political gloss. For example, an eyewitness account of Browne Bushell’s death appears to have reported his last words faithfully, before adding that while his performance on the scaffold may have led many to ‘eternize his name’ it was disputable ‘whether comience [sic] or courage, arm’d him with this Resolution’ and that Bushell had actually been motivated by the somewhat less admirable motive of envy toward the republic. Similarly, when the newsbook *Mercurius Politicus* reported the execution of the Earl of Derby the transcript of his execution speech was preceded with several dismissive remarks, not least that the Earl had attempted to spin ‘out the day as Long as possible he could’.

Such harsh treatment of some of the Commonwealth’s wartime enemies served a purpose beyond the neutralisation of the government’s more voracious opponents. When combined with a narrative that primarily held the King responsible for the wars, public retribution against a few main figures helped to facilitate the pursuit of what was in fact one of the republics’ primary aims: the reconciliation of individual Royalists with the republican state. By restricting vengeance to a few central figures and those whose attempts to foment opposition were clearly ongoing, the authorities satisfied the army’s demand for retribution without criminalising the vast numbers of people who had served the King. Instead, the Commonwealth actively sought to integrate many of their former enemies into the new state.

Though Parliamentary defectors were dealt with harshly, Royalist turncoating was actively encouraged. The Engagement, an oath of loyalty to the Commonwealth first introduced in

127 Anon., *The several speeches of Duke Hamilton Earl of Cambridge, Henry Earl of Holland, and Arthur Lord Capel, upon the scaffold immediately before their execution, on Friday the 9. of March. Also the several exhortations, and conferences with them, upon the scaffold, by Dr Sibbald, Mr Bolton, & Mr Hodges* (London, 1649; Thomason / E.546[21]), p. 17.
129 *Mercurius Politicus*, 16-23 October 1651, p. 1151.
1649, was extended to all adult males in early 1650. The wording, however, only required a person to swear fidelity to the state ‘as now established’, a formulation which did not imply any corresponding support for past events.\textsuperscript{130} It was removed altogether in 1654. A 1651 edition of \textit{Mercurius Politicus} sought to tackle head-on the negative connotations that accompanied side switching, arguing that though fear of being considered a turncoat was ‘one main impediment that keeps men from quitting their old corrupt principles […] if God once declare as it were from heaven against thy wayes, thy Principles, or thy Party, then it is no dishonor, but Ingenuity and thy duty to Turn’.\textsuperscript{131} To emphasise that God had indeed made such a declaration, the newsbook went on to list the many godly deliverances that Parliament had received during the Civil Wars. Similarly, a pamphlet entitled \textit{The Cavaliers Jubilee} (1652) presented a dialogue between two Royalists, ‘Sir Timothy Turn-Coat’ and ‘Sir Rowland Resolute’. The two men reflected on the – highly stereotypical – follies of the Royalist party, including their ‘drunkenesse, whoredome, and rioting (the common use and custome of our Cavaliers)’, before concluding that they would embrace the pardon offered to them by the Commonwealth and that Sir Rowland would ‘go home and hang up my sword or myself too, if ever I draw it against the Parliament any more while I live’.\textsuperscript{132}

The most explicit legislative statement of this desire to forget past service came in February 1652 with the passage of the Act of General Pardon and Oblivion. This legislation declared that all the ‘Rancour and Evill Will occasioned by the late Differences may be buried in perpetual Oblivion’, and, to this end, that all offences committed prior to 3 September 1651 would be pardoned.\textsuperscript{133} There were, of course, some exceptions. The subclauses of the act stated that it did not extend to treasonous acts committed since 30 January 1649 (other than crimes of speech), people already imprisoned for offences prior to 28 January 1651, individuals who refused to subscribe to the Engagement, those suspected of involvement in the Irish rebellion, and some named individuals (mainly prominent Royalists, such as Lord


\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Mercurius Politicus}, no. 66, 4-11 September 1651 (London, 1651; Thomason / 98:E.641[12]), p. 1045.

\textsuperscript{132} Anon., \textit{The cavaliers jubilee: or, long look’d for come at last: viz. the generall pardon. In a pleasant dialogue between Sir Timothy Turn-coat, and Sir Rowland Resolute, two cavaliers that met accidentally, and were lately come over from beyond sea, upon the noise of the generall pardon, and their resolution to leave the service of the young Charles Stuart, and imbrace the Parliaments protection in their gracious act of oblivion} (London, 1652; Thomason / E.655[25]), pp. 3, 6.

Goring), or to ‘voluntary murthers’, buggery, rape, and a lengthy list of other offences that were essentially non-political.\footnote{Ibid.}

As Ross Poole has noted, there is at first glance something rather self-refuting about governmental attempts to impose oblivion. To obey, a person must know, or remember, the very thing they are expected to forget, and the law itself must outline, and therefore memorialise, the actions to which it applies.\footnote{Ross Poole, ‘Enacting Oblivion’, \textit{International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society}, 22.2 (2009), 149-157.} Poole therefore suggests that what acts of oblivion generally are is not a call for widespread amnesia, but a means of removing the legal force of certain acts of remembering – they reduce memories to something that has cognitive but not conative force. This was certainly true of the 1652 act, which, in essence, offered legal amnesia of a person’s wartime service in return for their ongoing loyalty to the republican state. It did not (as in the case of the 1660 Act of Oblivion or the 1814 French Royal Charter) attempt to abolish \textit{all} memories of the wars completely, and to do so would have been at odds with those commemorative practices, which, as we have seen, the state did on occasion seek to foster.\footnote{As well as a general pardon, the 1660 act stated that for three years any person who should ‘presume maliciously to call […] any name or names, or any other words of reproach anyway tending to revive the memory of the late Differences’ would be fined. Statutes, v, pp. 565-577. The French Royal Charter instructed ‘Courts of law and individual citizens […] to practice the same oblivion’ – that is, there was to be no memory of the divisions prior to the restoration of Louis XVIII, whether legal or personal. See Poole, ‘Enacting Oblivion’, pp. 150-151. For a comparison of oblivion acts in early modern England, France and the Netherlands, albeit with reference to the 1660 rather than the 1652 act, see Judith Pollmann, \textit{Memory in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 140-158.}

However, in contrast to the fictional Sir Rowland, who enthusiastically embraced this ‘gracious’ pardon, in reality the act met with a good deal of scepticism from Royalists. A pamphlet published in September 1652 sarcastically asked ‘whether the Cavaliers are not infinitely obliged to the State for the Act of Oblivion, which in the beginning forgives all, in the middle some, and in the end none’, a play, presumably, on its lengthy list of exceptions.\footnote{Anon., \textit{Paul’s churchyard. Libri theologici, politici historici, nundinus Paulinis (una cum templo) extant venales} (Unknown, [1652]; Thomason / E.675[12]), p. 19 [mispaginated, actually p. 3].} A satirical list of acts produced in the same year included ‘An Act of Oblivion for Malignants to forget that ever they had Estates’.\footnote{Anon., \textit{Paul’s Church-yard. Libri theologici, politici, historici, nundinus Paulinis (unà cum templo) prostant venales} (London, 1652; Thomason / E.989[7]), sig. B2r.} This line obliquely compared the apparent forgiveness offered by the Act of Oblivion to the Sequestration Ordinances of 1643 and 1644, whereby Royalist estates valued at over £200 had been confiscated and their rents...
paid to the Parliament until such time as their owner (if eligible) had taken the appropriate oath and paid a fine proportional to their value. These so-called composition fines were not fixed, and the precise amount a person was expected to pay was decided by the Committee of Compounding with Delinquents. In an effort to secure the most favourable sum delinquents petitioned the committee, and these narratives generally contained details of their former service, assurances of their newfound Parliamentarianism, and pleas of financial hardship.

Often, these financial pressures were themselves the result of armed conflict, whether through voluntary provision of money to the armies, plunder, fire, or other acts of war. Thus, the whole process of compounding encouraged people to recall and recount their wartime experiences in some detail.

Sequestrations made prior to 1651 were unaffected by the 1652 Act of Oblivion, and the Commonwealth caused further consternation among Royalists when, shortly after its enactment, they passed two acts for the sale of the estates of approximately 700 named delinquents, primarily because the costs of their administration were proving prohibitive.

As the ballad *Upon the general pardon pass’d by the Rump* observed, ‘where there’s money to be got / I find this Pardon pardons not / Malignants that were rich before / Shall not be pardon’d till they’re poor.’

There was undoubtedly some truth in the accusation that the amnesia of past service proffered by the Act of Oblivion was at odds with the strictures of other government policies. In particular, the need to maintain state security conflicted with the desire to forget the delinquency of former opponents, just as the utility and necessity of remembering providential victories was at odds with the goal of reconciliation – and, once again, the short-term expediency of remembrance often took precedence. In 1647, an ordinance was passed
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139 ‘March 1643: An Ordinance for sequestring notorious Delinquents Estates’, in A&O, i, p. 106; ‘August 1643: An Ordinance for Explanation of a former Ordinance for Sequestration of Delinquents Estates with some Enlargements’, in A&O, i, pp. 254-260 and ‘May 1644: An Ordinance for the better execution of the former Ordinance for Sequestration of Delinquents and Papists Estates’, in A&O, i, pp. 437-441. About 60 named delinquents, all Catholic recusants in the King’s army, and all participants in the 1641 Irish rebellion were denied pardon by the Parliament’s peace propositions and therefore could not compound.


that forbade any person who had fought for or aided the King from holding municipal posts in corporate towns ‘without the allowance of both Houses of Parliament’, or from acting as electors in these contests.\textsuperscript{143} While initially intended as a temporary measure, it was renewed again in 1652 with an extended scope that precluded persons ‘who hath been aiding or assisting the late King’, were subject to sequestration, or were otherwise ‘Enemies of the Parliament’ from being selected for any ‘office or place of trust’, or from voting in these elections.\textsuperscript{144} This measure was also timebound, but the aspiration of eventual reintegration was once again trumped, in the shorter term, by the need to keep potentially dangerous enemies out: it was renewed by Cromwell in 1655.\textsuperscript{145} The newsbook \textit{Mercurius Politicus} explicitly justified these ongoing restrictions on the Parliament’s former enemies by appealing to national security. ‘To admit all persons whatsoever, and by Consequence the \textit{Old Enemy}, into an equal share and interest with the Common-Wealth’s Friends’, they argued, would be ‘the ready way to destroy the Government, and by a promiscuous mixture of opposite interests, turn all into confusion’.\textsuperscript{146}

The 1654 Instrument of Government, rather than barring all those who had been in arms for the King from sitting in parliament, made provision for the inclusion of men who had been ‘since in the Parlaments Service, and given the signal Testimony of their good Affections thereto’.\textsuperscript{147} After three succeeding triennial parliaments this was to be extended to all eligible men except Roman Catholics and those who had been involved in the Irish Rebellions. The purpose of this formulation was to maintain the safety of the state, while also paving the way for ‘extinguishing all animosities, and putting into oblivion the memory of all the Feids [sic] and divisions contracted by Civil War […] whereby through the blessing of God, the people may be harmoniously disposed to a lasting peace and settlement’.\textsuperscript{148} Such leniency was not without its critics, and to some state loyalists it seemed that Cromwell was favouring former
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\item \textsuperscript{143} ‘October 1647: An Ordinance for disabling Delinquents to bear Office, or to have any voyce in the election of any’, in A&O, i, pp. 1023-1025 (p. 1023).
\item \textsuperscript{144} ‘October 1652: An Act for disabling Delinquents to bear Office, or to have any Voice or Vote in Election of any Publique Officer’, in A&O, ii, pp. 620-621 (p. 620). There were also earlier, localised restrictions on office holding in London. See ‘December 1649: An Act Disabling the Election of Divers persons to any Office or Place of Trust, within the City of London, And the Votes of such persons in full Elections’, in A&O, ii, pp. 319-320.
\item \textsuperscript{145} Anon., \textit{A proclamation prohibiting delinquents to bear office, or to have any voice or vote in election of any publique officer} (London, 1655; Thomason / 669.f.20[15]).
\item \textsuperscript{146} \textit{Mercurius Politicus}, no. 93, 11-18 March 1652 (London, 1652; Thomason / 101:E.656[20]), p. 1458.
\item \textsuperscript{147} Anon., \textit{A True state of the case of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging; in reference to the late established government by a Lord Protector, and a Parlament} (London, 1654; Thomason / E.728[5]), p. 31.
\item \textsuperscript{148} Ibid., p. 32.
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Cavaliers. In 1655, George Smith penned a pamphlet which sought to defend the Lord Protector from such criticisms. In this tract, Smith offered the need for the reconciliation of the nation as one of the main reasons to support the reintegration of the Parliament’s wartime enemies, and asked his readers to consider whether ‘because we have been in a War shall we never be reconciled? God forbid’.149

The Humble Address and Remonstrance of February 1657 was even more generous. While Irish ‘rebels’ and papists were still excluded, article 12 allowed all other Royalists to be appointed to parliament immediately, provided they were restored by an act of parliament and took an oath abjuring Charles Stuart.150 This formulation proved rather too lenient for some, and in May of that year the Humble Petition and Advice reverted to the restrictions favoured in the Instrument of Government, with the added proviso that only Royalists who had actively ‘borne arms’ for the Parliament might serve as MPs.151

The uprisings of 1655 had made state security a pressing concern, fuelling the government’s desire to maintain the restrictions placed on Royalist office holding. They also prompted orders that all individuals who had been in arms against the Parliament during the wars should leave London, its lines of communication, and all places within twenty miles of these lines, unless it was their place of residence.152 Similar orders recurred in times of political insecurity throughout the 1650s.153 The rebellion also convinced the Lord Protector of the need for extra security measures, and, in response, England and Wales were divided into ten regions, each governed by a major general.154 To fund this new system, the authorities

149 Smith, Gods unchangeableness, p. 55.
151 Ibid., pp. 37-38 (p.38).
152 Anon., A proclamation commanding all persons, who have been of the late Kings party, or his sons, to depart out of the cities of London and Westminster, and late lines of communication on or before Thursday the twelfth day of July instant (London, 1655; Thomason / 669.f.20[3]), n.p
153 See, for example, Anon., A proclamation commanding all papists and all other persons, who have been of the late Kings party or his sons, to depart out of the cities of London and Westminster, and late lines of communication, on or before Monday the 8. of March, one thousand six hundred fifty seven (London, 1658; Thomason / 669.f.20[72]); Anon., By the Lord Protector. A proclamation commanding all papists, and all other persons who have been of the late Kings party or his sons, to depart out of the cities of London and Westminster, and late lines of communication, within three days (London, 1659; Thomason / 669.f.21[22]).
154 Philip Major has calculated that between 1646 and 1660, there were no fewer than 18 acts, ordinances, and proclamations were passed by Parliament, the Council of State, or the Lord Protector that expelled Royalists and Catholics from the capital. See Philip Major, ‘“Twixt Hope and Fear”: John Berkenhead, Henry Lawes, and Banishment from London during the English Revolution’, The Review of English Studies, 59.239 (2007), 270-280 (p. 270). For the petitions of individual Royalists who sought to be exempted see TNA SP 18/99 f. 95, SP 18/100 f. 141, SP 18/180 f. 18.
introduced the decimation tax, which required all those who had fought for the King, or had been sequestered, to pay an annual levy of 10% on lands worth over £100 a year, and £10 on every £1,500 of personal property. In theory, immunity was granted to those who could demonstrate that they had abandoned the King’s interest, were above complicity in the recent plots, or could prove their desire to live peacefully. In practice, this was difficult to corroborate and very few successful claims for exemption were made.

Nevertheless, there is some evidence that members of the government remained committed to the principle of reconciliation. When, in the winter of 1656, John Desborough moved to make the decimation tax permanent, he was opposed by many of his fellow MPs who argued that this would contravene the provisions of the 1652 Act of Oblivion. The proposal was quashed in January the following year. As one MP argued, the Act of Oblivion was the ‘best expedient to procure our peace and quiet the spirits of our enemies; and by this means [i.e. decimation] we shall stir them up again’ and, further, that it was ‘against the common rule of justice to punish all for the offence of one man’.

Civil War service, then, was not so much cast into oblivion as placed on a high shelf, out of sight but not out of mind, and easily retrievable when state security or financial pressures demanded it. The government was clearly not unaware of the latent contradictions of this somewhat schizophrenic approach. In a declaration from 1655, Cromwell attempted to defend the decision to arrest and expel former Royalists from London even when they had not been ‘visibly in Arms upon the late Insurrection’. To do so, he outlined the many ways the republics had sought to unite the nation since the end of the wars, from the Act of Oblivion to the Instrument of Government, and other leniencies that were ‘very extraordinary, if compared with that which other Nations in all Ages have endured after a like disappointment by Civil War’. The recent need to resurrect the spectre of past divisions, he argued, was entirely the fault of those men who had initiated the 1655 risings, who were

156 See, for example, the plea made by Sir Edward Hales. Thurloe, iv, p. 364.
159 Anon., A declaration of His Highnes, by the advice of his council, shewing the reasons of their proceedings for securing the peace of the Commonwealth, upon occasion of the late insurrection and rebellion. Wednesday, October, 31, 1655 (London, 1655; Thomason / E.857[3]), p. 14.
160 Ibid., p. 7.
undermining the government’s efforts to engender peace and reconciliation. It was an argument rather similar to those used to defend the recounting of providential victories in times of political crisis, an act which could likewise be presented as something forced upon the state by the actions of troublesome and divisive enemies.

Thus, though successive republican regimes actively sought to forget the actions of their erstwhile opponents and to integrate these individuals into the republican state, these efforts often conflicted with other political goals, and particularly the need to maintain state security. In this respect, as with memories of providence, the desire for reconciliation proved impossible to square with the utility of remembrance. Former delinquency was never entirely deprived of contemporary significance, and, as a result, attempts to forget past service were only ever skin deep, meaning memories of Civil War allegiance continued to resurface throughout the 1650s.

iv. ‘To propagate their Just odium to all posteritys’: Memories of the Scots

Though successive republican regimes attempted to achieve a degree of reconciliation with their fellow Englishmen, albeit with varying degrees of success, it is far from clear that they sought a similar burying of the hatchet with their northern neighbours. Instead, a propensity to remember both the actions of the Scots during the first and second Civil Wars and the Commonwealth’s victory over the Scots in the third Civil War endured throughout the decade, untroubled by the ambivalence that surrounded the commemoration of the providential victories of 1642 to 1649 or the recollection of an individual’s former service. These representations of the Scots were almost wholly negative, especially after the Treaty of Breda was signed between Charles II and the Scottish Covenanters in May 1650, prompting the Commonwealth to launch a pre-emptive military strike north of the border. It is certainly no coincidence that the most notable exception to the overwhelmingly hostile portrayal of the Scots during the 1650s was also one of the earliest, penned prior to the re-commencement of hostilities in the summer of 1650: Thomas May’s Breviary.

In the early sections of the Breviary, May painted a picture of Scotland’s role in the wars which was almost entirely sympathetic. He defended Scotland’s engagement in the Bishops’ Wars as essentially a defensive act, one justified by the King’s tyrannical behaviour. The alliance between the Scottish Covenanters and the Parliamentarians, meanwhile, was described warmly as the Parliament ‘inviting to their assistance their brethren of Scotland’: a mutual and legitimate agreement which is compared favourably with the King ‘calling in his
Irish’ as foreign Catholic mercenaries.\textsuperscript{161} May then went on to discuss the Solemn League and Covenant, the agreement that underlay the Parliamentarian/Covenanter alliance of 1643, and a long-term source of tension between Independents and Presbyterians. In theory, the Covenant clarified the cause for which both parties fought. In practice, it was vague enough to allow for a multitude of interpretations. This difficulty was not lost on the Parliament, and in April 1646 they sought to clarify exactly what the Covenant bound them to. The answer, it seemed, was precious little, particularly in terms of religious settlement.\textsuperscript{162} By contrast, for many Presbyterians, both Scottish and English, the Covenant was a commitment to a constrained and reformed monarchy in a mixed constitution system and a unified English and Scottish Presbyterian church.\textsuperscript{163}

At the time when May was writing the \textit{Breviary}, tensions between the Independents and the Presbyterians had escalated. Many Presbyterians had been removed from the Parliament altogether in December 1648, and they expressed widespread revulsion at the execution of the King. In his narrative, May justified the Commonwealth’s position in part by invalidating the Covenant, the document which many Presbyterians (and the Sion Conclave in particular) pointed to as evidence of the illegitimacy of the regicide, the religious settlement, and the actions of the army.\textsuperscript{164} May offered three separate objections. First, that the Scots had agreed a sum for their service in the wars which had now been settled, and that it was this financial transaction that was the basis of their alliance, not the Covenant. Second, that the Scots had in any case broken the Covenant by putting garrisons in Newcastle, Tynemouth, and Carlisle. Third, that the Covenant gave the Scots no cause to demand a particular religious settlement.\textsuperscript{165} From this point on, the main enemy in May’s narrative, besides the King, was

\textsuperscript{161} May, \textit{Breviary}, p. 4, p. 90. This sympathetic treatment of the Bishops’ Wars was by no means inevitable. For an account of eventual Parliamentarians who appeared to have little sympathy for the Scots in the 1630s see David Scott, ““Hannibal at our Gates”: Loyalists and Fifth-columnists during the Bishops’ Wars – the Case of Yorkshire’, \textit{Historical Research}, 70.173 (1997), 269-293.

\textsuperscript{162} A declaration of the Commons of England assembled in Parliament, of their true intentions concerning the ancient and fundamental government of the kingdom, the government of the church, the present peace; securing the people against all arbitrary government, and maintaining a right understanding between the two kingdoms of England and Scotland, according to the covenant and treaties (London, 1646; Thomason / E.333[19]).
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the Presbyterian faction, whom he claimed were ‘ready to sacrifice themselves and their cause to their hatred, against the Independents’.\textsuperscript{166}

Significantly, however, May was also careful to clarify that the Presbyterian ‘faction’ in England were just that; a factional group. He did not elide them with all forms of Presbyterianism, or with the Scots as a whole, of whom only some had supported the Engagement with the King in 1647. In the second Civil War it was a ‘faction’ in the Parliament of Scotland, led by the Duke of Hamilton, who had turned on England, and May emphasised the distinctions between English and Scottish Presbyterianism when he voiced his perplexity that the Parliament’s victory in the second Civil War ‘should please the Presbyterian Scots for Religions sake, and for Religions sake displease the Presbyterians of England’.\textsuperscript{167} In this respect, the tone of May’s history reflects the political situation of 1649, when one of the main threats to the government was their former English Presbyterian and Scottish allies, but before the Parliament abandoned attempts to forge a reconciliation. The Engagement Oath of January 1650, for example, was specifically designed to be palatable to Presbyterians and Independents alike.\textsuperscript{168} In this context, to present faction and disunity, and particularly the English Presbyterians, as the main threat to the peace, was a way of justifying the expulsion of those Presbyterian MPs who had opposed the trial of the King and of emphasising the importance of unity behind the new Commonwealth government.

By the summer of 1650, however, a further war, this time against Charles II in alliance with the Scottish Covenanters, was about to commence. From this point on, the treatment of the Scots in printed material was both harsher and less nuanced. While there are moments in the \textit{Breviary} where antipathy towards the Scots slips in – as well as being referred to as ‘brethren’ they are also occasionally called ‘Forraigners’ – in narratives composed after mid-1650 such hostility was far more overt, and not reserved for a particular Scottish faction.\textsuperscript{169} In a short historical tract from September 1650, \textit{The Changeable Covenant}, May’s own descriptions were already significantly less sympathetic. While still outlining a broadly similar understanding of why the Covenant had been invalidated, this text dwelt far more on
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the hardships that the Scottish armies had inflicted on the English, particularly during the second Civil War. May claimed that ‘scarce was it ever known […] that any Army was more barbarous, or exercised under greater cruelty to the poor Inhabitants of England, then this Under Hamilton did’. He used these hardships to justify the pre-emptive invasion of Scotland in 1650, quoting from a Parliamentary declaration which also sought to remind its readers of the cruelties of the Scots and present these as grounds for military action: ‘that we may not be at the insupportable charge of keeping severall Armies in our own bowels, and subject ourselves to the Contributions, Plunderings, and Barbarous usage of a Scottish army, if we suffer them againe to enter’. Memories of the cruelties of the Scottish army recurred in diverse media, with accounts of the misdemeanours of the Scots in the northern counties and in Herefordshire particularly prevalent. In a pamphlet published in 1651, the author, possibly Cuthbert Sydenham, expressed the hope that ‘remembrance of what is past’ would act as a ‘caution for the future’, and went on to outline the diverse misdeeds committed by the Scots in the first Civil Wars, especially in the north. If this narrative was indeed Sydenham’s, it was, in all probability, directly sponsored by the government: in 1652 Sydenham was awarded £100 and a pension of the same sum for ‘writing in the cause of the commonwealth’. In June 1650, *Mercurius Politicus* published two accounts of crimes committed by Scottish soldiers during the wars. The first was a record produced by the Herefordshire man Miles Hill of the ‘losses and Plunderings’ which the Scots had inflicted on that county in 1646, detailing losses by parish. The second was a relation from a Yorkshire gentleman that described the thefts, house burnings, and ‘ravishing’ of virgins conducted by the Scots during their time in the northern counties. The implication of all this was, as Henry Walker put it, that ‘wives, children,
estates, and lives are danger to be ravish, beaten, plundered and taken away, (as the Northern Counties, and the inhabitants of Herefordshire can tell us, by late woefull experience) if God do not inable you to suppresse them [the Scots].

A similar technique was used to defend the suppression of Ireland, which was often couched as a retaliation for the butchery of the 1641 rebellion. As one historian put it, Cromwell ‘sacrificed 3000 Irish unto the Ghosts of 10 000 English whom they had massacred some years before’. In the context of the ongoing military engagement between the three kingdoms, evoking memories of the cruelties and hardships of the first and second wars was not just a way of fixing the interpretation of these events; it also became an important way to contextualise and defend subsequent military action.

However, this tendency to emphasise the harshness of the Scottish armies was not restricted to texts produced in the midst of the engagements of 1650 to 1651. Instead, it became a trope that endured for the remainder of the decade, beyond the immediate justificatory requirements of the Scottish invasion. Particularly popular were tales of the cruelties that the Scots had inflicted on English soldiers and civilians during the first and second wars. William Lilly described the Scots as ‘the truest Harpies that ever lived, stealing and purloining where ever they came, even unto a Dish-clout’. He went on to relay a story about two Scottish soldiers who plundered a kettle and some (stereotypically Scottish) porridge from their landlord, before being killed by ‘an honest troopers of ours [i.e. the English]’ who then returned the kettle to its rightful owner. ‘Carrington’, meanwhile, claimed that the Scots often killed English soldiers, even when they had promised them quarter. Even as late as 1660, the anonymous author of one history described ‘that sad burden they [England] groaned under by the Plunder and Opression of the Scots Army’.

The ballad Jockies Lamentation (1657) dwelt on similar themes, outlining in verse the treacherous actions of the Scots over the course of the wars, including several references to...
their plundering predilections – ‘in Lancashire/Our brethren dear, did plunder there/both rich and poor’. That the Scots’ wartime actions featured even in the highly commercial medium of the ballad suggests that there was a market for this form of memorialisation, and not necessarily one that was strictly partisan; the Scots often fared little better in material written by opponents of the republic. In an almanac chronology from 1654, George Wharton, a staunch Royalist, informed his readers that it was eleven years ‘Since they [the Scots] return’d from Hereford (well paid!)’, a reference to the reputation they had earned for plunder in the county. Meanwhile, the Royalist playwright John Tatham produced a play, The Scots Figgaries, whose characters included, amongst others, the Scots Jocky, Billy, and Scarefool, and which poked fun at the changeability of the Scots’ alliances. By 1651, the image of the Scottish forces as plundering thieves was so entrenched that Mercurius Politicus chose to describe the tumults of the French people against their Protector General as ‘plundering like Scots’.

Whether or not these hostile accounts of Scots’ wartime activities were true, they would probably have seemed credible to the contemporary reader, not only because plundering and the provision of free quarter clearly was a problem, especially in the north of England and the Welsh Marches, but also because longstanding prejudicial stereotypes presented the Scots as brutish and unrefined. In calling out the cruelties of the Scots, writers were building on stereotypes which were already engrained in English attitudes to their northern neighbours and redeploying them in the context of the events of the Civil Wars. In fact, memories of the Scots’ actions during the wars were only one small part of a wider anti-Scotch rhetoric that proliferated in England in the 1650s. Mercurius Politicus continued to describe the Scots with recourse to their longstanding representation as superstitious and obstinate, and the pamphlet
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A perfect description of the people and country of Scotland (1649) was comprised of a litany of negative Scottish stereotypes.\textsuperscript{186}

Furthermore, after the start of the third Civil War, the relatively sympathetic portrayal of Scotland presented in May’s Breviary was supplemented by accounts in which their every action should be understood, and remembered, as part of a treacherous Scottish design. The pamphlet The False Brother, for example, provided a potted history of the Scots’ role in the wars, emphasising that at every turn the Scots had sought not the preservation of religion, as they had so often claimed, but the advancement of the Scottish interest at the expense of English citizens and the English state. Viewing the events of the wars through this lens, its author described how during both the first and second wars the Scots had simply been ‘designing, and making their advantages of our [England’s] necessity’, the better to achieve their aim of depriving Englishmen of their ‘privileges’ and possessing their ‘inheritances’.\textsuperscript{187}

During the Bishops’ Wars religion had apparently acted as a mere cloak for the pursuit of Scotland’s material and political interests. Even the execution of the king could be laid ‘very honestly on the Scots’.\textsuperscript{188}

The False Brother also called into question the Scots’ military utility. It claimed that as allies they had been more concerned with preserving their own borders than fighting for the Parliamentarian cause, and that the victories at York and Marston Moor had been achieved in spite of, rather than because of, the assistance of Scottish troops.\textsuperscript{189} Similarly, the anonymous author of The Scot Arraigned (1651) interpreted the Scots’ actions during the Civil Wars as just one in a long line of historic betrayals, and stated that their purpose in recalling these transactions was to ‘propagate their Just odium to all posteritys’.\textsuperscript{190}

In 1650, the recently acquired Commonwealth propagandist Marchamont Nedham summarised the tone of many such narratives when he wrote that ‘notwithstanding all the specious Pretences of brotherly Love, their [the Scots] Designe in it hitherto hath beene, onely to serve themselves into an
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\textsuperscript{187} [Sydenham], The false brother, pp. 11, 14.

\textsuperscript{188} Ibid., p. 51.

\textsuperscript{189} Ibid., p. 14. A similar slight on the Scots’ performance at Marston Moor also featured in the ballad Jockies Lamentation.
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equall Interest with us in this Nation’. In these accounts, the distinctions May made in the Breviary between different Scottish factions were effectively abandoned in favour of a cruel, treacherous, and homogenous Scottish enemy whose previous misdemeanours should not be forgotten.

It was a version of events that endured in diverse forms of pro-republican print for the rest of the decade. On some occasions, specific acts were recalled and cited as evidence of Scottish treachery. Of these, particularly popular examples included the Scots’ treatment of the King after he surrendered to them in 1646, likened to a ‘sale’, and the Engagers decision to ally with the King in 1647, which was often presented as a straightforward betrayal by all of the Scots. On other occasions, the entire Scottish war effort was characterised as a self-serving plot. In the poem The British Appeals, Wither dismissed the Scots as ‘Spies and Agents, to promote / Their own designs’, while the authors Thomas Manley and ‘T. D.’ referred to them as the ‘unfaithfull Scot’ and the ‘treacherous Scots’, respectively.

Parliamentary hostility towards their former allies was clearly nothing new. As Mark Stoyle has demonstrated, many Parliamentarians had been deeply ambivalent about the decision to call in the Scots in 1643. This unease was heightened when Scottish armies occupied the north of England in 1644, but seemed disinclined to advance any further south. In this context, it is not surprising that from the summer of 1650 onwards, and with any hopes of an accommodation with the Covenanters extinguished, those Parliamentarians who continued to support the republic felt no qualms about remembering the treachery and cruelty of their northern neighbours. What may seem more surprising, however, is that the same hostility was not unleashed on the Welsh or the Cornish, both of whom had been the subject of virulent anti-Celtic propaganda during the wars. Unlike memories of the Scots, specific memories of the actions of the Welsh and the Cornish are conspicuous only by their absence in the vast majority of pro-republican material produced in the 1650s. This was perhaps because, unlike
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the Scots, who were widely regarded as foreigners, the Cornish and the Welsh were, by the mid-seventeenth century, regarded by the majority of the English as an integral part of the English state. While the Scots could be established as an enemy external to England, one who could be held culpable for many of the transactions and hardships of the wars, to do the same for the Cornish and the Welsh would serve as a reminder of internal tensions. Therefore, to evoke memories of the predominantly Royalist Welsh and Cornish war efforts would be at odds with the republics’ efforts to reconcile the people of England to the new English state – and, as Derek Hirst has shown, it was this specifically English, rather than a broader British, state, that was the republics’ principal concern for the entirety of the decade.

In the context of English state-building, it was their ability to masquerade as a unifying narrative that made memories of the third Civil War particularly useful, and, as a result, particularly prevalent. We have already noted that in contemporary accounts the third Civil War was characterised as a war against the Scots, specifically, rather than as a continuation of the fight against the Royalist cause. By Scottifying the war in this way the republics were able to remind people of the favour God had shown the Commonwealth without the need to evoke the divisions of the first and second wars.

This depiction of the third Civil War as a national struggle against the Scots was also useful for other purposes, not least discrediting the cause of Charles II. Though Hirst has suggested that the readiness with which Englishmen in republican circles referred to Charles II by the title ‘King of the Scots’ reflected their acceptance of Scotland’s constitutional independence, I would like to suggest another possible explanation: that this phrase was actually part of a wider effort by the republics’ supporters to associate the cause of Charles Stuart with the cruelty and treachery which, by 1650, dominated their representation of the Scots. If between 1642 and 1648 the Scots had been plundering, barbarous, and scheming, what did this say of the man who, in 1651, was willing to lead them into England once again? Stoyle has rightly observed that, owing to the longstanding prejudices of the English against their northern neighbours, the 1643 Parliamentarian alliance with the Scots had presented the Parliament with a serious PR problem (albeit one that Charles I failed to fully capitalise
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It is therefore entirely understandable that, when presented with the opportunity to disassociate themselves from the Scots and instead link the cause of Charles II with this cruel and disreputable nation, the republics’ supporters seized it with both hands.

Thus, remembering the third Civil War not as a continuation of domestic discontent but as a defence against a foreign adversary served a dual purpose. First, it helped to discredit the cause of Charles II who, from this perspective, was less a rightful monarch than a mask for an attempted Scottish invasion. Second, it enabled the English republics to commemorate the victories of the war as the first of their successful engagements against a foreign enemy, and as a demonstration of the favour that God had bestowed on the fledgling English state. The republic transformed the latest instalment in a divisive civil conflict into a unifying victory, one that could be remembered without necessarily evoking the divisions of the first two Civil Wars. By emphasising the cruelty of the Scots, their foreignness, their treachery, and their untrustworthiness, pro-republican writers created a sense of the Scots as ‘other’, a foreign enemy who could be blamed, variously, for the third war, for many of the hardships people had experienced between 1642 and 1649, and also used to discredit the cause of Charles Stuart.

Indeed, in this respect, the Commonwealth regime could plausibly be said to be exhibiting a variation of a technique that is not uncommon in modern post-civil war states: ‘othering’. In the aftermath of communal violence, groups often attempt to dilute responsibility for the ensuing suffering by projecting blame onto a demonised enemy or other, the ‘stranger in our midst’. Once identified this enemy is deployed as a scapegoat, taking the mantle of culpability and absolving the other groups involved of responsibility. In the case of the Spanish Civil War, for example, the ‘other’, in pro-Franco public memory at least, was the Communists. Meanwhile, in mid-twentieth-century Greece, much of the blame for the recent domestic conflict was laid on the government’s leftist enemies, who were branded as external agents – ‘Slavo communists’, or ‘Bulgarians’ – and excluded from the political

---

Coupled with the king-blaming accounts that were used to assign responsibility for the initial outbreak of the wars, the demonisation of the Scots was a narrative that helped to absolve the republic, and its supporters, of any culpability for the hardship and bloodshed of the previous decade, to identify an external enemy, and establish the notion of a cohesive, divinely favoured English state. It was a narrative that found at least some popular resonance. Upon the Restoration in May 1660, Margaret Dixon, a woman from Newcastle, objected to the return of Charles II, exclaiming ‘What! can they finde not some other man to bring in then a Scotsman? What! Is there not some Englishman more fit to make a King then a Scott […] hee will sett on fire the three kingdoms as his father before him has done’. In her dismay, Margaret not only remembered the Civil Wars as having been Charles I’s fault, but expressed a mistrust of Charles II that was rooted in his strong association with the Scottish nation.

**Conclusion**

By extending our understanding of what constitutes a commemorative act beyond collective, public solemnities and adopting a correspondingly broad definition of what may be considered a memorialising practice, it becomes clear that the public memory of the wars during the republics is not best characterised by its absence. Far from believing that ‘the time was not right for the idea of memorialising events of national importance for the “people’s view”’, successive republican regimes, and their supporters, made concerted efforts to remind people of the events of the wars, and particularly the culpability of Charles I, the cruelty of the Scots, and the providential victories of the third Civil War. Memories of these events served to absolve the republic of responsibility for the conflict, legitimate the state, and often provided convenient scapegoats for the cruelties and hardships of war.

These wartime memories were not, however, entirely unproblematic. The republican regimes were also often confronted with a dilemma between the duty and utility of remembrance and that which would best facilitate their broader desire for reconciliation. This tension was particularly acute in relation to memory of providential victories against fellow Englishmen and the memory of individual wartime service. While remembering such incidents was often
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politically useful – and, in the case of providence, theologically desirable – it also necessitated reopening the divisions and animosities of the internecine conflict. Successive republican regimes were thus attempting to steer a tricky course between the necessity of memory and the desirability of reconciliation, and it is this tension that goes much of the way to explaining some of the inconsistencies in republican memorial policy.

Indeed, in this respect, the republics faced a question that continues to trouble states in the modern day: how, if at all, can the duty to remember be reconciled with a desire for peace and healing? David Rieff has recently observed that in the modern world the belief that to remember traumatic events is a ‘moral imperative’ has hindered the peaceful settlement of numerous states, including the former Yugoslavia and Israel.204 The evidence presented in this chapter suggests that this is far from being a modern phenomenon. That, ultimately, memories of the Civil Wars persisted in republican public memory throughout the decade was the result of an almost inevitable failure to definitively resolve this tension between remembrance and reconciliation, coupled with the frequent prioritisation of political expediency over visions of national reconciliation.

Chapter Two

Rival Recollections

On a trip to London in July 1657 a Scottish visitor, James Fraser, commented with some surprise on the quantity of printed material that was hostile to the Lord Protector available on the capital’s streets: ‘I cannot omit that though he [Cromwell] had his flies and flatterers that fauned on hi[m] so also his Satyres that raled and flouted him these comming out daylie in print, although the Print offices were stricklie noticed and adverted to’.¹ In spite of the governments’ efforts to direct the ways the Civil Wars should be remembered, they never possessed a complete monopoly over printed material, nor, consequently, over attempts to frame the public memory of recent events. In the previous chapter, we encountered several ways in which opponents of the republics’ challenged the state’s commemorative practices, including attacks on the 30 January thanksgiving day and satirical lampooning of the Act of Oblivion. This chapter moves beyond these individual acts of defiance to explore the ways in which three opposition groups – Royalists, the Levellers, and proponents of the ‘good old cause’ – sought to shape public memory of the internecine conflicts in printed material.

The extent to which opponents of the republics were able to propagate rival memories was clearly constrained, though not entirely suppressed, by censorship legislation. The abolition of the High Commission and Star Chamber in 1641 had prompted an explosion of printed material, and the Parliament struggled to regain control of press output throughout the 1640s.² During the 1650s, the authorities made two particularly important attempts to regulate publication. The first was the 1649 Act Against Unlicensed and Scandalous Newsbooks, which aimed to suppress printed material produced ‘by the Malignant party at home and abroad’.³ Its provisions included severe fines or jail terms for the authors, printers, and vendors of offending material and orders that all books and pamphlets should be licensed. The Company of Stationers was required to undertake searches for unlicensed material.⁴ The second was Cromwell’s order in the summer of 1655 that earlier printing legislation should be enforced (especially the ordinance of June 1643, which required pre-
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publication censorship of all books), and the Council of State’s approval of new orders which further restricted the publication of news. How far these measures succeeded in controlling press output, and the effectiveness of early modern censorship more generally, has been hotly debated by historians. Most recently, Jason McElligott has convincingly shown that censorship during the 1650s is best understood neither as entirely impotent nor as the harbinger of a Gestapo-like ruthlessness, but rather as a chaotic, reactive, and often ad hoc process. Whilst there can be little doubt that the 1649 act had a significant effect on opposition printing – the catalogue of the Thomason collection shows that the number of newsbooks and pamphlets published in 1651 was less than half what it had been in 1648 – it did not eradicate all hostile material, or even attempt to do so. Conceived efforts at suppression waxed and waned with political circumstances, meaning print legislation acted less as a blanket ban and more as a ‘keep off the grass sign’, to be implemented when it was deemed necessary.

This chapter analyses opposition print material which did reach the presses, legally or otherwise. It argues that in contrast to the period immediately following the Restoration, when the authorities largely succeeded in erasing rival memories of recent events from public view, opposition memories of the Civil Wars did feature in the print culture of the 1650s, both more and less explicitly. The first two sections explore different facets of Royalist


8 These figures are taken from G. K. Fortescue (ed.), Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration Collected by George Thomason, 1640-1661, 2 vols (London: British Museum, 1908), i.

9 McElligott, Royalism, Print and Censorship, p. 213.

10 This chapter is based on all forms of opposition print that were available in England during this period, whether printed in Britain or on the continent. Given the use of false imprints on materials produced in Britain it is difficult to distinguish material printed overseas and subsequently smuggled into Britain from texts printed domestically with any degree of certainty. For example, the mark of The Hague was used on copies of Eikon Basilike and Reliquiae Sacrae Carolinæ printed in England in an effort to throw censors off the scent. See Falconer F. Madan, A New Bibliography of the Eikon Basilike of King Charles the First, with a Note on the
memory, with particular emphasis on martyrrological writings and printed histories. The third section examines the way that memories of the wars were deployed by some of the Parliament’s former allies, focusing on the Levellers and also those people who, in 1658 and 1659, opposed the Protectorate and sought the redistribution of power to an alternative body, a multifarious group commonly referred to as the ‘good old cause’.

At the outset, the term ‘Royalist’ requires some clarification. Though once understood to mean those who fought for Charles I during the wars, recent scholarship has problematised this definition, not least its inability to account for the vast number of people who supported the King but never took up arms, or those many Parliamentarians who changed allegiance in the years after 1646. In this thesis, Royalism is defined as any articulation of support for Charles I’s cause during the Civil Wars, or an express desire to restore the Stuart dynasty as a primary political goal. This definition is broad enough to incorporate a wide range of Stuart supporters, while still allowing that not every expression of hostility to the republics was necessarily a sign of Royalism. Crucially, when applied to a text or individual utterance, it places no onus on its creator to be consistent, or for the historian to know what was really in their heart, a near impossibility, especially given the high level of collaboration with the republics exhibited even by some of the King’s most ardent supporters. As Jason McElligott and David Smith have noted, many aspects of Royalism during the 1650s remain unexplored, not least its print culture, with the bulk of studies to date focusing on the experience of

Authorship (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950), p. 166. In any case, the fact that texts printed on the continent often found their way into the English book trade renders the firm separation of texts produced in England from those printed overseas somewhat arbitrary, since many readers would have had access to both. For discussion of recent debates over the definition of Royalism see Jason McElligott and David Smith, ‘Introduction: Rethinking Royalists and Royalism’, in Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars, ed. by Jason McElligott and David Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 1-15 (pp. 10-15); Jason McElligott and David Smith, ‘Introduction: Rethinking Royalists and Royalism During the Interregnum’, in Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum, ed. by Jason McElligott and David Smith (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), pp. 1-17 (pp. 8-9); Barry Robertson, Royalists at War in Scotland and Ireland, 1638-1650 (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 19-21.

Or, indeed, every attempt to secure the restoration of the monarchy. The Levellers, for example, formed a brief alliance with the Royalists in the autumn of 1649, but the return of Charles II was not their primary motivation so much as a means to secure other political goals; to describe this group as Royalists would be to stretch the term so far as to render it almost meaningless. Much the same may be said of the Covenanters and their alliance with Charles II between 1650 and 1651.

It is for these reasons that I have not adopted Jason McElligott and David Smith’s preferred definition of a Royalist as someone who ‘by thought or deed, identified him or herself as a royalist and was accepted as such by other individuals who defined themselves as royalists’. See McElligott and Smith, ‘Introduction’, in Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars, ed. by McElligott and Smith, pp. 12-13. While their emphasis on self-definition and recognition is interesting, it is problematic for printed material, and particularly anonymous print, where the evidence of an author’s intentions lies only in the text and the reception of that material is rarely available.
leading Royalists or elite texts in isolation. What follows here makes an effort to redress this scholarly imbalance, considering memories of the war in a wide range of printed media, from books, sermons, and eulogies to ballads, newsbooks, and almanacs.

Taken as a whole, the chapter shows that dissident groups actively sought to frame the public memory of the wars, often directly contesting republican scripts, and that in spite of the impediments of censorship legislation there were some aspects of opposition memory that were advanced consistently throughout the decade. Further, it suggests that these narratives had important implications for contemporary political affairs, the shape of public memory after 1660, and the Restoration settlement more broadly, not least the eventual exclusion of the ‘puritan impulse’ from civil and ecclesiastical affairs. It also demonstrates that, while there were significant recurring themes in opposition public memory, these groups were nevertheless broad churches. An appreciation of the subtle differences in manifestations of memory reveals some of the variations which existed within these groups, both ideologically and temporally.

i. Martyrdom and Memory

In the days and months following Charles I’s execution, Royalist material decrying the regicide began to circulate in print. Indeed, one of the very first tracts – probably available on the day of the execution and certainly for sale in bookstalls by early February – purported to have been written by the late King himself. This posthumous text, the Eikon Basilike,
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15 The term ‘puritan impulse’ is Matthew Neufeld’s. He uses it to refer to ‘that which the Restoration settlements sought to exclude from civil and spiritual affairs […] men and women seeking fervently to evangelise and catechise the whole people under the inspiration of the best Reformed Churches’. See Matthew Neufeld, The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), pp. 11-12.

16 Potter, Secret Rites, Secret Writing, p. 169.
proved so popular that it ran to thirty-nine English language editions in 1649 alone. Its spread was apparently undaunted by the Commonwealth’s order that the sergeant-at-arms in London should ‘make Stay of, and seize at the Press, all those Books now printing or printed under the Name of the Book of the late King’. A combination of the King’s reflections, supposedly penned while in prison, and prayers and psalms, it was the most successful of a raft of texts that sought to present the deceased King as a martyr for his church and country.

Each of the twenty-eight chapters dealt with a different episode from England’s recent troubles. Throughout, the King emphasised that in all his actions he had only ever sought the good of his country and his people, a cause for which he had suffered many hardships, and, ultimately, death. Charles confided that he ‘had rather suffer all the miseries of life, and dy many deaths, then shamefully to desert, or dishonourably betray My own just rights and Soveraignty’, and it was this role of a patient, loyal sufferer that he occupied for the entirety of the piece. Even the engraved frontispiece, composed by William Marshall, sought to reinforce the image of Charles as a long-suffering martyr: it showed the King kneeling before an altar, crown of thorns in one hand, crown of England at his feet, gazing up at the heavenly diadem of glory – a martyr’s reward (fig. 3).

---

17 CJ, vi, p. 166. There were also twenty foreign language editions, including copies in Dutch, French, Latin, and German. For a detailed account of the different editions of *Eikon Basilike* and their variations see Madan, A New Bibliography. Throughout this chapter references are to the 1649 edition found at Wing (2nd ed.) / E.310, unless otherwise stated.


The representation of the King as a suffering martyr had a lengthy pedigree. As early as 1647, Marchamont Nedham – then still a writer of Royalist sympathies – had penned a play in which the narrator asked the audience ‘Doth not thy very heart consume with paine / When thou considerest thy sovereign […] His sufferings being unparalleled? / Seest thou not his Religious constancy / His patience, care and, zealous piety’, and in 1648 Edward Symmons wrote one of the first accounts that attempted to draw a comparison between the sufferings of the King and the sufferings of Christ. In words that proved to be prophetic, Symmons stated that, like Jesus, Charles would ‘rather suffer himself to be no Man, than yeild himself to be no King; he would rather part with his life, then his Kingship’. Though Symmons received some sharp chastisements for this comparison at the time, it became commonplace following
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20 [Marchamont Nedham], The Levellers levell’d. Or, The Independents conspiracie to root out monarchie (Unknown, 1647; Thomason / E.419[4]), p. 6; [Edward Symmons], The Kings most gracious messages for peace, and a personal treaty. Published for his peoples satisfaction, that they may see and judge, whether the foundation of the Commons declaration, touching their votes of no farther addresse to the King, (viz. His Majesties aversenesse to peace) be just, rationall and religious (Unknown, 1648; Thomason / E.438[19]). For further discussion of the matryrological tradition prior to 1649 see Lacey, The Cult of King Charles the Martyr, pp. 18-48.

21 [Symmons], The Kings most gracious messages, p. 50.
Charles’ actual translation from earthly king to divine martyr in 1649. In a sermon delivered and printed in the summer of that year, Henry Leslie dedicated the first half of his narrative to the Passion of Christ, before going on to draw out the parallels with the life and death of the late King. He concluded that ‘he [Charles I] was a most lively image of Christ, so lively an image of him, that amongst all of the Martyrs […] never was there any who expressed so great a conformity with our Saviour in his sufferings, as he did’. The King’s execution prompted an explosion of material that proffered variations on this theme, from elegies and epitaphs to biographies and poetry.

Given that Royalist writers often lamented that both the regicide and the Civil Wars more generally were events almost too awful to contemplate, there is a certain irony in the fact that martyrological interpretations of the King’s death generally required people to remember the wars. For it was the events that had occurred immediately prior to and during the conflict that best demonstrated Charles’ virtues: his patience, his good intentions, his sufferings. As the anonymous author of The Martyr of the People put it, readers must

Consider his Sufferings from his departure from White-hall to his death, before his said Palace; and you may conclude, the Glory of England is taken from us; Remember first, how he was forced from us by tumults […] An Army raised against him […] how many dangers he was exposed too, chased from place to place […] the remembrance of his sufferings and death shall eternize him glorious.

Thus, in martyr narratives, memories of the wars served two main purposes. First, they demonstrated Charles’ constancy and dedication to his cause, which had only been the proper protection of his people, church, and country. The presence of a just cause was integral to notions of early modern martyrdom, and a person who suffered and died for anything less could not be considered a martyr. As a 1650 edition of The Man in the Moon reminded its readers, ‘doth not the Cause crown the Martyr?’ Second, recalling the diverse hardships which Charles had experienced during the conflict demonstrated the sufferings he had endured in the pursuit of this goal. To this end, writers frequently narrated events that had occurred in the run-up to the wars, presenting Charles as a well-intentioned monarch who had
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22 Lacey, The Cult of King Charles the Martyr, pp. 30-31.
23 Henry Leslie, The martyrdom of King Charles, or His conformity with Christ in his sufferings (The Hague, 1649; Thomason / E.569[10]), p. 14.
24 See, for example, Anon., Vaticinium votivum or, Palaemon's prophetick prayer (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.1217[2]), p. 68 and Anon., Monumentum Regale or a tombe, erected for that incomparable and glorious monarch, Charles the First, King of Great Britane, France and Ireland, &c (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.1217[5]), p. 20.
25 Anon., The martyr of the people, or, the murdered King. Expressed [sic] in several considerations upon his sufferings and death. With a character of his life and vertues (London, 1649; Wing / M859), pp. 3-6.
26 The Man in the Moon, no. 51, 10-26 April 1650 (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / 92:E.601[5]), p. 387.
sought only the peace and security of his country, as well as the events of the wars themselves, with emphasis on the sufferings the King had endured at the hands of his enemies.

The anonymous pamphlet *King Charles the First, no man of blood*, published in June 1649, was typical. In this tract, events that in the king-blaming narratives of the republics were provided as clear evidence of Charles’ tyrannical plots were reinterpreted and redeployed as evidence that the King had acted with the best of intentions, often in the face of a hostile and malicious Parliament. Thus, the King’s attempt to arrest the five members was presented not as a gross breach of parliamentary privilege, but as an attempt to curtail the designs of wicked men who had plans to ‘roote out [the King], subvert the Lawes and alter the Religion, and Government of the Kingdome’, a ‘peaceable behaviour […]which] had all manner of evill constructions put upon it’. Similarly, his decision to leave London in 1642 was interpreted not as an abandonment, but rather as a necessary precaution, undertaken with great reluctance only to preserve his own safety in the face of tumults deliberately stoked by the Parliament. The author also reminded readers of the numerous concessions the King had put to the Parliament both before and after the outbreak of war, acts which illustrated Charles’ commitment to peace and demonstrated that he ‘offered all that could be imagined to bee for the good and safety of his People’. An edited compilation of the King’s writings, the *Reliquiae Sacrae Carolinae*, dedicated a whole section to ‘His Majesties Messages for Peace’.

---

27 Anon., *King Charles the First, no man of blood: but a martyr for his people* (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.531[3]). For other martyrological tracts that deployed memories of either the causes or the events of the wars, or both, see Anon., *A faithful subjects sigh, on the universally-lamented death, and tragicall end, of that virtuous and pious prince, our most gracious soveraigne, Charles I* (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.560[4]); Anon., *The Scotch Souldiers Lamenation upon the death of the most glorious and illustrious martyr, King Charles* (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.560[15]); Anon., *The devilish conspiracy, hellish treason, heathenish condemnation, and damnable murder committed and executed by the Jewes against the Anointed of the Lord, Christ their King* (London, 1649; Thomason / E.550[16]); Anon., *Vaticinium votivum; John Quarles, Regale lectum miseriae or, a kingly bed of miserie* (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.1345[1]); Anon.; *The royall legacies of Charles the first of that name, of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, King and martyr; to his persecutors and murderers* (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.557[1]); Leslie, *The martyrdom of King Charles; Anon., An Elegie on the meakest of men, the most glorious of princes, the most constant of martyrs, Charles the I. &c* (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.553[1]); Anon., *We have fish’d faire and caught a frog. Or, The history of several new fisher-men: who are in a short time, growne great proficients in that art* (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.558[17]); Anon., *Reliquiae sacrae Carolinae. Or the works of that great monarch and glorious martyr King Charls the I* (The Hague, 1651; Thomason / E.1220[1]); Anon., *Stipendariae lacrymae, or, A tribute of teares* (The Hague, 1654; Thomason / E.745[23]).

28 Anon., *King Charles the First No Man of Blood*, p. 5.

29 Ibid. Leslie’s sermon went so far as to compare Charles’ departure with Christ’s withdrawal from Jerusalem. See Leslie, *The martyrdom of King Charles*, p. 16.

30 Anon., *King Charles the First No Man of Blood*, p. 53.

An emphasis on concessions served a dual purpose. On the one hand, Charles’ apparent willingness to negotiate with the Parliament was deployed as evidence of his commitment to preserving the peace and his people’s wellbeing, as was consistent with a righteous martyrdom. On the other, it also helped to absolve the King of responsibility for the wars. If, in fact, Charles had done all he could to prevent hostilities then he could not be blamed either for the outbreak of war or the bloodshed that followed, an interpretation that rendered the legal charges that the High Court had brought against him invalid.

In contrast to the often lengthy recitals of the events that had occurred prior to 1642, martyrological texts did not tend to dwell on the military transactions of the wars in any great detail. Instead, they focused primarily on those occasions when the King had experienced personal hardships or betrayal, often deploying this as further evidence of his Christ-like suffering. The Scots’ decision to turn the King over to the Parliament in February 1647 – an episode that was frequently remembered as a treacherous ‘sale’ and likened to Judas’ betrayal of Jesus to the Jews – was particularly popular, as was his time in prison, though even events as minor as being caught in the rain while travelling were described at length.32 These incidents were sometimes buttressed with descriptions of the cruelty of the Parliamentarians more generally, particularly when these could be contrasted with the peaceful actions of the King. For example, the author of King Charles the First, no man of blood described how, after being turned away from Hull, Charles with ‘patience and hope forbore any action, or attempt at force, according to His promise’.33 By contrast, Sir John Hotham, Hull’s Parliamentary governor, ‘sallied out in the night, and murdered many of His fellow Subjects’.34 Charles’ eventual execution, then, was only the crowning glory in a long line of

32 For some examples of texts that draw an explicit parallel between the sale of Christ and the actions of the Scots see Anon., A subjects sigh, p. 5; Anon., The Scotch souldiers lamentation, p. 12; Anon., The royall legacies of Charles the first, p. 2; Leslie, The martyrdome of King Charles, pp. 23-24; Anon., Loyalties tears flowing after the blood of the royal sufferer, Charles the I (Unknown, [1649]; Thomason / E.561[15]), p. 3. For references to the King’s sufferings while in prison see Anon., Loyalties tears, p. 3; Anon, The martyr of the people, pp. 2-4; Anon., The princely pellican. Royall resolves presented in sundry choice observations, extracted from His Majesties divine meditations: with satisfactory reasons to the whole kingdome, that his sacred person was the onely author of them (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.558[1]), p. 37; Anon., Vaticinium votivum, p. 69; Quarles, Regale lectum miseriae, p. 28; Anon., We have fish’d faire and caught a frog, p. 4. For an account of the King’s fortitude when caught in the rain see [Peter Heylyn], A Short View of the Life and Reign of King Charles (the second monarch of Great Britain) from his birth to his burial (London, 1658; Wing / H1735A), p. 107.

33 Anon., King Charles the First No Man of Blood, p. 15

34 Ibid. According to this text, other atrocities inflicted by the Parliamentarians included ‘Women and Maids ravished, and their fingers cut off for their rings, old Best of Canturbury hanged up by their privities, others tortured, and had burning matches tied to their fingers to make them confesse where their money was […] horses […] taken away, in so much as some were inforced to blinde and put out their horses eyes that they might not bee taken from them’ (p. 33). In his account of the siege of Colchester, the Royalist army officer Matthew Carter dwelt for quite some time on the Parliamentarian plundering of the Lucas house, describing how soldiers
hardships, all of which he had patiently endured in pursuit of the good of his people – or, as one elegist succinctly put it, the King had been ‘A persecuted Saint, for seven years space / Prest down with sorrowes, yet held up by Grace’.35

However, though the King’s concessions and sufferings were often emphasised in Royalist martyrologies, such submissiveness was not always considered straightforwardly praiseworthy, and it is possible to identify a subtle sheen of criticism even in vehemently martyrological texts. One concession that was singled out with particular frequency was the King’s assent to the Triennial Act in 1641, which required parliament to meet for a minimum of fifty days at least once every three years.36 In the verse Regale lectum miseriae, John Quarles described how ‘his [the King’s] meeknesse made his foes / Grow supercilious’, such that they ‘zealously betray’d / The Lord of Englands life, whose free consent / Granted them a triennial Parliament / To salve the Kingdomes grievances, but they / Took not the grievances, but Him away’.37 In these lines, Quarles criticises the actions of the Parliament, but he does not shy away from the fact that it was Charles himself who had, through his ‘meeknesse’, enabled them to act in this way. The anonymous author of the pamphlet The English Tyrants was even more explicit, stating that by this act Charles ‘gave his prerogative and power out of his own hand, which proved his and the Kingdoms ruin’.38

Meanwhile, the author of Two Elegeis [sic] reflected on the King’s concessions more generally, calling on readers to ‘Witness King Charls, whose Saint-like Mercies were / So great, they did remit that needful fear / Subjects should shew unto their Kings’.39 In these lines, the author betrayed an ambivalence not uncommon in Royalist writings, torn between the praiseworthiness of a merciful king and the problematic repercussions this mildness had served to create. Criticisms of Charles could also extend to the tactically unwise decisions he

broke into the family vault, and, finding the bodies of Lady Lucas and Lady Killigre within, ‘tore open that coffin beyond what ever was known or read before, or amongst the most unhumane barbarous thoughts, dismembred their trunks, throwing a legge in one corner of the vault, and arme in another, and were so Impudent in this so worse the brutish act, as to beare away the haire of their heads in their Hats as a triumphant bravado in honour to their villanie’. See [Matthew Carter], A most true and exact relation of that as honourable as unfortunate expedition of Kent Essex and Colchester (Unknown, 1650; Wing / C662), pp. 164-165.

35 Anon., The monument of Charles the First, King of England Who was beheaded before Whitt-Hall [sic] January 30th 1648. In the 24th yeare of his reigne (Unknown, [1649]; Thomason / E.569[4]), n.p.


37 Quarles, Regale lectum miseriae, p. 83.

38 Anon., The English tyrants. Or, A brief historie of the lives and actions of the high and mighty states, the lords of Westminster, and now (by usurpation) kings of England. Containing all their rebellious and traiterous proceedings and transactions in Parliament. (London, 1649; Thomason / E.569[4]), p. 3.

39 Anon., Two eleges [sic]. The one on His late Majestie. The other on Arthur Lord Capel (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.550[3]), p. 4.
had made when in military command. Describing the transactions of the wars themselves, even the author of *King Charles the First, no man of blood* lamented the King’s failure to ‘make use of any of the victories or advantages God had given him’.40

Indeed, criticisms of Charles I in the works of the Royalist Peter Heylyn, particularly his *Observations on the Historie of the Reign of King Charles*, were so prevalent that Anthony Milton has concluded that Heylyn rejected the depiction of Charles as a martyr altogether.41 Those occasions when Heylyn did deploy martyrological language – most notably in *A Short View of the Life and Reign of King Charles*, published without licence in 1658 – are dismissed by Milton as mere lip service, masking Heylyn’s broader disdain for hagiographical accounts of the King’s actions.42 Milton is certainly right to draw attention to the fact that Royalist memories of Charles I could be somewhat conflicted. It is also true that Heylyn’s criticisms of Charles were towards the more aggressive end of the spectrum – so much so, in fact, that his fellow Royalist historian, Hamon L’Estrange, commented that ‘the Title of his Pamphlet might rather have been formed into the Observations against King Charles, then Observations upon his History’.43 More questionable, however, is Milton’s contention that the hostility Heylyn exhibited towards Charles in certain passages is best understood as a rejection of the representation of the King as a martyr. For, as the critiques of Charles which have been discussed above show, it was not unusual for martyrological writings to include a degree of hostility – or, at the very least, ambivalence – towards the King’s actions. In this respect, and when viewed in the context of Royalist print more broadly, Heylyn’s critiques of the King are not necessarily as inconsistent with his hagiographical passages, or indeed as unusual, as Milton has implied.

One possible explanation for the apparent tensions in Royalist writings concerned the King’s actions is the emphasis in martyrological accounts on intentionality. In other words, martyrological texts tended to privilege the intentions and emotions of the King over factual

---

40 Anon., *King Charles the First No Man of Blood*, p. 41.

41 Anthony Milton, ‘“Vailing his Crown”: Royalist Criticism of Charles I’s Kingship in the 1650s’, in Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum, ed. by McElligott and Smith, pp. 88-102; [Peter Heylyn], *Observations on the historie of the reign of King Charles* (London, 1656; Wing / H1727).

42 For two overtly martyrological passages see [Heylyn], *A Short View*, pp. 107, 133.

43 [Hamon L’Estrange], *The Observator Observed: or, Animadversions upon the Observations on the History of King Charles. Wherein That History is Vindicated, partly Illustrated, And several other things tending to the Rectification of some publike mistakes, are inserted. To which is added, at the latter end, the Observators Rejoinder* (London, 1656; Wing / L1188A), p. 1. For further discussion of Heylyn and his histories see below, pp. 131-132.
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accuracy. For example, in *Eikon Basilike* the rationale for Charles’ move against the five members was qualified with the phrase ‘as I thought’, a wording which implied that it was Charles’ belief about the correctness of his actions, and not the accuracy of this assessment, that was important. Martyrological narratives tended to turn on the praiseworthiness of the King’s aspirations when acting, rather than on their wisdom or consequences. As a result, there were clearly many occasions when it was possible for even his supporters to perceive a gulf between Charles’ supposed good intentions and the political or military outcomes of his actions. It is these contradictions that best account for the subtle equivocation that surfaces in many martyrological accounts. Charles I may have meant well, acted for the good of his people, and died a true martyr. Nonetheless, even his Royalist defenders were not blind to the fact that, on some occasions, his choices may have been ill-judged. Clearly not oblivious to this apparent tension, some writers attempted to reconcile the two sentiments by suggesting that Charles’ tactical follies were simply further evidence of his good and trusting nature, and of the unscrupulous character of his opponents. The author of *King Charles the First, no man of blood*, for example, noted that while the King did ‘tarry too long’ in constructing his defences this was only because of his faith in ‘the love and religion of his Subjects and Parliament[s] promises’, a trust which had proven to be sadly misplaced. When viewed in this light, even Charles’ mistakes could be used to reinforce his martyrlogy.

However, hagiographical accounts did more than simply deploy memories of the wars in order to portray the King as a suitable candidate for a Protestant martyrdom; in the process, they also contested the republics’ efforts to control the public memory of these events. Their interpretation of the King as a peaceful and well-meaning monarch stood in direct opposition to the king-blaming accounts proffered by state-sponsored writers such as Thomas May. In response, the Commonwealth’s supporters penned several tracts that were explicit rebuttals of martyrological works. John Milton’s *Eikonoclastes*, for example, was a government-commissioned response to *Eikon Basilike*, while *The Life and Reigne of King Charles; or the Pseudo-Martyr discovered* (often, though not definitively, attributed to Milton) also sought to counter martyrological narratives.

---

45 Anon., *Eikon Basilike*, p. 12. Indeed, Andrew Lacey has calculated that the phrase ‘conscience’ appears 112 times in *Eikon Basilike*. See Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, p. 83, fn. 13.
46 Anon., *King Charles the First No Man of Blood*, p. 40.
In turn, Royalist writers produced works that sought to directly undermine the republics’ preferred version of wartime events. Not all of these were necessarily explicitly martyrological. For example, the pamphlet *Traytors Deciphered* tackled head on the account of the conflicts presented in the republican pamphlet *A Declaration of the Parliament of England* (1649).\(^48\) In so doing, its author appealed less to the King’s intentions and personal virtues and more to legal and historical precedent, arguing that Charles had in fact acted entirely within the limits of the constitution and law. Events that in *A Declaration* were cited as proof that Charles had attempted to ‘awe us into Slavery’ were reinterpreted as both reasonable and legal.\(^49\) As an illustration, Ship Money was ‘judged by the best learned of the laws of England to be his MAJESTIES right to require’, while the calling of parliaments was deemed to be at the King’s discretion, rather than a legal necessity.\(^50\) A potted history of the wars printed in 1649 deployed similar arguments. It concluded with a lengthy list of events that the author believed ‘should be remembred’ [sic], from Hotham’s actions at Hull to the Parliament’s deployment of foreign troops, all of which apparently demonstrated that the King was not responsible for the outbreak of war or the death and destruction that followed.\(^51\)

In addition to contesting republican accounts of the King’s culpability, the king as martyr narrative also had the advantage of offering Royalists an alternative way to interpret the Parliament’s victory in the Civil Wars. As many historians have noted, the belief that military victory could be equated with divine favour was widespread in seventeenth-century England.\(^52\) This posed an obvious challenge for the defeated Royalists, one to which Charles’

---

\(^48\) Anon., *Traytors deciphered in an answeare to a shamelesse pamphlet, entituled, A declaration of the Parliament of England, expressing the grounds of their late proceedings, and of settling the present government in the way of a free state* (Unknown, [1650]; Thomason / E.777[7]).

\(^49\) Anon., *A Declaration of the Parliament of England, expressing the grounds of their late proceedings, and of settling the present government in a way of a free state* (London, 1649; Thomason / E.548[12]), p. 7. For further discussion of this declaration see chapter one, pp. 54-55.


\(^51\) Anon., *An inquisition after blood. To the Parliament in statu quo nunc, and to the Army regnant: or any other whether Royalist, Presbyterian, Independent or Leveller, whom it may concern* (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E. 531[23]), pp. 8-9 (p. 8). For other potted histories of the wars that were Royalist in tone but not necessarily explicitly martyrological see Anon., *The charge against the King discharged: or, The king cleared by the people of England, from the severall accusations in the charge, delivered in against him at Westminster-Hall* (Unknown, [1649]; Thomason / E.542[10]); Anon., *Majestas intemerata or, the immortality of the King* (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.1347[1]); Lambert Wood, *Florus Anglicus: or An exact history of England, from the raign of William the Conqueror to the death of the late King* (London, 1656; Thomason / E.1677[1]); Anon., *A second narrative of the late Parliament (so called.) Wherein, after a brief reciting some remarkable passages in the former narrative, is given an account of their second meeting, and things transacted by them* (Unknown, 1659; Thomason / E.977[3]).

martyrdom offered a potential solution. For if it was through his sufferings, patience, and constancy during the wars that Charles had been prepared for the glories of martyrdom, then the Parliament’s victory could be understood less as a defeat and more as simply a necessary precursor to this divine accession. This sentiment was clearly expressed in Quarles’ poem *Regale lectum miseriae*, in which Charles declared that

God knows my cause was just  
An yet he lay’d my Armies in the dust:  
Shall I repine because I dayly see  
My foes prevale, and triumph over me  
No, no I will not, they shall live to dye,  
When I shall dye, to live, and glorifie’.  

In this verse, military defeat, far from being the result of divine displeasure, had actually been designed to prepare the King to enter God’s kingdom. In a similar vein, the anonymous author of a sermon printed in 1649 stated that ‘God did often inflict great temporall punishments even upon his best and dearest children’, including Charles I, Job, and Jeremiah, in order ‘to make them exactly conformable to the Image of his onely Son’. Just as Charles was translated from failed earthly king to divine monarch upon his execution, so a martyrological interpretation of events enabled Royalists to elevate crushing military and political defeat into something that evidenced the virtues of the King and his cause, a mere precursor to his divine glorification.

For good measure, Royalists also advanced several arguments that rejected any connection between the outcome of the wars and God’s support for the Parliament. First, and most straightforward, some writers simply denied there was always a connection between military success and godly approbation. In his almanac for the year 1654, Richard Fitzsmith accompanied the date of the Battle of Naseby, a major Royalist defeat, with a reminder to his readers that they should ‘Judge not a cause as it does prosper here / God with his own oftentimes is most severe’. To support this point, writers often drew attention to the military

---

54 Anon., *The teares of Sion upon the death of Josiah, distilled in some country sermon notes on Febr. 4. and 11th, 1649* (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.560[18]), sig. A2v.
55 Richard Fitzsmith, *Syzygiiasticon instauratum: or, An almanack & ephemeris for the year of our Lord God, 1654. Being the second after leap year, and from the creation*, 5603 (London, 1654; Thomason / E.1500[1]), sig. D7r.
successes of countries that were widely regarded by the English people as ungodly and barbaric, usually the Ottoman empire.\textsuperscript{56} Thus, a 1650 edition of the Royalist newsbook \textit{Mercurius Pragmaticus} chided the republic for their belief that ‘Heav’n doth own’ their cause, claiming that ‘\textit{if it bee Sucesse / That Stamps its goodnesse; Mah’met’s-Lawes / and Doctrine were no lesse},’ while a Royalist play published in 1649 noted that victory ‘proves not the justnesse of thy cause: For, by the same rule the \textit{Ottaman may boast / The partiall Deities favour him the most}’.\textsuperscript{57} Other authors, meanwhile, argued that the Parliament’s victories had indeed been instituted by God, but that these represented a national punishment rather than divine favour. According to one printed sermon, possibly penned by the Anglican preacher William Juxon, the Lord had removed their ‘good King’ from them as a punishment for the nation’s sins, prior to bringing ‘\textit{the fiercenesse of his great wrath}’ down upon them.\textsuperscript{58}

As the vanquished party, albeit one that generally rejected the connection between military success and divine support, it is unsurprising that Royalist writers, in contrast to their Parliamentarian counterparts, rarely sought to commemorate specific military engagements once hostilities had ceased.\textsuperscript{59} What they did do, however, was remind their readers of the heroic wartime deeds of particular individuals, even when these actions had been displayed in the context of defeat. As Lacey Baldwin Smith has commented, ‘martyrs rarely appear singly. They are usually a group phenomenon [reflecting] serious rifts in society’.\textsuperscript{60} Charles I’s martyrdom was no exception, and other Royalists who had fought for the King, refused to concede to the Parliament, and ultimately embraced death were commemorated with their own martyrlogies. Most notably, Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle – Royalist commanders sentenced to death by a council of war following the siege of Colchester in 1648 – were presented as martyrs for the cause and the memory of their deaths was evoked in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{57} \textit{Mercurius Pragmaticus}, no. 20, 28 August–4 September 1649 (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / 88:E.572[18]), sig. A1r; Anon., \textit{The famous tragedie of King Charles I basely butchered} (Unknown, 1649; Wing / F384), p. 10. For a similar line of argument that draws on biblical rather than earthly parallels see Henry Hammond, \textit{To the right honourable, the Lord Fairfax, and his counsell of warre: the humble addresse of Henry Hammond} (London, 1649; Thomason / E.540[18]), pp. 4-5.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Anon., \textit{The subjects sorrow: or, Lamentations upon the death of Britaines Josiah, King Charles, most unjustly and cruelly put to death by His owne people, before His Royall Palace White-Hall} (London, 1649; Thomason / E.546[16]), p. 2. See also Anon., \textit{Traytors deciphered}, p. 32 and William Stampe, \textit{A treatise of spiritual infatuation being the present visible disease of the English nation} (The Hague, 1651; Thomason / E.1388[1]), pp. 53-53.
\item \textsuperscript{59} For a notable exception, see Jane Cavendish’s manuscript poem commemorating her father’s victory at Adwalton Moor on 30 June 1643, which included the lines ‘Therefore I'le keepe this thy victoryes day / If not in publique by some private way’. See Bod MS Rawl Poet 16, p. 38.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Lacey Baldwin Smith, \textit{Fools, Martyrs, Traitors: The Story of Martyrdom in the Western World} (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1997), p. 18.
\end{itemize}
Royalist print throughout the 1650s. Several writers even contended that there was a physical ‘monument of that cruell murder to all eternity’ visible at the site of their execution in the form of a bare patch of ground that could not ‘be forced by art to bear any [grass]’. Indeed, the martyrdom of Lucas and Lisle was a particularly popular Royalist narrative precisely because it prompted people to remember not just the heroism of the Royalists, but also the cruelty of the Parliamentarians. Though the execution of an enemy who had surrendered to mercy was not, technically, a contravention of early modern codes of just war, it was nevertheless interpreted by Royalist contemporaries as a barbaric and unsoldierly act.

As a result, Royalist writers were often quite explicit that by remembering the bravery of Lucas and Lisle, they were also recalling the harshness of their enemy. As John Quarles wrote in *Fons lachrymarum*, a collection of poems published (without licence) in 1655: ‘this Act [i.e. the deaths of Lucas and Lisle] must be /Recorded in the Roules of Infamie/That after Ages, when they do behold/ May blush, what noble Deeds were done of old [...] Say Tyrants, say, wasn’t not a shameful strife/ To send a Death, after a promis’d Life?’. There were tropes and expectations of Christian martyrdom embedded within the English Protestant tradition dating back to John Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*. These constrained, to some extent, which Royalist figures could be most readily translated from wartime death to divine crown. As a rule, a degree of agency, defiance, and public performance was necessary to render someone a martyr; to have been a simply victim of war was not, strictly speaking,  

61 See, for example, [Carter], *A most true and exact relation*, pp. 197-200; Anon., *Stipendiae lacrymae*, p. 23; Anon., *Vaticinium votivum*, p. 52.
62 [Carter], *A most true and exact relation*, pp. 199-200. See also *The Man in the Moon*, no. 17, 8-15 August 1649 (Unknown, 1649; Thomason /87:E.569[14]), p. 140. For further discussion of the bare patch of earth at Colchester see chapter four, pp. 208-209.
63 Fairfax defended the decision, claiming that ‘by delivering upon mercy is to be understood, that some are to suffer the rest to go free’, but this line of argument cut little ice with the Royalist press. See Barbara Donagan, *War in England, 1642-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 368. On codes of just war during the Civil Wars, including the difference between surrendering to quarter and surrendering to mercy, see Barbara Donagan, ‘Atrocity, War Crime and Treason in the English Civil War’, *The American Historical Review*, 99.4 (1994), 1137-1166.
64 John Quarles, *Fons lachrymarum*, or, A fountain of tears from whence doth flow Englands complaint, Jeremiah’s lamentations paraphras’d, with divine meditations, and an elegy upon that son of valor Sir Charls Lucas (London, 1655; Wing / Q129), p. 119.
65 John Foxe, *Actes and monuments of these latter and perillous dayes touching matters of the Church, wherein ar [sic] comprehended and describid the great persecutions [and] horrible troubles, that have bene wrought and practised by the Romishe prelates, speciallye in this realme of England and Scotlandle, from the yeare of our Lorde a thousande, unto the tyme nowe present* (London, 1563; ESTC / 11222). For further discussion of the relationship between Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs* and the cult of Charles the martyr see Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, p. 52.
sufficient to qualify.66 While Charles I, Lucas and Lisle, and also Lord Capel – executed away from the scene of the battle after refusals to acquiesce to demands – more or less conformed to these criteria, the same could not be said of all the King’s supporters who were killed during the wars.67 That Royalist writers were alert to these constraints is clear from the somewhat tentative language in which other, less straightforwardly martyrrological Royalist figures were remembered. The narrator of the 1654 verse *Stipendariae lacrymae*, a poem dedicated to remembering the deeds of a raft of Royalist martyrs, including many men who had died on the field, used the equivocal phrase ‘If Phocas gave that name [i.e. martyr] to all that died / In war, they [i.e. Lucas and Lisle] merit it by double right’.68 In using these words, the narrator exhibited some uncertainty over whether the Royalist war dead, had, in fact, always rendered themselves martyrs; and, if they had, then Lucas and Lisle should be considered a special category of martyr – namely, martyrs twice over – owing to the manner of their deaths.

Not all Royalist authors were so punctilious about promoting casualties of war to the status of martyrdom. For example, in the postscript to *The royall legacies*, the anonymous author declared that he sought to ‘stir up the Memory of such Heroes, as no Nation can parallel’.69 To do so, he narrated the deeds and deaths of some of the King’s leading supporters, many of whom had been killed in direct combat, claiming that the ‘Actions of Duty, and Allegiance, the sufferings of Persecution and Martyrdome, eternize the[se] Names, and Persons’.70 Such descriptions were not without precedent. The Cornish general Sir Bevil Grenville, slain at the Battle of Lansdown in 1643, was described in a book of memorial verses as a ‘Souldier, and Martyr too’ and a ‘Heroic Martyr’.71 What constituted a martyrdom became even more

67 Even relatively minor figures, like Mr Beaumont, the vicar for South Kirby, executed for passing intelligence to the Royalists and for complicity in betraying the castle of Pontefract, and John Burley, executed in 1648 for attempting to free the King from the Isle of Wight, were remembered as martyrs. See George Wharton, *Hemeroscopeion the loyall almanack, for the year of Christ, 1650* (London, 1650; Thomason / E.1323[1]), sig. B2v.
68 Anon., *Stipendariae lacrymae*, p. 23. Phocas was a Byzantine emperor who was overthrown and killed by Hercules following his civil war defeat. See also Anon., *Two Elegeis*, p. 7.
69 Anon., *The royall legacies*, p. 92.
70 Ibid., p. 89. Republican propagandists sometimes chose to pick up on the inconsistencies between Royalist martyrdoms and the Christian martyrrological tradition. In *Eikonoclastes*, for example, Milton’s objections included the fact that no true martyr could bear witness to themselves and that martyrs could not die for an established church. For further discussion of this point see Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, p. 90.
71 Henry Birkhead, *Verses by the University of Oxford on the death of the most noble and right valiant Sir Bevill Grenvill, alias Granvill, Kt. who was slain by the rebells at the battle on Lansdown-Hill near Bathe, July the 5, 1643* (London, 1684; Wing / O989), pp. 6, 17. These verses were first published at Oxford in 1643 and later reprinted in 1684. A monument to Grenville was erected on the site where he was mortally wounded in 1720.
flexible after the Restoration. William Winstanley’s *Loyall Martyrology* included not just martyrs, in the traditional sense of the term, but a selection of ‘the most Eminent Persons who Suffered by their Conscience during the late times of Rebellion, either by Death, Imprisonment, Banishment or Sequestration, together with those who were Slain in the Kings Service’.  

This broadening of the concept of martyrdom and its deployment by the defeated party in the aftermath of civil conflict is by no means unique. To take a more recent example, there are monuments across the southern United States that commemorate the martyrdoms of Confederate soldiers killed and executed during the course of the American Civil Wars. To represent one’s dead in this way offers the vanquished party a way of remembering domestic defeat that dwells on the strengths and commitment of the lost cause, rather than its military failures. It translates memories of defeat and loss into memories of heroism, and it is this transformatory quality that perhaps accounts for the prevalence of martyrological narratives among diverse defeated parties across time and space.

Other Royalists, perhaps more sensitive to the constraints that were incumbent on a traditional Protestant martyrdom, were content to confine themselves to remembering the feats of their former comrades in the language of heroism. For example, an elegy to Francis Villiers (son of the first Duke of Buckingham, slain at a skirmish near Kingston-on-Thames in 1648) which was republished in the 1649 volume, *Vaticinium votivum*, described how Villiers did ‘in a brave career […] out-dare the Destinies and tread / A loftie measure through whole showres of Lead’.

Similarly commendatory elegies commemorating Royalist gentlemen who had been killed during the wars continued to be produced and reprinted throughout the decade.
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72 William Winstanley, *The loyall martyrology, or, Brief catalogues and characters of the most eminent persons who suffered for their conscience during the late times of rebellion either by death, imprisonment, banishment, or sequestration together with those who were slain in the Kings service: as also dregs of treachery: with the catalogue and characters of those regicides who sat as judges on our late dread soveraign of ever blessed memory* (London, 1665; Wing / W3066, sig. A1r. See also Anon., *The Royal martyrs, or, A List of the lords, knights, commanders, and gentlemen that were slain in the late wars, in defence of their king and country as also of those executed by high courts of justice or law-martial* (London, 1660; Wing / R2134).


74 Anon., *Vaticinium votivum*, p. 65.

75 For example, Robert Heath’s collection of poetry included, amongst others, an elegy to his friend killed at the Battle of Newbury in 1645. See Robert Heath, *Clarastella together with poems occasional, elegies, epigrams, satyrs* (London, 1650; Thomason / E.1364[1]), p. 4. See also Quarles, *Fons lachrymarum*, originally printed in 1649 and reprinted in 1655; Quarles, *Regale Lectum Miseriae*, originally printed in 1649 and reprinted in 1658 and 1659; Henry Vaughan, *Olor Iscanus: A collection of some select poems, and translations* (London, 1651;
A broadside produced in 1653 opened with the phrase ‘In Memoria eterna erit Justus’ [The Just shall be in eternal remembrance], and went on to list the names and brave actions of fallen Royalists, such as Sir John Smith Banneret, ‘who rescued the Kings Standard from the enemy at Edg-hil’.76 Meanwhile, the ‘Loyall Almanack’, produced by George Wharton, recorded the deaths and deeds of notable Royalists in its ‘Micro-Chronicon’ of wartime events.77 For the month of May alone this included the ‘murder’ of Robert Yeamans and George Bouchier at Bristol in 1643, the execution of Strafford in 1641, and the date Pontefract castle was surrendered in 1648 ‘whence the gallant Governour thereof, with two more of the six excepted Persons forced their passage through the whole Body of Rebels then before it’.78 Even the historian William Sanderson made a short digression to record the number and names of the men in the Colchester garrison, arguing that they ‘deserve to be mentioned (Some amends for their suffering) they were Valiant men’.79 These texts, whether in the form of lists, chronologies, or elegies, like martyrlogies, offered Royalists a way of remembering the wars that overlooked military defeat and focused on individual heroism. They transformed uncomfortable military memories into something that could be recalled, commemorated, even celebrated.

However, the 1653 broadside is also notable for another reason: it is a catalogue only of lords, knights, and gentlemen killed during the wars who were of ‘the Catholick Religion’.80 As such, it was not only a commemoration of Royalist war dead, but also an effort to remind fellow Royalists of the contribution that adherents to the Catholic faith had made to the King’s cause. As we will see in more detail in the next section, Royalist memories of the wars were neither homogenous nor produced with the sole aim of challenging republican scripts – they could be deployed in the hope of influencing the attitudes of fellow Royalists too.

Wing (2nd ed.) / V123. For an interesting interpretation of the role that elegies played in fostering Royalist identity more generally see Susan Clarke, ‘Royalists Write the Death of Lord Hastings: Post-Regicide Funerary Propaganda’, *Parergon*, 22.2 (2005), 113-130.
76 Anon., *A Catalogue of the lords, knights, and gentlemen (of the Catholick religion) that were slain in the late warr, in defence of their king and countrey as also, of those whose estates were sold by the Rump for that cause* (Unknown, [1652]; Wing / C1383), n.p.
77 Wharton, *Hemeroscopeion the loyall almanack, for the year of Christ, 1650*, sig. B2r.
78 Ibid., sig. B3v, B4r.
80 Anon., *A Catalogue of the lords, knights, and gentlemen (of the Catholick religion)*, n.p. For a list of notable Royalist war dead that is not Catholic see Anon., *The royall legacies*, p. 92.
In short, martyrological tracts directly contested some of the central tenets of republican memory, furnishing Royalists with an alternative way to remember not only Charles I and his execution but the transactions and outcomes of the wars more generally. Though the republics’ supporters accused Royalists of trying to place the events of Charles’ reign in a ‘Coffin of Oblivion’, quite the reverse was true; to present the King as a martyr necessitated remembering many of his actions, albeit in a very particular light.81 Though initially such material was probably intended to rally supporters to the cause of the Charles II, after his defeat in 1651 Royalist writings predominantly were, as C. V. Wedgewood puts it, ‘not the prelude to action; they were a substitute for it’, at least prior to the constitutional crisis of 1659.82 Notwithstanding a reduction in numbers from their peak in 1649 to 1650, that martyrrological narratives continued to be produced suggests that the King’s supporters had a keen appetite for material that would remind them of the wars, of Charles’ role within them, and of the heroic deeds of their fellow Royalists.

However, presenting Charles and his actions in this generally sympathetic light did pose Royalists with a quandary: if Charles himself had acted throughout with such good intentions, why had the nation found itself in the throes of a bitter Civil War? It is to Royalist attempts to allocate responsibility for the wars, and their implications for our understanding of 1650s Royalism and public memory after 1660, that this chapter now turns.

ii. Peace and Puritanism: (Re)assigning Responsibility for the Civil Wars

Pondering in the *Eikon Basilike* ‘what ground of Justice is alledged for this War’ the King remarked that it seemed ‘rather the productions of a surfeit of peace, and wantonesse of minds, or private discontents, Ambition and Faction […] then any reall obstructions of publick Justice, or Parliamentary Priviledge’.83 That is, the very peace and prosperity of Charles I’s reign had corrupted men, causing them to seek power and advantage for themselves. They did so, however, under the ‘soft and smooth pretensions of Religion, Reformation and Liberty’, which obscured from the people their true design: their own self-interest and the destruction of both church and crown.84 ‘The Divell of Rebellion’, Charles observed, ‘doth commonly turne himselfe into an Angell of Reformation’.85 It was an

---

81 The phrase ‘Coffin of Oblivion’ can be found in Anon., *The Life and Reign of King Charles*, sig. A4r.
83 Anon., *Eikon Basilike*, p. 50.
84 Ibid., p. 223.
85 Ibid., p. 216.
understanding of the recent past that offered a direct challenge to the republics’ preferred version of events, in which responsibility for the wars lay primarily at the King’s door.

Instead, the *Eikon Basilike* attempted to shift culpability onto a group of factious men, an explanation which served both to exonerate Charles and to confine blame to a relatively small number of disaffected persons. If it was only a few factious and malicious spirits who had deliberately deceived the people, then the large number of subjects who had opposed the King could be explained away as having been misled ‘by blinde error, and outward appearances’, as Lambert Wood termed it, rather than any genuine hostility towards their monarch.\(^\text{86}\) It was this explanatory framework that formed the basis of the vast majority of Royalist histories produced during the 1650s.

Though Royalist satirists were often scathing about the republics’ efforts to frame the memory of the wars through printed histories, this did not discourage them from producing their own historical accounts that sought to reassign responsibility for recent events.\(^\text{87}\) In a short history of the wars produced in response to *Eikonoclastes*, the anonymous author argued that ‘the blessings of God, peace and plentie are often turned into wantonesse’, and reminded readers of the ‘wiles [...] that were used to seduce the people [...] still fresh in Memory’\(^\text{88}\). Similarly, for the author of the pamphlet *An apologetick for the sequestred clergie*, the Parliamentarians’ calls for reform had been merely a ‘*Trojan Hors*, which usher’d in those armed cruelties’.\(^\text{89}\) Some writers drew extensively on the *Eikon Basilike* itself, echoing not just the book’s explanatory thesis but its evidentiary material. Perhaps most notably, William Sanderson’s *A Compleat History of the Life and Raigne of King Charles*, published without licence in 1658, included large passages that had been lifted directly from the *Eikon* to support Sanderson’s conclusion that ‘too much Felicity introduced Luxury, and a Colluvies of Vices, Pride, Ambition, Contempt of things divine and humane, whence
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\(^\text{87}\) Much of this hostility was directed at the works of Thomas May. A satirical will from 1650 bequeathed May ‘Five shillings; I intended him more, but all that have read his *History of Parliament* thinke Five shillings too much’. See Anon., *The Earle of Pembroke’s last speech* (London, 1650; Thomason / E.593[16]), p. 3. For further examples see *The Man in the Moon*, no. 57, May 5 June 1650 (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / E.602[24]), p. 427; Anon., *Paul’s Church-yard. Libri theologici, politici, historici, nundinus Paulinis (uni cum templo) prostant venales* (Unknown, [1651]; Thomason / E.637[15]), sig. A2v.

\(^\text{88}\) Anon., *Eikon aklastos: The image unbroaken: a perspective of the impudence, falshood, vanitie, and prophansse, published in a libell entitled Eikonoklastee* (Unknown, 1651; Wing / J451), pp. 156, 57.

\(^\text{89}\) Anon., *An apologetick for the sequestred clergie of the Church of England. Disclaiming and detesting the late unnatural, presumptuous, unparallel’d and antichristian proceedings, against the honor and life of the best of Kings, our most dear and dread sovereign Lord and King, St Charls the martyr* (Unknown, [1649]; Thomason / E.554[7]), p. 6.
proceeded mutual Emulation and Envy, and to trample under foot Religion, Laws, and Sovereignty and all'.

However, unlike the *Eikon Basilike*, which, as David Loewenstein has noted, was relatively vague about the identity of the faction that bore responsibility, many Royalist writers were far more explicit about precisely whom they believed was to blame: the puritans.\(^\text{91}\) In his history of the Civil Wars published in 1658, Peter Heylyn concurred with the assessment that faction seemed ‘for some years to have been raked up in the ashes of contentment’.\(^\text{92}\) However, he also went on to argue that it was ‘the Puritans of both Nations’, specifically, who, ‘working themselves […] into a Body’ had joined together and plotted to levy a war against the King.\(^\text{93}\) A ghostly dialogue published in 1659 made much the same point, though rather more pithily, when it had the spectre of Charles I declare that it was the puritans who had ‘sought all means to work me Ill and Mischief’.\(^\text{94}\) Meanwhile, in the index to the 1653 publication *Cabala*, puritans were referenced as ‘Puritaines, see Allegiance, haters of Government, begun in Parliaments, fall upon the Councellours of State, willing to clip the King’.\(^\text{95}\) Here, it was the perceived role of the godly as the authors of civil conflict, rather than as extra-zealous Protestants, that was integral to the very definition of the term.

In Royalist accounts, puritanism was reduced to little more than a cloak for evil designs against the King and established church, a mere religious vizard that masked a longstanding plot to subvert the monarchy and seize power for malicious ends. Or, as the anonymous tract *Vox Veritatis* put it, this sect were the ‘Jesuits of our Age, who under an hipocritical shew of Religion, and feigned holinesse, deceive many honest and conscientious soules […] to satisfie their Pride, Ambition, and Revenge, and quench their thirstie, and bloody Consciences with Innocent Blood, which doth still crie for more blood’.\(^\text{96}\)

Though some authors made efforts to distinguish between different forms of puritanism, and particularly Presbyterianism and Independency, they generally concluded that both these groups were to blame. As one edition of *Mercurius Pragmaticus* put it ‘what the Independent

\(^{90}\) Sanderson, *A Compleat History of the Life and Raigne of King Charles*, p. 299.


\(^{92}\) [Heylyn], *A Short View*, p. 57.

\(^{93}\) Ibid., p. 66.

\(^{94}\) Adam Wood, *A new conference between the ghosts of King Charles and Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1659; Thomason / E.988[28]), p. 4.


\(^{96}\) Anon., *Vox veritatis* (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / E.616[6]), p. 3.
does or loves / The Presbyterian by no means approves: / Yet hand in hand accursedly they went / To Ruine Church, King, Lawes and Government’. Given the number of Presbyterians who opposed the regicide and the prominence of Presbyterian opponents such as Christopher Love during the early years of the Commonwealth, this may seem somewhat surprising. Yet just as after the Restoration, when Presbyterian Royalists were ‘less a conundrum for sanctioned histories and more a contradiction’, so the Royalist print of the 1650s made little effort to absolve the Presbyterians of blame, a decision which undoubtedly made their exclusion from the ranks of the King’s loyal supporters after 1660 significantly easier.

Equally notable is the distinct lack of Presbyterian-Royalist narratives of the wars produced during this period. Many Presbyterians argued that they had fought ‘against the forces of the King, but never against the person of the King’, a cause which they believed had subsequently been betrayed by the army and the Independents. Nevertheless, they deployed this narrative largely in defence of specific political points, such as the validity of the Covenant and the invalidity of the Engagement. They did not make efforts to frame public memory of the wars on the same scale as Anglican Royalists. The closest the Presbyterian Royalists came to producing their own history of the wars during the republican period was the second part of Clement Walker’s *Anarchia Anglicana*, published in 1649, and even this text was limited to a discussion of the political machinations of the previous year. One possible explanation for this dearth of material is the obvious difficulty that their previous engagement against the King posed for Presbyterian writers, particularly since they were generally unwilling to disown entirely the cause for which they had fought. In this context, to remember the wars would be to remember the reasons why they had taken up arms against their sovereign and their military victories against him, memories that were perhaps better left forgotten by those who had now come to favour the return of Charles Stuart.
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97 *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 28 August–4 September 1649, sig. A3v. For other accounts that distinguished between the Independents and the Presbyterians but ultimately held both responsible for the wars and the regicide see Anon., *The Scotch Souldiers Lamentation*, p. 15; Anon., *The rebels looking-glasse: or, The traytors doome. Wherein is discovered the judgements of God upon the rebels and traytors in all ages: collected out of several histories both sacred & profane* (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.554[23]), sig. A2r; Anon., *The princely pelican*, p. 34; Leslie, *The martyrdome of King Charles*, pp. 20-21.

98 Neufeld, *The Civil Wars after 1660*, p. 36.

99 [Christopher Love], *A Modest and Clear Vindication of the serious representation, and late vindication of the ministers of London, from the scandalous aspersions of John Price, in a pamphlet of his, entituled, Clerico-classicum or, The clergies alarum to a third war* (London, 1649; Thomason / E.549[10]), p. 13.

100 Theodorus Verax [Clement Walker], *Anarchia Anglicana: or The history of independency. Being a continuation of relations and observations historical and politick upon this present Parliament* (Unknown, 1649; Wing (2nd ed.) / W316).
Indeed, Royalist historians often declared that it was the Scottish Presbyterians who bore responsibility for first initiating the rebellion. In these accounts, it was the Scots’ actions against Charles I in the late 1630s, and particularly during the Bishops’ Wars, that had produced the spark that enflamed both the Presbyterians and the Independents south of the border. As Heylyn wrote, ‘the fire breaking out in Scotland, it was no marvel if it had laid hold in England also’. The former bishop Henry Leslie argued that the ‘religion wherein most of them [i.e. the Scots] were brought up’ had caused this nation to act ‘many more parts than Judas did: for they were the first that tooke armes against him […] and by their example and Covenant, encouraged their Brethren in England to doe the like’. L’Estrange, meanwhile, concurred that England had been ‘disciplined by Presbyterian emissaries, and resolved to fashion herself to the Scots’ h designes’. When combined with their harsh descriptions of the Scots’ dealings with the King in 1646, Royalist narratives were scarcely more charitable to their northern neighbours than their republican counterparts. In this respect republican and Royalist memories shared a kinship, one grounded in a longstanding English prejudice against the Scottish nation.

The only exception to this general antipathy towards the Scots in the Royalist press of the period came in the months between May 1650 and September 1651, when Charles II formed an alliance with the Scottish Covenanters. In this transformed political context, Royalist authors made some efforts to forget the Scots’ previous wartime disloyalties and to fashion their new northern allies as faithful supporters of the King’s cause. But even these valiant attempts at positivity often became infused with suspicions and hostilities born of the experiences of the 1640s. Though one image of Charles II from 1651 was apparently inscribed with the words ‘King of England […] Nowe in the head of gallant and numerous

101 [Heylyn], A Short View, p. 66.
102 Leslie, The martyrdom of King Charles, pp. 23-24.
103 [Hamon L'Estrange], The reign of King Charles I: An History, Disposed into Annals (London, 1656; Wing / L1190), p. 187 [mispaginated, actually p. 192]. It is worth noting that the first edition of L’Estrange’s text, unlike the vast majority of works referenced in this section, was licensed. This may have been precisely because it dealt primarily with the period of the Bishops’ Wars and ended with the execution of Strafford in 1641. Thus, though L’Estrange inserted subtle insinuations about the causes of the Civil Wars into his text, he did not cover the outbreak of war itself. There is some tentative evidence that this work was not entirely well-received after its publication. A second instalment covering the period of the wars themselves, though promised by L’Estrange, was never produced, and few months after The reign of King Charles was granted a licence a man named ‘Hammons le Strange’ appeared in a list of people apprehended as prisoners, to be released on payment of a bond, in the state papers. Though the nature of the offence is not specified it seems likely that the man was L’Estrange; his arrest may have been linked to the contents of his history, which was perhaps more concerned with the causes of the wars then its narrow time frame may have led the authorities to expect. CSPD, ci, p. 367; G. E. Briscoe Eyre (ed.), A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers, 1640-1708, 3 vols (London: The Stationers’ Company, 1913), i. p. 485.
army of valliant and faithfull Scottes’, more typical was the rhyme that appeared in a 1650 edition of *Mercurius Pragmaticus*:

*The Scots are all one hue,*

*To make our English Rebells bow,*

*They’ll shew themselves true-blew.*

*The Jockeyes will bee stayn’d no more,*

*Now Treason they defye!*  

*They’ave vow’d in Traytors Crimson-Goare*  

*They’ll their Blew-Bonnets dye.*

In this verse, any attempt to praise the Scots’ armed resistance against the Commonwealth was marred by the phrase ‘stayn’d no more’, a line which clearly referenced the Scots’ previous wartime disloyalty, rendering its commendatory tone lukewarm at best.

Not all writings that proffered a Royalist account of the causes of the wars were necessarily as overt as the examples discussed thus far. Though, as we have seen, some of the King’s supporters did publish material that sought to enshrine a distinctly Royalist version of wartime events in public memory, the strictures of censorship legislation meant that others chose to produce texts that dealt with these themes rather less explicitly. Perhaps most obviously, in the context of the cult of Charles the martyr and the comparisons drawn between Christ and the King, texts that relayed the passion of Christ could be deployed with an eye to their political as well as their religious significance. For example, in 1653, the Royalist publisher Richard Royston chose to reprint a collection of four sermons, including one that dealt with the Passion, and it seems probable that he had deliberately selected these orations for their political connotations, and framed them accordingly. The collection was published under the title *The grand conspiracy of the Jewes against their King*, a choice of words that echoed the Royalist interpretation of the wars as a plot against Charles I, and the sermon on the persecution and suffering of Christ frequently referred to Jesus as ‘the King’, a

---

signifier that had two potential referents: Christ, King of the Jews, but also Charles I, King of England.106

Also at the less explicit end of the spectrum were allegorical writings, in which stories and characters that bore no intrinsic relation to recent events were used to subtly convey a particular interpretation of the Civil Wars. For example, a history of Wat Tyler’s 1381 rebellion, subsequently attributed to John Cleveland but published anonymously in 1654, provided a narrative of the fourteenth-century revolt that had clear parallels with the Royalists’ preferred understanding of contemporary events. Discussing the causes of the revolt, Cleveland concluded that though ‘the title of the Rebellion spoke fair’ this had merely been a cloak for the self-interest of its leadership, much as religion and liberty had furnished the puritan faction with a suitable pretence for their own subversion of the state.107 Such similarities were made all the more overt by Cleveland’s use of descriptors more commonly associated with the divisions of the Civil Wars to delineate various fourteenth-century parties. Tyler’s rebels, for example, were referred to as the ‘Common-wealthsmen’, while the King’s supporters were described in some places as ‘Cavaliers’.108

Similarly, the second part of Dodona’s Grove, written by James Howell and published in 1650, provided an allegorical history of England during the early 1640s.109 Though the fact this book was licensed makes it tempting to dismiss this text as part of Howell’s apparent accommodation with the republican state, its contents, including the parables Howell embedded within it (adapted and extended from the 1644 text Parables Reflecting on the Times) were distinctly Royalist in tone.110 The text traced the history of the fictional country of Druina [i.e. England], with each of the main parties and figures represented by a different

106 Anon., The grand conspiracy of Jewes against their King (London, 1653; Thomason / E.1524[1]), pp. 47-93.
107 [John Cleveland], The idol of the clowmes, or, Insurrection of Wat the Tyler with his priests Baul and Straw together with his fellow kings of the commons against the English church, the king, the laws, nobility and royal family and gentry, in the fourth year of K. Richard the 2d, an. 1381 (London, 1654; Wing / C4673), sig. A4r. For another example of an allegorical text that concerned itself with the causes of the Civil Wars see Anon., Panthalia: or The royal romance. A discourse stored with infinite variety in relation to state-government and passages of matchless affection gracefully interveined, and presented on a theatre of tragical and comical state, in a successive continuation to these times (London, 1659; Thomason / E. 1797[1]), pp. 173-178.
108 [Cleveland], The idol of the clowmes, pp. 6, 69.
109 The first part of Dodona’s Grove, published in 1640, dealt with the period from 1603-1640. At the end of the second part, Howell expressed his intention that 'Dodona next shall trembling tell / What a sad period Him befell / How to mankinds eternall wonder / His trunk from top was cleft asunder’, but this third part of the series was never produced. See James Howell, Dendrologia Dodonae’s grove, or, The vocall forest (London, 1650; Wing / H3062), p. 287.
kind of plant or tree. Accounting for Druina’s descent into civil conflict, Howell called on his readers to ‘behold that fatall faction which was so long hatching twixt the Basilean and Classican’, the latter of which ‘by way of Reformation, would have a new government introduc’d’. It was these cunning Classicans who, under the guise of ‘imaginary feares, doubts and ombrages’, sought to destroy the ruling order and bring about their own designs, a plot that ultimately culminated in a war between the Senat [Parliament] and the Oke [Charles I].

In spite of Howell’s confidence that his reader would be ‘no blockhead’, the extent to which contemporaries perceived the significance of Howell’s often complex allegorical references is hard to judge. Nevertheless, there is at least some evidence which suggests that they were not entirely wasted on their audience. Several surviving copies of the 1650 text contain what appear to be contemporary annotations, equating the allegorical trees with the relevant Civil War figures and parties. Also noteworthy, for our purposes at least, is the fact that one of these readers chose to translate the potentially ambiguous ‘Classicans’ directly as ‘Puritans’ – as opposed to Parliamentarians, Roundheads, or rebels, all of which would sit equally well with the thrust of the text. This provides tentative evidence that the readers of these works appreciated, and perhaps even shared, the notion of a specifically puritan culpability that dominated Royalist histories.

When viewed in this light, several texts that at first glance appear to be straightforward translations of European histories can also plausibly be read as subtle efforts to convey a distinctly Royalist understanding of Britain’s recent past. The early 1650s saw the publication of a series of translations of European histories, of which no fewer than four concerned the rebellion of the Protestants in the Low Countries against the Spanish monarchy: Robert Stapleton’s translation of Famiano Strada’s history of the Dutch Revolt, De Bello Belgico (1650) and Henry Carey’s translations of Guido Bentivoglio, published as Historicall Relations of the United Provinces (1652), The History of the Warres of Flanders (1654), and

111 Howell, Dodona’s Grove, pp. 103-104 [mispaginated, actually 203-4].
112 Ibid., p. 148.
113 Ibid., p. 4.
114 In both cases the identity of the original annotator is not known, but the handwriting suggests the notes were made by a contemporary. I am indebted to Nicola Whitehead and Owen McKnight for drawing these copies of the text to my attention. See Oxford, Jesus College Library, I Arch.1.49 and the copy of Dodona’s Grove held at Princeton, Princeton University Library in the Robert H. Taylor Collection of English and American Literature, Departments of Rare Books and Special Collections. For a manuscript key to the 1640 text see BL Add MS 78429 f. 9.
115 I Arch.1.49, p. 251.
The Compleat History of the Warres of Flanders (a second edition of The History, also published in 1654). All of these texts were published by the Royalist publisher Humphrey Moseley, and all provided narratives that chimed with Royalist attempts to explain the source of Britain’s own domestic troubles.

In Royalist histories of the Dutch revolt, authors traced the roots of rebellion on the continent to a self-interested Protestant faction, which, masquerading under the banners of religion and liberty, had led the people into civil conflict. Thus, Bentivoglio/Carey argued that rebellion in the Netherlands had spread from France, where it had been ‘openly fomented’ by the Huguenots, who had then proceeded ‘by a thousand false pretensions to turn Religion into Faction’. According to Strada/Stapleton there was nothing ‘so pernicious to Monarchy’ as Calvinism, which had taught the people ‘to contest with their Prince, and to dissent from him, not only with impunity but with advantage’. Though the religious factions held responsible for inciting rebellion were the Huguenots and the Calvinists, rather than the puritans, these were explanations that bore striking similarities to Royalist accounts of the British Civil Wars.

Further, the introductory material attached to some of the English translations actively encouraged readers to draw out the parallels between the Dutch and English rebellions. In the preface to The Compleat History, the Stationer’s note commented that ‘Whosoever shall consider the successes of this Warr […] shall be compell’d to confess, that never any afforded more matter of humane instruction’. Even more explicit was Carey’s claim that the war entailed ‘all the Mischifes that can be done by Fire or Sword: Many of which, we in the Dominions of England, Scotland, and Ireland have of Late too Sadly experienced’. In both cases, readers were encouraged to dwell on the pedagogic qualities of these texts in light


118 Strada, *De Bello Belgico*, p. 32. For discussion of the relationship between Protestant resistance theory and Royalist propaganda and a lengthier exposition of these histories generally see Whitehead, ‘The Publisher Humphrey Moseley’, pp. 162-190.


of England’s recent troubles. The potential for such comparisons was probably all the more obvious to contemporaries because drawing explicit parallels between the Dutch and English rebels was not unusual in Royalist propaganda more generally. For example, the pamphlet *A briefe description of the two revolted nations Holland and England* (1650) was dedicated to emphasising the – unfavourable – similarities between the two countries. This included several vivid descriptions of alleged atrocities committed by the Dutch rebels, including the removal of an opponent’s beating heart which was then ripped to shreds with bare teeth, and the claim that the Parliamentarians had ‘out gone them [i.e. the Dutch] in cruelties’, citing the ‘massacring’ of Colonel Stanhope and the deaths of Lucas and Lisle, amongst others, as evidence.\(^\text{121}\)

The sheer consistency with which Royalist print material of the 1650s presented the Civil Wars as the result of a devious plot fomented by a self-interested puritan faction had significant implications for the Restoration settlement, as well as shaping the nature of public memory after 1660 more broadly. Though initially the Restoration government attempted to engender reconciliation with their former enemies, the election of the Cavalier Parliament in 1661 marked the beginning of a period of increasing persecution and exclusion. While not explicitly overturning the acts of the Convention Parliament, this assembly nevertheless rejected its reconciliatory impulse, and instead passed many measures that sought to bar puritan-minded men from civil and ecclesiastical affairs.\(^\text{122}\) To justify such exclusions, Matthew Neufeld has argued that ‘at this time the foundational explanatory narrative of a longstanding puritan conspiracy against the Church and state […] emerged as part of the ideological case for the exclusive settlements’, and that it was this narrative which dominated public memory for the next fifteen years.\(^\text{123}\)

Yet, as the study of Royalist material in this section has shown, an account of the recent past that held the puritans primarily responsible for the outbreak of war was, in fact, well established in Royalist print long before the first glimmers of the Restoration. Furthermore, it

---

\(^{121}\) Anon., *A briefe description of the two revolted nations Holland and England. Against their true and lawfull Kings, lawes, and statutes, to the dishonour of God, and the losse of their owne soules for ever* (London, 1650; Thomason / E.597[6]), p. 3.

\(^{122}\) The Conventicle Acts (1664 and 1670) and the Five Mile Act (1665) were all aimed at constraining puritans from authority and punishing those who refused to conform to the established church.

seems highly likely that the Cavalier Parliament’s desire to exclude these groups from the Restoration settlement was itself predicated, at least in part, on the consistency with which Royalists had fostered and entrenched this distinct strand of public memory throughout the 1640s and 1650s.\(^{124}\) That is, if the Royalist writers of the 1650s had not relentlessly advanced a narrative of the wars that held a puritan faction primarily to blame, it is questionable whether the Royalists of the early 1660s would have displayed such unanimous agreement that this was in fact where culpability lay. The ‘state sanctioned’ public memory of the wars which Neufeld identifies as emerging in the 1660s did not appear fully formed as a response to the Restoration settlement, but rather owed its origins, along with the settlement itself, to the Royalist memory culture of the 1650s. In this context, to study Civil War memory exclusively from the standpoint of the Restoration not only obscures those currents of memory that did not endure post-1660; it impoverishes our understanding of public memory after the Restoration too. For if, in fact, the ‘state sanctioned’ public memory that emerged after 1660 owed much to Royalist memories that were inculcated during the 1650s, then it is clearly not best understood as a solely pragmatic response to the conditions of the early 1660s. Rather, the shape of Restoration public memory owed a significant debt to the Royalist memories that had been propagated during the previous ten years, memories that were themselves the product of diverse influences, not least rival republican scripts.

Nevertheless, the prevalence of an overarching explanatory narrative both before and after the Restoration should not blind us to some of the other variations that existed within Royalist memory. We have already noted some disparity in the extent to which Royalists were willing to criticise the actions of Charles I, in Royalist attitudes towards the Scots (especially between 1650 and 1651), and in the prominence which writers occasionally gave to the King’s Catholic supporters. Also striking, however, are some of the differing interpretations of the actions of Archbishop Laud in the period leading up to the outbreak of war, variations that reflect disagreements among Royalists over what constituted the true Anglican church more generally.\(^{125}\) In his history, *The reign of King Charles I* (1656),

\(^{124}\) Evidence that the idea of a puritan plot existed prior to 1649 can be found in Anon., *The case of the King stated, from the very beginning of the warre to this present day* (Unknown, 1647; Thomason / E.416[5]). See also David Cressy, ‘Remembrances of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographies of the 1640s’, in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 257-268.

Hamon L’Estrange provided a lengthy discussion of the religious policy of the 1630s in which he argued that Laud’s excessive zeal had caused the King to make some unwise decisions. Though broadly supportive of the desire to ensure religious conformity, without which ‘Schisme will flow apace’, L’Estrange was dismissive of many of the specific policies of the period, not least the relocation of communion tables and the introduction of the Book of Common Prayer into Scotland, actions which he held to be ‘anomalous, innovations and so severely urged’. For L’Estrange these acts, pushed on the King by an archbishop who was ‘too full of fire’, had only served to further inflame the unrest generated by the puritans, thus contributing to the slide into Civil War.

L’Estrange’s text prompted a hostile response from fellow Royalist Peter Heylyn, who, unlike L’Estrange was a staunch supporter of Laudianism. In his reply to L’Estrange, Heylyn sought to defend Laud on two fronts. First, he denied that the religious reforms of the 1630s were the ‘Anomalous Innovations’ that L’Estrange painted them to be. Second, he emphasised the extent to which Charles had supported these policies, rejecting the claim that they had been thrust upon the King by an overreaching archbishop. In a later text, the Bibliotheca Regia (1659), Heylyn was equally keen to display Charles’ support for the Laudian church. Though in theory the Bibliotheca was simply a compilation of the King’s writings, Anthony Milton has rightly argued that Heylyn’s choice of texts owed much to his pro-Laudian religious agenda. For example, he included among the King’s key writings all the canons from the 1640 convocation, which had sought to legitimise Laud’s ecclesiastical reforms and included the highly contentious ‘etcetera oath’, while a one hundred-page section containing Charles’ statements on the Church of England reads as an annotated documentary of the King’s Laudianism. Heylyn’s spat with L’Estrange was not the only time his religious
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126 [L’Estrange], *The reign of King Charles*, pp. 137-146.
127 Ibid., pp. 143, 144.
128 Ibid., p. 189.
130 [Heylyn], *Observations*, pp. 132-143, 174.
131 [Peter Heylyn], *Bibliotheca regia*, or, *The royal library containing a collection of such of the papers of His late Maiesty King Charls, the second monarch of Great Britain, as have escaped the wrack and ruines of these times, not extent in the Reliquiae Carolinae, or, the exact collection of Edward Husbands* (London, 1659; Wing H1684).
opinions led him into heated public debate with other Royalists. Heylyn also took issue with the portrayal of Laud in both William Sanderson’s and Thomas Fuller’s histories.\textsuperscript{133}

Remembering the events that led up the Civil Wars could be about more than just reaffirming the justness of the Royalist cause and the evils of the republican government; it could also serve as an intervention in debates about the nature of Royalism itself. Authors were keenly aware that the memory of past events could have significant implications for contemporary attitudes to both church and state, and, as a result, they perceived the need to counter not just republican scripts but also those texts that propagated an alternative vision of Royalism.

Thus, though some Royalists clearly did retreat into retirement or reconcile themselves to the republican regimes, others actively attempted to memorialise a particular interpretation of the Civil Wars in printed material, sometimes overtly but on other occasions less so. Particularly consistent were Royalist accounts of the causes of the wars in which blame was assigned to a malicious puritan faction, an allocation of responsibility that countered republican scripts, and also had some important implications for public memory and the political settlement after 1660. Nevertheless, in spite of this element of consistency, Royalist memories of the wars were not entirely homogenous, and could be deployed against fellow Royalists as well as their republican rivals. The memory wars of the 1650s were not simply a battle between the republics and Royalism, but a war fought on many fronts between diverse competing visions of the past, present, and future. These alternative visions did not stem solely from those who supported the King, and it is to the challenges posed by some of republics’ other opponents that we will now turn.

iii. ‘Toil, treasure, and blood’: The Wars in Radical Rhetoric

Though it was the Royalists who made the most sustained and consistent attempts to contest the public memory of the Civil Wars they were not the governments’ only opponents, or the only group to deploy rival memories of the wars in printed material. After the regicide and throughout the 1650s, successive regimes faced stiff opposition from various factions that, though once sympathetic to the Parliamentarian cause, were now among the republics’ fiercest critics. This section focuses on two traditions of radical opposition – the Levellers

\textsuperscript{133} Peter Heylyn, \textit{Respondet Petrus: or, The answer of Peter Heylyn D.D. to so much of Dr. Bernard’s book} (London, 1658; Thomason / E.938[4]); Peter Heylyn, \textit{Examen historicum, or, A discovery and examination of the mistakes, falsities and defects in some modern historics} (London, 1659; Wing / H1707).
and the ‘good old cause’ – and demonstrates that memories of the wars formed a central part of their critiques of the regimes of the 1650s.\footnote{The validity of the term ‘radical’ to characterise the political and religious thought of the seventeenth century is controversial. Nevertheless, it has some utility, if only as a collective noun for a wide range of disparate opposition groups. For a recent defence of the term in the early modern context see Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan, ‘Introduction: Reappraising Early Modern Radicals and Radicalisms’, in Varieties of Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context, ed. by Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), pp. 1-22. I have chosen to focus on the Levellers and the ‘good old cause’ partially for their temporal span, but also because memories of the wars were particularly prominent in their rhetoric. There is clearly scope for further analysis of the uses of war memory by other radical groups during the 1650s, not least the Quakers, and, while I gesture to this here, it is beyond the scope of a study of this length to analyse the print material of every sect and faction in depth.}

In the years between 1647 and 1650 one of the greatest threats to the Commonwealth’s security came not from the Royalists, but from a group which had links to many of the Parliamentarians own supporters, and particularly the rank and file of the New Model Army: the Levellers. It is difficult to delineate precisely what constitutes a Leveller text for, as Rachel Foxley has argued, ‘none of the attempts in the literature to slice a clean line between one set of texts and people and another (whether those are ‘Leveller’, ‘Independent’ or ‘army’) is entirely convincing’.\footnote{Rachel Foxley, The Levellers: Radical Political Thought in the English Revolution (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 153.} Nevertheless, in this thesis, a work is considered to be a Leveller tract if it was written by any of the four main individuals usually associated with leadership of the movement – John Lilburne, William Walwyn, Richard Overton, and Thomas Prince – or by army radicals and their sympathisers who espoused similar political goals, particularly the New Model mutineers of 1649. The most prominent and consistent of these aims were: the desire for a new constitutional settlement founded on a representative and regularly elected parliament, as outlined in the Agreements of the People; various reforms that would eradicate arbitrary power and the persistence of differentiated privileges in the legal system; toleration in religion; the abolition of tithes and monopolies; the abolition of a professional standing army and an end to the compulsory impressment of soldiers; and the preservation of rights and liberties as enshrined in the Petition of Right and Magna Carta.\footnote{Henry N. Brailsford, The Levellers and the English Revolution (London: The Cresset Press, 1961), pp. 523-532.} Leveller agitation had commenced as early as 1646, but it began to gain real traction in the army during the Putney debates of 1647, when the rank and file debated the principles of political settlement with their officers on the basis of two radical papers: The Case of the Army Truly Stated and The First Agreement of the People.\footnote{Foxley, The Levellers, p. 12. Anon., The Case of the armie truly stated together with the mischieves and dangers that are imminent, and some suitable remedies, humbly proposed by the agents of five regiments of}
attempt to establish a settlement which would unite the interests of soldiers with civilian Leveller demands. Though Leveller and army radicalism cannot simply be conflated, as Foxley has amply demonstrated, in 1649 the concerns of the Levellers and many army radicals fused once again, leading to a series of tracts that expressed common grievances. Most significant was the accusation that the new Commonwealth regime was tyrannous and had failed to deliver to the people the cause for which they had fought, a claim that was clearly predicated on a very particular understanding of the Civil Wars themselves.

Though the Leveller leaders had been relatively quiet during the early part of 1649, perhaps waiting for the direction of the new government to emerge, they returned with a vengeance at the end of February with the publication of the first part of John Lilburne’s explosive tract *England’s New Chains Discovered*. In this pamphlet, Lilburne fiercely attacked the direction of the new Commonwealth regime and condemned the Parliament’s handling and removal of the King. The crux of his complaint was that the Commonwealth’s leaders had deserted the rights and liberties for which the Civil Wars had originally been fought, usurping power for themselves and establishing a government that was scarcely less tyrannical than that which they had removed. Most significantly, the new Commonwealth had failed to call new elections, established a new arbitrary court in the form of the High Court of Justice, and sought to impress soldiers into service against their will, contrary to the *Agreements of the People*. Lilburne roundly condemned all those specious pretenses, and high Notions of Liberty, with those extraordinary courses that have of late bin taken (as if of necessity for liberty, and which indeed can never be justified, but deserve the greatest punishments, unless they end in just liberty, and an equal Government) appear to us to have bin done and directed by some secret powerful influences, the more securely and unsuspectedly to attain to an absolute domination over the Common-wealth.

Although this account of power appropriated by a malicious self-serving faction clearly bears some similarity to Royalist narratives, unlike the King’s supporters the Levellers broadly subscribed to the government’s preferred account of the wars as a defensive act, fought for the preservation of the people’s liberties in the face of the tyrannical actions of Charles I. Where
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*horse, to their respective regiments, and the whole army* (London, 1647; Wing / W2168); Anon., *An agreement of the people for a firme and present peace, upon grounds of common-right and freedome; as it was proposed by the agents of the five regiments of horse; and since by the generall approbation of the Army, offered to the joynit concurrence of all the free commons of England* (Unknown, 1647; Thomason / E.412[21]).

139 Ibid., pp. 150-182.
140 John Lilburne, *Englands New Chains Discovered; or The serious apprehensions of a part of the people, in behalf of the Commonwealth* (Unknown, [1649]; Thomason / E.545[27]), sig. A3v.
they differed, however, was in their analysis of how far that cause had been achieved since 1646. Thus, while they did not seek to reframe public memory of the original causes of the first Civil War, they did attempt to deploy the Commonwealth’s preferred version of events against them, arguing that the (just) Parliamentarian cause had been subverted by an (unjust) faction who, masquerading under the banner of liberties, had sought to secure power for themselves. Or, as Lilburne put it, they had ‘by assuming our generally approved Principles, and hiding under the fair shew thereof their other designs’ made both the army and the people ‘unwittingly instrumental to their own and their Countries Bondage’.141

In some accounts, this process of subversion had begun as early as 1646 and had played a central role in provoking the second Civil War, a conflict which, unlike the wars of 1642 to 1646, was the result of specious double-dealing by leading Parliamentarians.142 Thomas Prince, for example, devoted a large part of his pamphlet The silken Independents snare broken to the causes of the conflicts of 1647 and 1648. He argued that ‘The last War had been prevented […] if our advice had been taken; but you [i.e. William Kiffin, and other Independents] and your Faction countenanced the breach of engagement with all sorts of people; abusing honest men, as now ye do […] by which fraudulent dealing, and extremes, a new War came to passe’.143 Such treachery had apparently only intensified in subsequent years, and, by 1649, the Levellers claimed that the rights and liberties that had been fought for during the wars were now further

141 Ibid., sig. A3v. For other Leveller accounts that propound a similar narrative of a just cause betrayed see John Lilburne, Richard Overton, and Thomas Prince, The second part of Englands new-chaines discovered: or a sad representation of the uncertain and dangerous condition of the Common-Wealth (London, 1649; Thomason / E.548[16]), pp. 1-10; [John Lilburne], The hunting of the foxes from New-Market and Triploe-Heaths to White-Hall, by five small beagles (late of the Armie) (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.548[7]), pp. 4-5; Anon., The soldiurers demand. Shewing their present misery; and prescribing a perfect remedy (Bristol, 1649; Thomason / E.555[29]), p. 9; William Bray, Innocency and the blood of the slain soldiours, and people, mightily complaining, and crying out to the Lord, and the people of the land, against those forty knights and burgesses, or thereabouts, that sit in the House of Commons (London, 1649; Thomason / E.568[12]), p. 5; John Lilburne, An impeachment of high treason against Oliver Cromwel, and his son in law Henry Ireton Esquires, late Members of the late forcibly dissolved House of Commons, presented to publique view (London, 1649; Thomason / E.568[20]), pp. 20-21; Anon., An outcry of the youngmen and apprentices of London: or, An inquisition after the lost fundamentall lawes and liberties of England (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.572[13]), pp. 2-4; Anon., The Army's martyr: or A faithful relation of the barbarous and illegall proceedings of the court-martiall at White-Hall upon Mr. Robert Lockier (London, 1649; Thomason / E.552[11]), p. 3; John Lilburne, As you were, or, The Lord General Cromwel and the grand officers of the armie their remembrancer wherein as in a glass they may see the faces of their soules spotted with apostacy, ambitious breach of promise, and hocus-pocus-juggleing with the honest soldiours and the rest of the free-people of England (Unknown, 1652; Wing / L2084), p. 12; John Lilburne, The just defence of John Lilburn, against such as charge him with turbulency of spirit (Unknown, [1653]; Thomason / E.711[10]), pp. 6-8.

142 See Lilburne et al, The second part of Englands new-chaines, p. 17; [Lilburne], The hunting of the foxes, p. 8; Lilburne, An impeachment of high treason against Oliver Cromwell, pp. 4-5, 45.

away than ever: ‘their [i.e. the people’s] burthens are greater now, then ever they were before; and that they have been made fools, in pretentiously fighting for liberty, which hath brought them into bondage’.

To reinforce this point, writers often referred to the Parliament’s own declarations from the 1640s, reminding readers of the promises that the Parliament had made during the previous decade and comparing these unfavourably with the reality of current affairs. For example, Lilburne compared his own imprisonment, without charge or trial, to the King’s attempt to bring articles of high treason against Lord Kimbolton and the five members, arguing that though the Parliament had decried the King’s actions as ‘an invasion of the peoples Liberty […] yet forty times more illegaitie [is] exercised by themselves upon me’.

This narrative of a righteous cause subverted was also deployed by those parts of the army that actively opposed the fledgling republic. During the spring of 1649, several regiments of the New Model Army rose up against their commanders, citing a combination of political and military grievances from arrears of pay and impressment to Ireland to the restriction of army petitioning, illegal courts, and extensive taxes. They called for the settlement of the Commonwealth according to the Leveller promoted Agreement of the People, and the mutineer Captain William Thompson attached a copy of the latest version of this text, produced by the Leveller leaders that May, to his declaration England’s Standard Advanced. The rebellious soldiers defended their actions by claiming that since the regicide army grandees and the government had continued to ride roughshod over the very rights and liberties they had fought to protect. A declaration by the army mutineers published in Bristol in May lamented that the ‘dissembling and hypocritall Parliament’ had ‘gull’d and deceiv’d us by their faire pretences’ and had, in reality, only served to reduce ‘the ancient Liberties of the People of England’.

Similarly, a declaration purporting to be from the apprentices of London claimed that resistance to the regime was necessary because the ‘laws, safeties, and securities of the people […] for which you [the army] pretendly took up arms against the late King and his party are now all subverted’. In Leveller rhetoric, remembering the cause the Parliament had fought for during
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146 William Thompson, Englands standard advanced in Oxfordshire, or, A declaration from Mr. Wil. Thompson, and the oppressed people of this nation, now under his conduct in the said county (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.555[7]).
147 Anon., The Souldiers demand, p. 1.
148 Anon., An outcry of the youngmen and apprentices of London, p. 1-2. Brailsford states that this tract was ‘manifestly’ written by John Lilburne, but he does not elaborate on why he believes this attribution is obvious. See Brailsford, The Levellers and the English Revolution, p. 563.
the wars was a necessary preamble to their favoured narrative of betrayal. Resistance was predicated not only on the illegality of the Commonwealth’s actions, but on the grounds that they had failed to deliver those reforms that they had purported to support.

Leveller writers also sought to remind readers of the various hardships and sufferings that the people had endured in the pursuit of this (betrayed) cause. To this end, tracts often included reminders of the ‘the vast expence of blood and treasure that hath been made to purchase those freedoms’, the magnitude of this wartime sacrifice serving as an implicit legitimisation of the Leveller’s demands. These memories of sufferings could be either general or more specific. An example of the former can be found in *England’s New Chains*, in which Lilburne exhorted his readers to consider what rackings and tortures the People in general have suffered through decay of Trade, and deernesse of food, and very many families in particular, through Free-quarter, Violence, and other miseries, incident to warre, having nothing to support them therein, but hopes of Freedom, and a well-settled Common-wealth in the end.

Here, the hardships evoked are non-specific and generalised, a technique that presumably relied on readers having their own, distinct, wartime memories that would conform to this broad-brush picture. By contrast, other Leveller-inspired declarations often evoked memories of the authors’ own particular wartime experiences in an effort to justify their demands. In February 1650, a declaration by ‘divers of the Inhabitants of the County of Hartford’ outlined a series of typically Leveller grievances, and affirmed that they would ‘be glad to injoy what these mens [i.e. the Levellers] declared Principles hold forth’. They prefaced these demands with a summary of the hardships they had endured in order to free the nation from tyranny, from the loss of money and men to the challenges of suppressing the risings in Kent and Essex, and concluded that their requests were ‘but a small requital for our service and expens’.

Similarly, the soldiers of Colonel Scrope’s regiment defended their resistance against the army leadership on the grounds they had fought only for the removal of tyranny in England, ‘in the prosecution of which Engagement, many of our dear Fellow Souldiers have lost their Lives;
and many amongst us have received many Wounds, and all of us have adventured our Lives, and undergone much hardship.\textsuperscript{153}

Evocations of the aims and sufferings of the wars were often accompanied by a very particular account of divine providence. As we have seen in the preceding chapter, the belief that the Parliament’s military victories were a sign of God’s favour presented the republican regimes with a dilemma, torn between the theological necessity of commemorating deliverances and the reconciliatory utility of forgetting them. This picture was further complicated by the Leveller’s co-option of the language of providence for their own ends. For Lilburne and his allies, Parliament’s successes in the wars were not a sign of God’s support for the Parliament itself, but evidence of His approbation for their own particular understanding of the Parliamentarian cause – ‘the many eminent and even miraculous Victories God hath been pleased to honour our just Cause withall’, as Lilburne phrased it.\textsuperscript{154}

The significance of the Leveller’s interpretation was twofold. First, it furnished their sympathisers with a clear imperative to act. For just as the republic and its supporters believed that God’s military favour had legitimated the state, so, by these lights, they legitimated Leveller goals. As Lilburne wrote in his 1649 tract, \textit{A Manifestation}

when so much has been done for recovery of our Liberties, and seeing God hath so blest that which has been done, as thereby to cleer the way, and to afford an opportunity which these 600 years has been desired, but could never be attained, of making this a truly happy and wholly Free Nation; We think our selves bound by the greatest obligations that may be, to prevent the neglect of this opportunity.\textsuperscript{155}

The Commonwealth’s betrayal of the cause, then, was more than just a betrayal of the people and of the principles for which they had fought – it was also a betrayal of God’s purpose itself. Second, if God had indeed supported the Parliamentarian army only to further a particular cause, then there was an onus on the soldiers to ensure that it was fulfilled. Failure to do so rendered the deaths that they had inflicted during the Civil Wars little more than murder. According to Lilburne, it was only the preservation of ‘fundamental laws and liberties’ that

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{153} Anon., \textit{The Resolutions of the private soouldiery of Col. Scroops regiment of horse (now quartering at and neer unto Salisbury) concerning their present expedition for the service of Ireland.} (Unknown, [1649]; Thomason / 669.f.14[28]), n.p.
\end{flushleft}
elevated the army beyond being ‘real and wilful murderers, of all those persons they have slain in the late civil wars’.  

Tracts aimed primarily at an army readership presented the latter argument particularly forcefully. Consequently, what appear on the surface to be general discussions of the sins of wartime killing would probably have been read as highly charged calls for soldiers to remember, and consider the implications of, their own actions. For example, in a pamphlet ‘to be read by every honest Officer to his Souldiers; and by the Souldiers, one to another’, the anonymous author (possibly William Walwyn) reminded readers that it was only ‘those just ends, the rights and liberties of the people, that […] can acquit you from being murtherers in all you have done […] nor can you escape his [God’s] heavy Judgments, except you persevere and go on to those just ends’.  

It was a message that was clearly imbibed by the New Model mutineers, who in one declaration asked how they were ‘to answer these pestilent acts of ours, at the dreadfull bar of Gods divine justice?’, given the notable absence of the rights and liberties for which they believed they had fought.

Ultimately, the Leveller movement was unsuccessful. The army mutinies of the spring of 1649 were brutally suppressed at Burford in May of that year, and despite further uprisings during the autumn their lack of co-ordination and relatively small numbers meant that they were easily crushed. Lilburne and his collaborators were arrested following the publication of The Second Part of England’s New Chains in March 1649, and they spent much of the early 1650s in prison. Though Lilburne continued to write and publish until his death in 1657, Leveller tracts were at their peak between 1649 and 1652. This was not, however, the last, time that memories of the Civil Wars were used to undergird critiques of the regimes of the 1650s.

In 1654, many of the same rhetorical techniques were deployed by writers who opposed the Instrument of Government. For example, the anonymous authors of the pamphlet Some mementos for the officers and souldiers of the Army made familiar requests for their soldier audience to ‘Remember what your Cause hath been and is, for which you have spilt so much blood, and spent so much treasure, and suffered so much hardship, and lost so many of your
dear friends lives’. Further, they reminded soldiers that failure to fulfil this cause would be to ‘take the guilt of shedding the blood of a hundred thousand men unlawfully, upon your own head’ and to ‘slight all the eminent appearances of God for you in your battels for that cause’. The ‘cause’ in question, however, was not the protection of the people’s rights and liberties as articulated in the Agreements of the People, but a more limited demand for the maintenance of free parliaments and opposition to the engrossment of military power under a sole figure, in this case the Lord Protector.

Similarly, during the crown debates of 1657, Samuel Chidley, a firm opponent of the proposed kingship, utilised memories of the wars to reinforce his belief that Cromwell should decline. He emphasised that during the wars God ‘never wrought more powerfully […] then when the Parliaments Commissions were most effectual against the King […] And the Kingly Office being utterly abolished with the house of Lords as useless and burthensome, God went on with his mercies, crowning this Commonwealth with many Victories’. It was an argument that stood in sharp contrast to the proposal’s supporters, many of whom presented the numerous victories Cromwell had won during the wars as evidence of his suitability for the office of monarch, both spiritually and personally. By reinterpreting Cromwell’s victories as a sign of God’s support for a particular cause – the abolition of kingly office – rather than for Cromwell himself, Chidley deployed the memory of wartime victories as a weapon in a specific political conflict, demonstrating that recollections of the same past events could be marshalled for quite contrary purposes.

However, perhaps the most extensive use of Civil War memories to critique the state came during the turbulent year of 1659, when they were deployed to great effect by a coalition of anti-Cromwellians under the banner of the ‘good old cause’. The phrase the ‘good old cause’ had its origins in printed material dating back to the late 1640s, and in 1656 it was deployed in the postscript to Henry Vane’s 1656 tract A Healing Question, which called for the

159 Anon., Some mementos for the officers and soaldiers of the Army, from some sober Christians (Unknown, [1654]; Thomason / E.813[20]), p. 2.
160 Ibid., p. 8.
161 For further discussion of this pamphlet, particularly its relationship to other anti-Protectorate texts, see Barbara Taft, “‘The Humble Petition of Several Colonels of the Army’: Causes, Character, and Results of Military Opposition to Cromwell’s Protectorate’, The Huntington Library Quarterly, 42.1 (1978), 15–41.
163 See, for example, Anon., The Unparalleld monarch. Or, The portraiture of a matchless prince, exprest in some shadows of his Highness my Lord Protector (London, 1656; Thomason / E.1675[1]).
Protectorate to be replaced with a ruling oligarchy of spiritual elites, known as ‘the Saints’. By 1659, it had become the rallying cry of a rather disparate selection of the second Protectorate’s opponents who sought to link the ideals of leading Commonwealthsmen, soldiers, and sects together – as William Prynne disparagingly put it, the ‘good old cause’ was the ‘confederated Triumvirate of Republicans, Sectaries and Souldiers’.

Initially, quite what the ‘old cause’ consisted of was somewhat abstruse. More obvious, however, was what it opposed, namely, the disempowerment of parliament by a negative veto and control of the armed forces by a single person. According to the author of *The good old cause dress’d in its primitive lustre* (1659), it was these two principles that had constituted the ‘first, and virgin-Cause’ over which the Parliament had ‘entred into the field, and fought so many fierce, and bloody Battels’, and which was ‘never to be receded from, nor blotted out of memory; since God has stamp upon it so many golden characters, and pledges his incomparable Presence’. Like the Levellers before them, the rhetoric (and even the name) of this coalition turned on nostalgic calls for a return to the original cause for which the Parliament had fought, an aspiration that was predicated on their own particular understanding of what had been at stake during the conflict. Memories of this rather vaguely defined ‘most glorious cause’ were supplemented with equally familiar reminders of the ‘toil, treasure, and blood’ that the English people had endured in order to free themselves from these injustices only a decade earlier.
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165 Austin Woolrych, ‘Introduction’, in *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. by Robert Ayers, 10 vols (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980), vii, pp. 1-228 (p. 19). I have deliberated avoided referring the supporters of the ‘good old cause’ as ‘republicans’, partially because to do so would create confusion between supporters of the states of the 1650s and those who sought a particular form of government, and partially because many of those who supported the ‘good old cause’ were not in fact straightforward republicans, in the constitutional sense of the term. Henry Vane, for example, did not privilege the sovereignty of the people; instead, he favoured a nominated assembly comprised of the godly.


167 R. Fitz-Brian, *The good old cause dress’d in it's primitive lustre, and set forth to the view of all men. Being a short and sober narrative of the great revolutions of affairs in these later times* (London, 1659; E.968[6]), p. 9. For similar texts see Anon., *XXV Queries: modestly and humbly, and yet sadly and seriously propounded, to the people of England, and their representatives* (London, 1659; Thomason / E.968[5]); Anon., *A call to the officers of the army, and all good hearts, to stand upon their watch; and in all meeknesse and sobriety to plead for the interest of the people of God, and for the just liberties of these nations* (London, 1659; Thomason / E.968[8]).

168 Anon., *A call to the officers of the army*, p. 3; Fitz-Brian, *The good old cause dress’d*, p. 11.
By early April, however, many proponents of the ‘good old cause’ had alighted on a more specific political demand: the return of the Purged Parliament. This ‘memorable renowned old Parliament’ or ‘famous and memorable Long Parliament’, as it was called, had been forcibly removed by the army in April 1653. Now, six years later, much of the rank and file, along with MPs as diverse as Arthur Hesilrige and Henry Vane clamoured for its return. Though practical arguments for its reinstatement were not entirely absent – the pamphlet Some reasons humbly proposed, for example, was comprised almost entirely of pragmatic justifications – appeals to the events of the recent past played a central role.

In particular, the advocates of the Purged Parliament argued that the victories which had been secured between 1642 and 1651 were clear evidence of God’s support for this body, and, further, that its return was necessary to justify the bloodshed of the wars: much the same arguments, in fact, that had been deployed by many radicals in support of their preferred settlement throughout the 1650s. Thus, a petition from ‘divers well-affected Persons of the City of Westminster’ addressed to those army grandees who opposed the alteration of government, argued that it was ‘the sense generally of all the well-affected people, who have constantly adhered to you in the prosecution of the Good Old Cause, that the Lord did vouchsafe his glorious presence with that renowned long Parliament, in their Counsels and Armies: never was there a Parliament more victorious by a constant series of gracious Providences’. Similarly, the tract XXV Queries held up the victories of the third Civil War as evidence that the Lord did ‘by his Providence wonderfully bless and prosper the Armies and endeavors of that renowned Parliament, after they had resolved the Government into a Free-State’.

That the Protectorate’s more recent military endeavours had proved somewhat less successful, especially the campaigns against the Spanish in the Caribbean, doubtless lent weight to the argument that it was the institution of the Purged Parliament, and not Cromwell himself, which God had favoured. Indeed, one text made this martial disparity explicit,
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169 Anon., XXV Queries, p. 3; Anon., To the officers and souldiers of the armies of England, Scotland and Ireland. The humble petition and advice of divers well-affected to the good old cause, inhabitants in and about the borough of Southwark (Unknown, 1659; Thomason / E.980[1]), p. 2.
171 Anon., Some reasons humbly proposed to the officers of the Army, for the speedy re-admission of the Long Parliament who settled the government in the way of a free state (London, 1659; Thomason / E.979[8]).
172 Anon., To the Right Honourable the Ld. Fleetwood, to be communicated to the officers of the Army, the humble representation of divers well-affected persons of the city of Westminster and parts adjacent (London, 1659; Thomason / E.979[5]), p. 2.
173 Anon., XXV Queries, p. 9.
arguing that England was now ‘like to be made a prey to a foreign Enemy […]’ Whereas before, the Parliament of England, and their Armies, were a terror to all the Nations round about us’. 174 Meanwhile, the anonymous authors of The Armies Dutie directly addressed the army and articulated the now familiar fear that those who had engaged in the wars must ‘answer to the blood of Thousands of the enemies, which are esteemed by God as murdered by you if the Justisick cause of the war be not effectually prosecuted’, an outcome which they claimed could now only be achieved by an overhaul of the existing political settlement. 175

When, on 7 May, the Purged Parliament was indeed restored, the declaration of the officers of the army emphasised that the members of this body ‘were eminent Assertors of the Cause, and had a special presence of God with them, and were signally blessed in that work’. 176 As a pledge that they did not mean to perpetuate their own authority indefinitely, on 6 June the Parliament voted that they would not sit beyond 7 May 1660, and the Grand Committee spent many days discussing proposals for a more permanent settlement. 177 These debates brought to light many of the fundamental divisions that existed within the ‘good old cause’ coalition, not least their divergent views on a permanent Senate, which, though endorsed by army grandees like John Lambert, was anathema to those who favoured a more representative form of government. 178

Meanwhile, proposals for settlement in the wider press grew apace, and many authors chose to appropriate the rhetoric and language of the ‘good old cause’ for their own purposes. As one writer lamented, there were now ‘swarmes of foolish and ridicoulous Pamphlets’, their proliferation ‘tending rather to debauch, corrupt, distract, and divide the minds of men, then any way to compose us to the reception of those sounder and soberer principles and notions that may (by Gods assistance) reduce and establish us in a just and equitable craftis and constitution of a reall Common-wealth’. 179 Among the most hostile and vocal of these writers

174 Anon., To the Right Honourable the Ld. Fleetwood, p. 2.
175 Anon., The Armies dutie: or, Faithfull advice to the souldiers: given in two letters written by severall honest men, unto the Lord Fleetwood Lieutenant-Generall of the Armie, and now published for the instruction of the whole Armie, and the good people of this Common-wealth (London, 1659; Thomason / E.980[12]), p. 8.
176 Anon., A declaration of the officers of the army, inviting the members of the long Parliament, who continued sitting till the 20th of April, 1653. to return to the exercise and discharge of their trust. Friday 6 May, 1659 (London, 1659; Thomason / E.980[20]), p. 3.
was William Prynne. In his texts, Prynne lambasted the return of the Purged Parliament and sought to present the ‘good old cause’ as none other than the preservation of the king, the laws, and both full houses of parliament, an interpretation which was ‘diametrically contrary […] in every branch to the mistaken Good old cause, now cried up and prosecuted’.\textsuperscript{180} To support his case, Prynne provided a potted history of the wars and reminded readers of the many Parliamentarian declarations which had stated that they fought only to preserve both the King and Parliament, not least the Solemn League and Covenant. It was in these declarations, Prynne argued, that ‘you have the Good old Cause truly, clearly and fully stated by both Houses of Parliament’, a conclusion which necessitated, as the first step at least, the return of the full house as it had sat prior to December 1648.\textsuperscript{181}

Thus, the memory of the Civil Wars, and especially one’s understanding of the cause for which the Parliament had fought, remained of acute political significance. Though over a decade had passed since the end of the second Civil War, competing interpretations of the Parliament’s cause – and, consequently, of God’s favour – still had the power to destabilise as well as to defend the political settlement. John Harris made this connection between recent events and the future settlement quite explicit when he explained that the purpose of his historical narrative was to

serve as a Clue to guide your memories (yea and judgements too) unto a right understanding of those things which probably hitherto you have had but some confused Notions of; and they too so disordered, that thereby you have not been able to weigh things aright, so as to owne or adhere to those principles of Freedom and Justice’.\textsuperscript{182}

That is, by providing his readership with a particular interpretation of past events, Harris hoped to assist them in reaching the correct conclusion about what was required in the present – in this case, the re-establishment of the first Commonwealth.

\textsuperscript{180} [William Prynne], The true good old cause rightly stated, and the false un-cased (Unknown, [1659]; Thomason / E.983[6]), p. 3.

\textsuperscript{181} Ibid., p. 3. A similar reinterpretation of the ‘good old cause’ can be found in Anon., England’s confusion: or A true and impartial relation of the late traverses of state in England; with the counsels leading thereunto. Together with a description of the present power ruling there by the name of a Parliament, under the mask of the good old cause (London, 1659; Thomason / E.985[1]). At the other end of the spectrum, for an attempt to re-fashion the ‘good old cause’ in support of Leveller-style demands see Anon., The honest design: or, The true Commonwealths-man; offering a word in this juncture of time, in order to a settlement (London, 1659; Thomason / E.980[11]).

\textsuperscript{182} John Harris, Peace and not warre: or The moderator. Truly, but yet plainly, stating the case of the Common-Wealth, as to several of the considerable councils & transactions from the year 1636 to 1659 (London, 1659; Thomason / E.1000[25]), sig. A3v-A4r.
Ultimately, however, these reminders of the events of the recent past were not enough to prevent history from repeating itself; the Purged Parliament was dissolved for the second time in October 1659, amidst growing animosity between the army and MPs. As instability turned to chaos in the final months of the year, the ‘good old cause’ continued to be appropriated to support competing political positions. As Austin Woolrych has noted, the rallying cry of the ‘good old cause’ was deployed once again in Lambert’s last fling in the spring of 1660, survived the Restoration to alarm Clarendon in the plot-scares of the 1660s, echoed through the Popish and Rye House Plots, and only finally spent its emotive force in Monmouth’s Rebellion.183 The republics’ various radical opponents may not have constructed a counter-memory of the wars to rival Royalist accounts, but memories of the wars remained a significant element of their political critiques for the duration of the 1650s.

**Conclusion**

In contrast to the 1660s, when the Restoration regimes monopolised the public memory of recent events, the republics’ opponents succeeded in providing alternative memories of the Civil Wars in printed material throughout the 1650s. Often, these memories directly contested republican scripts. Royalist histories consistently reassigned responsibility for the wars to a malicious puritan faction, and writers also rejected the link between military victory and godly approbation that was favoured by the republic. Meanwhile, hagiographical accounts of Charles I and leading Royalists encouraged readers to dwell on the sufferings of their former monarch, the cruelty of their enemy, and the heroic deeds of the King’s loyal supporters, as opposed to their copious military defeats. That said, Royalist memories of the wars were not all of one hue, and differing interpretations of the recent past could be deployed against fellow Royalists as well as their republican rivals. Memories of the wars, and particularly their aims, hardships, and godly victories, were also deployed by radical groups to critique contemporary political affairs and to buttress their preferred vision of the future. That competing memories of the original Parliamentarian cause had the same rhetorical power in 1659 as they had had in 1649 is a testament to the ongoing political significance of the events of the recent past.

Thus, not all opponents shared the sentiments of the poet Abraham Cowley, who wrote in the preface to his (licenced) *Poems* that ‘We ought not […] revive the remembrance of those times and actions […] neither We, nor They, ought by the *Representation of Places and*

---

*Images* to make a kind of *Artifical Memory* of those things wherein we are all bound to desire like *Themistocles*, the *Art of Oblivion*. Rather, as this chapter has sought to demonstrate, the republics’ patchy attempts at reconciliation faced hostility not only from some of their own supporters, but also from many of the policy’s supposed beneficiaries, who were unwilling to let the past lie or to accede to the state’s preferred version of events. Memories of the wars remained contested, and of acute political significance, in printed material throughout the 1650s.

---

Chapter Three

Memories in Everyday Discourse

Thus far, this thesis has been concerned with the ways that politicians, poets, and pamphleteers attempted to frame the public memory of the Civil Wars. It has said little, however, of the ways in which the wider English populace actually recalled the events of 1642 to 1651 in the course of their own lives; it is this question which lies at the heart of the present chapter.

To reconstruct the mental world of early modern men and women in this way is notoriously problematic, owing to the sparse impressions that the vast majority of people have left on the historical record. Few scholars can hope to encounter a source as rich in everyday detail as the inquisitorial records that animate Thomas Cohen’s study of peasant memory in the Italian village of Rocca Sinibalda, penned by the idiosyncratic Roman commisario, Anselmo Canuto, in the year 1556.¹ As a result, historians have acknowledged that the study of memories of ordinary people is a task which lies ‘at the limits of feasible research’ – but not entirely beyond them, as work by Andy Wood, Andrew Hopper, and Mark Stoyle has demonstrated.²

One of the most promising sources available to historians for this purpose are legal records, which can reveal as much about otherwise opaque realms of human experience as they do a particular crime.³ This chapter draws on legal records from across the country, probing them for what they can reveal about the ways in which relatively ordinary citizens remembered the British Civil Wars. In so doing, it shows that memories of the conflict were evoked, debated,

---
and contested by diverse sections of society for a wide range of reasons. Further, it argues that though some wartime recollections conformed to, or were encouraged by, governmental memorial practices, many individuals sought to utilise wartime memories for their own ends, whilst others actively subverted or rejected the republics’ preferred commemorations. It also demonstrates that people’s wartime recollections were both local and national in scope, and that there was a significant degree of interaction and fluidity between these types of memory. Thus, Daniel Woolf’s claim that the seventeenth century saw a national understanding of the past triumph at the expense of vernacular memories does not appear to apply to memories of the civil conflict – in its immediate aftermath, at least.4

In particular, this chapter draws on the quarter and city sessions records from the communities of Somerset, Essex, Norfolk, Colchester, Staffordshire, Wiltshire, Cheshire, Devon, and Middlesex, and the assize records of the Northern Circuit. These have been selected in part because of their relatively good survival rates, but also because they represent a variety of localities, geographically, economically, and politically. Indeed, while the varying contents and completeness of these archives makes direct comparison difficult, it has nevertheless been possible to identify some subtle variations in cultures of memory between these places.5 These documents have been supplemented with material from the Thurloe papers, the state papers, and printed editions of court records for other areas. Where possible, I have also made use of additional material that illuminates the ways in which people remembered the conflict, primarily diaries and textual annotations.

The use of legal records as a historical source is not without its challenges. For a start, though the informations and depositions given by witnesses and the accused to a court may be the closest we can come to accessing the quotidian statements of ordinary people, they are not the unmediated words of the individuals they purport to represent.6 While deponents ranged across the social spectrum, from gentry and husbandmen to alehouse keepers and butchers, their statements were nevertheless constructed as part of structured legal proceedings, and the

---

5 The deposition material from Essex, for example, is limited. Somerset’s indictment files are fragmentary, and only the indictments and recognisances survive for Middlesex. Assize material has survived only for the Northern Circuit (and, extremely sparsely, for Oxford). The prominence of the northern part of the country in the assize material goes some way to compensate for its slight under-representation among the selected quarter and city sessions records, for which survival is somewhat better in the Midlands and south.
vast majority were penned by clerks rather than by the deponents themselves. Even if the tendency of some clerks to move from the more usual third-person into the first-person signifiers of ‘I’ and ‘we’ is taken as evidence that scribes reproduced their narrators’ tales in more or less their own words, these were still narratives constructed for a very specific purpose, namely, to influence a justice, court, or other official. It is, therefore, quite possible that many of these statements are at least as reflective of the perceived priorities of their audience as those of the deponents themselves.

However, as Natalie Zemon Davies’ seminal study of sixteenth-century French supplicants’ appeals for mercy has shown, such accounts, for all their foibles, still have the capacity to illuminate the mental world of the people. Davies argues that it is precisely the ‘fictional’ elements of pardon tales – the narratives constructed, the lies which narrators considered it expedient to tell, the language used, and the incidental details they included – that shed light on the ways that supplicants built coherence from their own lived experience. Thus, one does not necessarily have to agree with the claim that such statements offer a ‘relatively uninterrupted narrative from the lips of the lower orders’ to appreciate the potential value of court records as receptacles of memory. At the very least, they throw into sharp relief those occasions when people chose to evoke particular recollections in the course of their interactions with legal authorities. Beyond this, however, they can also preserve fragments of conversations and incidental asides which would otherwise be lost to the historical record.

---

7 To give a sense of the social status of the individuals involved, of 18 cases that involved accusations of offensive speech in Somerset between 1649 and 1659 for which the social status of the speaker was given there were two carpenters, two innkeepers, two shoemakers, two merchants, a mason, a limeburner, the wives of an innkeeper and a butcher, a servant, a rag-gather, a taylor, a miller, a blacksmith, and the keeper of the house of correction. This reflects Lloyd Bowen’s findings that in a sample of 33 cases of Royalist seditious speech which came before the Middlesex and Westminster benches between 1649 and 1653 in which the social status of the offender was given, only 3 involved gentlemen. See Lloyd Bowen, ‘Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism, 1649-60’, in Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum, ed. by Jason McElligott and David Smith (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), pp. 44-66 (p. 47). For a good discussion of the legal processes that constructed depositions and their influence on the resulting narratives, albeit in the context of church courts, see Laura Gowing, Domestic Dangers, pp. 42-58.

8 For examples of statements that slip from third to first person see ERO D/B 5 Sb 2/9, February 1649, information of Nicholas Ginniburne and SRO Q/SR/306/52. For a rare example of an information written by its deponent see DHC, QS/B, Box 59, information of Arthur Featherstone.


10 Ibid., p. 5.

11 Thus, the work of Andy Wood and Simon Sandall focuses on the use of custumal memory by individuals and groups engaged in disputes over rights and resources. See Simon Sandall, ‘Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in the Forest of Dean, c. 1550-1832’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of East Anglia, 2009); Wood, The Memory of the People.
For example, in cases of treasonous or seditious words and other forms of offensive speech, such as defamation, the utterances of those who were thought to have contravened legislative boundaries were preserved in the informations of the people who heard and reported them. Such material can offer a rare externalisation of internal thoughts, and doubtless represents only a tiny fraction of similar conversations that went unrecorded. In these cases, because the law was concerned with the exact words spoken, there was a particular onus on clerks to transcribe the language of deponents precisely. This does not, of course, guarantee the veracity of the words themselves, and it is clear that some reports of dangerous speech were deliberate fabrications. For example, in 1651, Nicholas Ely confessed to the Wiltshire quarter sessions that Robert Ruddell had paid him to sign a charge of treasonable words against Morrice Jervice, ‘to procure the confiscation of his [i.e. Jervice’s] estates’, but that he had in fact ‘never heard such words uttered’. Nevertheless, even if one adopts a sceptical position about the validity of the evidence, such reports are still suggestive of the type and tenor of conversations that people undoubtedly were having. After all, the most convincing lies are founded on believable falsehoods, and, in any case, it would be implausible to suppose that every report of dangerous words was entirely deceitful.

While there is a certain irony to the fact that it is those voices which the authorities sought to suppress that are among the most audible in the present, legal records also include other types of document that may enable us to access the words and memories of more law-abiding citizens. Informations and depositions, for example, can include a wealth of incidental details beyond the particulars of the crime in question, while the quarter sessions records contain

---

12 For legislative acts that sought to constrain dangerous speech in the context of the republics see A&O, ii, pp. 120, 831-835, 937-939, 1038-1042. For an exploration of the distinctions that contemporaries made between treason, sedition, and other forms of dangerous words see Peter Rushton, ‘The Rise and Fall of Seditious Words, 1650 to 1750’, Northern History, 52.1 (2015), 68-84.
14 Bowen, ‘Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism’, in Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum, ed. by McElligott and Smith, p. 49; Gowing, Domestic Dangers, p. 46.
many documents that are primarily administrative as opposed to criminal, including petitions and certificates.\textsuperscript{17}

Moreover, the very nature of the post-war settlement – in which the question of Civil War allegiance retained some legal and administrative relevance – encouraged and helped to foster the recollection of those wartime divisions that were of ongoing legal import. In spite of the official pardon proffered by the 1652 Act of Oblivion, the King’s former supporters continued to face restrictions on their political, economic, and social freedom throughout the 1650s.\textsuperscript{18} In the arena of office holding, for example, ordinances forbade persons ‘who hath been aiding and assisting the late King’, were subject to sequestration, or were otherwise ‘Enemies of the Parliament’ from being elected to hold any ‘Office or place of trust’, or from voting in the same.\textsuperscript{19} Royalists who refused to compound for their estates, and who had not been pardoned, were repeatedly expelled from London, confined to the five mile radius around their homes, and were required to obtain a licence to travel further afield.\textsuperscript{20} They were also disarmed, and, prior to 1652, individual Royalist officers could be held financially liable for the damage which the troops under their command had caused during the wars.\textsuperscript{21} As long as wartime divisions retained such legal relevance some people clearly had an incentive to remember the transactions of war, and, as a result, the legal records also contain recollections of wartime events which were stimulated by, and responded to, government legislation.

Thus, while doubtless only the tip of the iceberg, a careful reading of the various items produced by legal processes – from reports of offensive speech to petitions and various

\textsuperscript{17} That said, the petitions of maimed soldiers and war widows are studied in more depth in chapter five and receive little attention here.


\textsuperscript{19} ‘October 1652: An Act for disabling Delinquents to bear Office, or to have any Voice or Vote in Election of any Publique Officer’, in A\&O, ii, pp. 620-621 (p. 620).

\textsuperscript{20} See, for example, C3, vi, p. 370; Anon., \textit{By the Protector an order and declaration of His Highness, by the advice of His council, commanding all persons who have been of the late Kings party, or his sons, to depart out of the cities of London and Westminster, and late lines of communication, on or before Monday the fifth day of November, 1655} (London, 1655; Thomason / 669.f.20[17]); Anon., \textit{A proclamation commanding all papists and all other persons, who have been of the late Kings party or his sons, to depart out of the cities of London and Westminster, and late lines of communication, on or before Monday the 8. of March, one thousand six hundred fifty seven} (London, 1658; Thomason / 669.f.20[72]).

\textsuperscript{21} Hardacre, \textit{The Royalists During the Puritan Revolution}, p. 70. See, for example, James Earl’s petition to the Council of State in 1653, concerning a suit brought against him by some clothiers who claimed that Earl’s troops had stolen their goods while stationed outside Banbury garrison in 1643 in CSPD, xxxvii, pp. 385-6 and the household accounts of Sir Hamon le Strange in Alfred Kingston, \textit{East Anglia and the Great Civil War: The Rising of Cromwell's Ironsides in the Associated Counties of Cambridge, Huntingdon, Lincoln, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, and Hertford} (London: E. Stock, 1902), pp. 295-296.
informations – is nevertheless richly illuminating of the diverse ways in which people recalled the internecine conflict. This chapter is comprised of three broad parts, each of which considers a different type of Civil War memory. The first two sections examine memories of Civil War allegiance and service, first in cases of reported speech and then in a wide range of other legal documents, while the third section explores the ways people remembered wartime events. Together, they show that the memory of Britain’s domestic conflicts remained alive in the minds and discourses of ordinary people throughout the 1650s, highlighting the diverse ways that the events of the turbulent recent past continued to be evoked, debated, and contested by the people of republican England.

i. Roundhead and Cavalier Rogues: Memories of Civil War Service in Reported Speech

In the year 1649, a blackletter ballad, The Glory of the West, was printed in London.²² It told the story of a fair maiden, the daughter of a man killed fighting for the King in the Civil Wars, who, out of loyalty, would now marry none but a Cavalier. After the usual double-dealings of the genre – including a rich suitor who was thwarted in his efforts to buy her affection – it came to pass that the young heroine married a man who, though poor, had lost all he had for the King. In common with many ballads from the period, this tale was intended as more than just entertainment, as it also sought to deliver to its readers a clear didactic message: in this case, that a man’s wartime service and political allegiance were of ongoing import, and a valid way ‘good from bad […to] discern’.²³ The enduring power of wartime affiliation depicted in this ballad, though heavily romanticised, reflects the ongoing significance that a person’s former Civil War service possessed during the 1650s more broadly. For in the legal records, the most common form of wartime memories are recollections of past allegiance and military service – one’s own, one’s family’s, and one’s neighbours’.

---

²² Anon., The fame, wit, and glory of the west, here in this song shall fully be exprest. A caveat for young men wherein they may behold, how a youngster gave away his mistris and his gold; and maids likewise may here a lesson learn, wherein good from bad they may discern (London, 164[9]; Wing / F350B). The exact date is unknown, as only the first 3 letters of the publication date survive. It has, however, been attributed by the Wing catalogue to 1649, and many of the themes in the text, particularly the defeat of the Royalist cause, support this attribution. The ballad was clearly popular enough to inspire a spin off, The Glory of the North, which told a similar story about a poor Royalist couple thwarting a devious maltman. See Anon., The credit of Yorkshire, or The glory of the north (London, 1649; Wing / H491B).

²³ Ibid., n.p.
For those who supported the King’s cause, such memories could inspire actions rather more provocative than the choice of a politically like-minded spouse.⁴ For a complaint by the Presbyterian minister Dr Francis Cheynell that Royalists were indeed inclined to discriminate against those who had served for the Parliament when selecting marital partners see Thurloe, vi, p. 229.

⁴⁵ Thurloe, iii, p. 330.
⁴⁶ CRO QJF 76/2/49.
⁴⁷ TNA ASSI 45/5/2/86; James Raine (ed.), Depositions from the Castle of York, Relating to Offences Committed in the Northern Counties in the Seventeenth Century, vol. xl (Durham: Surtees Society, 1861) p. 73.
⁴⁸ SHC Q/SR/83/150, Q/SR/82/132-33.
by denying them status as equal combatants. 29 Hanging, meanwhile, was a form of corporal punishment typically reserved for those of lower social status, and perhaps reflected the widespread Royalist antagonism towards the perceived social inferiority of the Parliamentarian party and its supporters; as the Somerset man John Sawser scathingly put it, ‘since they have put the kinge to death the Gov[er]n[or]s of this Kingdome are noe others then dishmakers, Tinkers and Coblers’. 30

Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that some Parliamentarians who later came to oppose the republican state remembered their own wartime actions scarcely more favourably. In the winter of 1648, John Griffyn appeared before the Exeter sessions of the peace accused of swearing twenty oaths and saying ‘that as he had done service for the parliament so nowe he would bee their enemy and doe as much against them and cutt their throats’. 31 A similar cocktail of resistance and regret infused the words of the Guernsey man Peter de Beauvoir, who, in 1650, declared to John Rockley: ‘I have beene a S[oldier] for the Parliam[en]t But and therewith swearing a great oath I wil never serve them more’. 32 In the same year Mr Cooke, a minister, fell into conversation with Sir John Corbett from Atherly in the county of Salop. On hearing Cooke express his support for Charles Stuart, Corbett said to his companion ‘though hee [Cooke] be pationate against som p[re]sent precedings […] hee hath bin for the parl[ea]ment since the beginning of the warre’, prompting Cooke to declare that had he ‘knowen of theire design I would have seen the parleament hanged before I would have bin of theire side’. 33

For the former soldier John Stradling, the desire to make amends for his previous Parliamentarian service led him beyond verbal abuse and into armed resistance. Discussing the events of the 1655 Salisbury rising in a Somerset alehouse, Stradling apparently boasted to his interlocuter of his involvement and said that ‘if things had gone well […] he had been a man, and his old spot or stain cast on him by the cavalier party, for serving as lieutenant under general Blake [i.e. Robert Blake, Parliamentarian commander], would have been wiped

29 Bowen, ‘Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism’, in Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum, ed. by McElligott and Smith, p. 56.
30 SHC Q/SR/83/86. For discussion of social status in Royalist satire see Laura Knoppers, ‘“Sing Old Noll the Brewer”: Royalist Satire and Social Inversion, 1648-64’, The Seventeenth Century, 15.1 (2000), 32-51.
32 TNA ASSI 45/3/2/17.
33 BL Stowe MS 184 f. 156.
off’. For Stradling, the memory of his past military actions was acutely tied to his sense of honour and manhood in the present.

By contrast, many men who had supported the King during the wars recalled their Civil War allegiance rather more positively, in verbal expressions that exhibited a combination of pride and defiance. In this respect, the words uttered by Symon Warrymer, from Knaresborough in the county of Yorkshire, were fairly typical. While working at his father’s house in the spring of 1653, Warrymer apparently declared that ‘he had beene for the Kinge, and would be still for him’. He then went on to recall his military deeds in some detail, including the time ‘when he was a souldier in Knaresborough castle, he kild one of ye Parliament’s party in his father’s orchards out of the castle’.

William Rossiter expressed similar sentiments, albeit rather more publicly, when he announced to the assembled company of a Taunton alehouse that he had been ‘A Cavalier, [and] yt he would be soe still’. Meanwhile, in 1653, William Ridgeway was reported to the Cheshire quarter sessions for saying that ‘hee was a Cavileere and hee would bee a Cavileere as longe as hee could blowe’, a turn of phrase that referred to his rather idiosyncratic habit of blowing his trumpet in a ‘rejoycinge manner’ whenever the Commonwealth fleet suffered a military defeat at the hands of the Dutch.

In these cases, men who had supported the King during the wars continued to conceive of themselves in terms of the partisan identities forged during that conflict, evoking their prior allegiance as a signifier of both their loyalty to the Stuart cause and their resistance to the republican state. The term ‘Cavalier’ was transformed by Royalists from a term of derision into a badge of honour and a symbol of ongoing identity.

Other Royalist veterans chose to conjure up rather specific memories of their wartime experiences in order to express their hopes for the future. In the year 1650, Joan Foart and her


35 Raine, *Depositions from the Castle of York*, p. 59; TNA ASSI 45/4/3/98. Warrymer was informed against by his own brother.

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid.

38 Ibid.

sister, Margery Seeley, from Wiveliscome in Somerset, gave information to the local quarter sessions against a local man, John Hellen. Among other misdemeanours, the women claimed that Hellen had said that ‘he cared not if he did kill her [Margery]’ for ‘he had killed divers (haveinge before bin a souldier in the late Kings Armey’ and, further, that he ‘hoped to see the same tymes againe’. On one level, Hellen’s words were clearly intended to intimidate the two sisters in the present. On another level, however, remembering his past actions also enabled Hellen to articulate his resistance to the Commonwealth state and construct a vision of the future, a time when he would once again be able to slay the King’s enemies. Similarly, when conversing with several of his neighbours in a Staffordshire inn in 1657, the husbandman John Strynger chose to recall those occasions when he had ‘houlpen to drive the Lord Protector when he was not Lord Protector into a narrow hole’ and expressed the hope that he would ‘see him dryven in agayne’. The blacksmith Henry Birkinshaw was indicted by the Barnsley quarter sessions for saying ‘the devil confound the Parlyam[en]t and all Roundheaded Rogueshee [i.e. Birkinshaw] plundered them & would doe againe if ever the Kinges Army came into the Country againe’. Far from being horrified by the bloodshed of the domestic conflicts, these men remembered the violent acts which they had committed with some enthusiasm and used them to imagine the ways in which they may be of service in the future.

In this respect, the recollections of Royalist soldiers bore a striking resemblance to those of the 1549 Norfolk rebels, who, in the immediate aftermath of defeat, often deployed memories of their recent, failed rebellion in order to imagine the possibility of another (successful) uprising. As Andy Wood has argued, utilising the past in this way enabled the members of a defeated group to construct a kind of ‘uchronia’: an imagined future that allowed them to ‘transcend reality as given and to refuse to identify with […] and be satisfied with the existing order’. For these individuals, to remember the recent past was not to dwell on the

---

40 SHC Q/SR/82/126.
41 SRO Q/SR/298/3.
42 WYAS QS 4/2/41v. For another similar example see WYAS QS 4/2/42. Thanks are due to Dr Andrew Hopper for kindly supplying me with these references.
difficult reality of military defeat but to invert it, in order to imagine and affirm the possibility of agency in the future.

Thus, in spite of the complaints in the Royalist press about the half-hearted nature of oblivion, many of the King’s supporters proved reluctant to forgive and forget the wartime service of those around them, or their own former actions. The poem *The Melancholy Cavalier* (1654), refashioned for the new political context from an earlier verse, poked fun at the predilection among Royalist veterans for recounting tales from their times in the wars. The lines ‘Let Souldier come with scarre-becarved skin, / And talk of Edge-hill Battell he was in: / Seige of Colchester, brave exploits in France / To golden credite ‘twill him not advance’ were targeted at those men who, like Symon, Strynger, and Hellen, were in fact only too keen to reminisce about the days when they had seen action for the King.45

To remember a person’s wartime service was not, however, the preserve of the republics’ opponents. While the very nature of seditious and treasonous words means that these cases tend to capture only the utterances of those who were inimical to the government, there are nevertheless incidences of reported speech – in defamation cases, indictments for ‘provoking words’, and other disputes – which suggest that citizens loyal to the republics (or at least, not obviously disloyal) also remembered and discussed the service of those around them.46 For example, in an information from 1654, Richard Talor, a yeoman from Huxley in Cheshire, claimed that he had overheard John Webster give ill language against the local knight Sir Thomas Wibraham. Webster had apparently said

that if Sir Thomas Wibraham of Woodhay Bart., did question him for some timber, he would question Sir Thomas for sending a white horse to Sir John Byron commonly called the Lord Byron, when the Siege was about Nantwich, or words to that purpose, and for sending four men and horses into Wales and cause him to be sequestered for the same, and he further saith that he heard Webster say he cared not for Sir Thomas Wibraham and many other uncivil speeches.47

45 ‘J. C.’, *The Melancholy Cavalier* (Unknown, 1654; Thomason / E.1493[3]), p. 11. The original, *The Melancholy Knight*, was published by Samuel Rowlands in 1615. Sarah Dickson has suggested that the mysterious ‘J. C.’ who adapted the poem may have been John Crouch, but a lack of firm evidence means that this attribution remains speculative. See Sarah Dickson, ‘The Melancholy Cavalier: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Plagiarism’, *Studies in Bibliography*, 5 (1952/3), 161–163.


In this unusually detailed account, Webster recalled not just the side that Wibraham had supported during the wars but also some of his specific deeds, right down to the number of men and the colour of the horse that he had supplied for the King. Though Webster’s words were primarily intended to convey his contempt for Wibraham, he clearly also believed that these memories might have some leverage over the knight in the future. In fact, Wibraham’s estates had been sequestered and subjected to a composition fine of £2,500 in 1646, but his only recorded offence was taking refuge in the Royalist garrison at Chester. Webster, however, appears to have believed that Wibraham’s misdemeanours were somewhat more extensive and threatened to deploy this knowledge against him, should the need arise.

In the autumn of 1650, the yeoman George Minshall the younger was reported to the Cheshire quarter sessions for saying that a local gentleman, Thomas Brereton, was ‘a worse Cavalier than ever his brother (meaning Richard Brereton deceased) was, and that the said Mr Tho: Brereton was the cause of his said brothers going from Ashley and leaveinge his howse there, and going to the late Kings p[ar]tie’ and, further, that he hoped they would ‘in a short tyme bee ridd of Gentlemen’. In this case, Minshall used his recollections of the wartime activities of a prominent local elite to express his distaste for several members of the Brereton family, as well as the gentry more generally. Meanwhile, in the year 1654, James Kent was indicted for uttering ‘disgracefull provoking words’ against James Smyth, clerk, from the village of Barthomley in Cheshire. Kent had reportedly said that when Smyth had been a Parliamentarian captain during the wars he had ‘runne away from the Parliamt Armye att [the] tyme the late Kings Army did worst a partye of the p[ar]liam[en]t forces at Stockport’. Smyth denied the claim, but the fact that Kent’s words were considered a sufficient slight on his character to prompt an indictment suggests that past military actions were widely considered to have a bearing upon a person’s reputation in the present.

Even the actions of non-combatants were not necessarily forgotten. In 1656, Agnes Davie was reported to the Devon quarter sessions for insulting the local minister and saying that his wife, Mrs Hopkins, had been ‘a Leger in Gorins [i.e. Lord Goring’s] Troope’ – that is, a Royalist camp follower. Similarly, in 1648, Anne Rosingreane explained that she had heard it ‘comonly reported’ that one Jane Taylor was a woman of ‘ill behaviour’ who had followed

---

49 CRO QJF 78/3/10.
50 CRO QJF 82/4/9.
51 DHC, QS/B Box 61 Epiphany 1656, information of Jamerne Harris.
the armies to the battle at York, a turn of phrase which suggests that Taylor’s wartime activities, and her implied moral impropriety, remained the subject of local conversation. 52

Indeed, a case that came before the Cheshire Court of Great Sessions in 1656 illustrates how, on some occasions, a person’s wartime activities might become so infused with gossip and rumour as to produce highly unstable memories. During a discussion about the wartime past of a local spinster, Katherin Dale, her neighbour, Hugh Humfreys, had apparently said that ‘if Kate Dale […] had ridden as a Trooper for the King […] it had bin gallant in her […] but rideinge for the Rebells […] it was a most base thing in her’. 53 Humfreys expressed his opinion in the context of what appears to have been a debate, and definitely an uncertainty, over Dale’s role in the wars. As a woman, there was no expectation that Dale would have fought: but had the spinster taken up arms, for whom, and was this indeed considered ‘gallant’, rather than an unacceptable breach of gender norms? The case raises interesting questions about the relationship between gender and Civil War soldiery, but, more saliently for our purposes here, it shows that memories of wartime service were a source of ongoing discussion and that how a person’s service was remembered could remain up for grabs several years after the conflict had ended.

On some occasions, people strayed beyond the verbal abuse of their erstwhile enemies and into actual violence. In an assault case that came before the northern assizes in 1654, Thomas Sharpe, a Commonwealth soldier, and his companion, Richard Turner, were accused of attacking two other men, Richard Crosland and John Topham, in a Yorkshire alehouse. While the deponents disagreed over precisely who had first resorted to violence, there was consensus among witnesses that the dispute began with the trading of insults over Civil War loyalties. Crosland and Topham allledgedly called Sharpe and Turner ‘roundheaded rogues’, while Sharpe reportedly told Topham ‘I believe I have seeen you a souldier in Pontefract Castle in the Cavalleers army’. 54 Topham denied the charge, but Crosland proudly announced that he had indeed been a Royalist soldier; hours later he was confined to his bed, roundly beaten. 55 Their dialogue suggests not only that people remembered the military service of those around them, right down to the places where they had served, but that these divisions remained of sufficient import to provoke disagreement well into the 1650s. Such disputes were not always split along purely partisan lines. In an unusual case from 1653, the Exeter

52 CRO QJF 76/4/87.
53 TNA CHES 24/131/3, indictment of Hugh Humfreys [my emphasis].
54 TNA ASSI 45/5/1/98-101.
55 TNA ASSI 45/5/1/101.
braiser Richard Moone was accused of the murder of a former Parliamentarian soldier who claimed to have killed his brother ‘in a fight in the warrs’, an act that was clearly motivated by personal as much as political enmity.\textsuperscript{56}

\textbf{ii. ‘a Malignant in the harte’: Memories of Civil War Service in Legal Records}

Thus far, the cases that have been discussed have involved only those individuals whose speech or acts in some way transgressed legal limits. In many ways, however, the very nature of the post-war settlement, in which a person’s former service retained some legal and administrative relevance, actually encouraged and helped to foster the recollection of certain wartime divisions. Former Royalists, in particular, remained subject to diverse restrictions and some people proved only too willing to remember the wartime actions of those individuals whom they believed had breached the constraints placed upon them by the government.

In 1656, Thomas Walker, a resident of the town of Leeds, was moved to pen a letter to the local commissioners of the peace calling for the removal of the city’s deputy bailiff, Peter Jackson. In his request, Walker explained that Jackson had been ‘for diverse yeares last past in actuall armes for the late king against the parliament’, and that though this clearly contravened the recent proclamation that ‘noe delinquents shall beare office’ the elders of Leeds had steadfastly refused to dismiss him.\textsuperscript{57} His missive concluded with the ominous warning that he was also aware of ‘many other officers in the same condition’.\textsuperscript{58} In September 1655, 147 inhabitants from the parish of Barthomley in Cheshire lodged a similar complaint against their minister, John Smyth. In their petition to the Lord Protector, they claimed that Smyth had committed many crimes that rendered him ‘scandalous and unquallified’ to hold the post, not least the fact that he had deserted the Parliament’s cause at Worcester, where he had been engaged as a chaplain for Colonel Croxton’s regiment.\textsuperscript{59} Seven years earlier, the Staffordshire quarter sessions had been presented with a request for the removal of local school usher, Samuell Crosse, on account that he had served in the Royalist

\textsuperscript{56} Bush, ‘The Civil War and Interregnum in Exeter’, p. 135. For further discussion of fights apparently sparked by disagreements over national politics or wartime allegiances see SHC Q/SR/82/149-51, Q/SR/83/145, Q/SR/86/22; ERO Q/SBa 2/80, information of John Barnard; TNA ASSI 45/4/1/177; LMA MJ/SR/1030/94.
\textsuperscript{57} Thurloe, iv, p. 398.
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{59} TNA SP 18/100 f. 235. For John Smyth’s defence see TNA SP 18/100 f. 233. For another, similar petition signed by the ‘well-affected inhabitants’ of Tettenhall in the west Midlands see TNA SP 18/96 f. 50.
army under the Earl of Newcastle and was therefore ‘by an ordinance of parl[ia]m[en]t uncapable of the Execucon of the place of schoolm[aster] or usher’. 60

Meanwhile, in 1655, the minister for the parish of Staplegrove in Somerset, John Gardner, and twenty-two of his parishioners petitioned the local quarter sessions for the removal of their newly appointed parish ‘registrar’, William Pummery. 61 In their petition, the parishioners explained that they considered Pummery to be an unsatisfactory choice for a number of reasons, including the fact that he was ‘a most desepa[te] malignant, one yt sought the ruine of this Towne as far forth as most of ye beseides in ye late troubles (being one of ye dearest favourites of the late Captain Anthill yt both employed and rewarded for so doing)’. 62 The town in question was probably Taunton, which sat on the fringes of Staplegrove parish and had been subjected to three major Royalist sieges between the winter of 1644 and the summer of 1645. The accusations which these men (and one woman) made against Pummery are noteworthy not only for their relative detail, but also because, for these loyal, puritan householders, to have served in the King’s army during the sieges appears to have been sufficient for a person to be considered an enemy of the entire town. He was duly removed from his post.

On a rather more exalted level, following the Parliamentary elections of 1654 the Council of State received a raft of petitions from the ‘well-affected inhabitants’ of various localities objecting to their newly selected MP on the grounds that they or their electors – or both – were barred from participation under the terms of the Instrument of Government. While there were in fact several clauses in this document that qualified who might be eligible to sit (including a rather expansive requirement that all candidates should be of ‘known integrity, fearing God, and of good conversation’), many of the petitions concerned the stipulation that no person who had ‘aided or abetted the war against the Parliament’ should be eligible either to sit or vote. 63 A petition from the inhabitants of Tiverton, for example, claimed that their newly selected MP, Robert Shapcott, had been chosen by invalid electors, many of whom had ‘ayded and abetted ag[ains]t the parl[yam]en[t]’, and that Shapcott himself had been ‘a feild
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officer under ye late King’.  

For good measure, they attached a list of forty-seven of his electors with notes detailing their Royalist service. The Council received a similar petition from a group of Leicestershire residents alleging that the Earl of Stamford and Thomas Beaumont, both recently elected for the county, had assisted Charles Stuart in Scotland and at Worcester and were therefore disqualified by dint of their Royalism. Beaumont, like Shapcott, must have proffered sufficient proof of his new-found loyalty to convince the Council that he was now a man of ‘good Affections’ and both were eventually admitted to the House. The Earl, however, was not. A similar fate befell the MPs Thomas Adams and John Langham, who were excluded following a petition from a group of Londoners outlining their former ‘disaffection to the Parliament and good people’.

Doubtless there were often other grievances at work in residents’ attempts to remove local officeholders beyond merely wartime allegiance. Pummery, for example, was clearly disliked by his neighbours as much for his dubious means of selection and violent behaviour as for his military service, and it is possible that this information was supplied simply as further ammunition in their request for his removal. Nevertheless, we must entertain the possibility that at least some petitioners were motivated by a desire to see their former enemies excluded. There were certainly incidences where an individual’s wartime allegiance appears to have been of significant personal import, not least the case of the Gloucester alderman Anthony Kingscote, who eventually disinherited his eldest son because of his Royalism.

When attempts to remove apparently ineligible men from office went unheeded, some people were not above going public with their grievances and publishing the case against an individual in the national press. On these occasions, wartime memories that were initially of primarily local significance were presented on the national stage, where they interacted with wider debates about the limits of reconciliation. A particularly notable example of this phenomenon occurred in 1650 when a Cumberland man, John Musgrave, published a
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pamphlet criticising the conduct of the governor of Newcastle, Sir Arthur Hesilrige.\textsuperscript{70} While Musgrave had a range of grievances against Hesilrige, chief amongst them was the fact that Sir Arthur continued to appoint former Royalists to office, including the new sheriff of Cumberland, Charles Howard. In his tract, Musgrave reminded readers of the wartime misdemeanours of various northern officeholders and argued that because Howard had borne arms against the Parliament in both the first and second wars and ‘raised great Forces, and mustered 8 000 men for the enemy’ he was ineligible, and unsuitable, for public office.\textsuperscript{71} Nor was Musgrave the only person who was concerned. In the same year, the pamphlet \textit{Strange Newes from the North}, in addition to reporting diverse curious phenomena that had been observed in the northern counties, from phantom armies to earthquakes, criticised the appointment of former Royalists such as Howard to the magistracy. Several pages were dedicated to accounts of Howard’s wartime conduct, and the author warned that to allow such men ‘who have lost their swords in battle’ to regain ‘the sword of authority’ would lead to the oppression of ‘the honest party’, perhaps even another Civil War.\textsuperscript{72} In fact, Howard had been cleared of disaffection by the Council of State earlier in the year, but this was not enough to convince everyone that he was a suitable, or safe, appointment.\textsuperscript{73} The ongoing significance of wartime service was not always clear cut, and there remained significant disagreement over the scope of government regulation, what constituted ‘good affection’, and the extent to which past conduct should continue to curtail a person’s actions in the present.\textsuperscript{74} The dispute over Howard’s appointment was not the only occasion when parts of the English populace proved rather more hostile to the reintegration of former Royalists than the national authorities. Indeed, expressions of discontent over the government’s perceived leniency towards its erstwhile enemies were not uncommon. In 1651, an anonymous letter printed in

\textsuperscript{70} John Musgrave, \textit{A true and exact relation of the great and heavy pressures and grievances the well-afflicted of the northern bordering countries lye under, by Sir Arthur Haslerigs misgovernment, and placing in authority there for justices of the peace, commissioners for the militia, ministry, and sequestrations, malignants, and men disaffected to the present government} (London, 1650; Thomason / E.619[10]). For further discussion of printed attacks on Arthur Hesilrige and the relationship between local and national disputes see Caroline Boswell, \textit{Disaffection and Everyday Life in Interregnum England} (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2017), pp. 37-45.
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Mercurius Politicus scathingly dismissed the acceptance of ‘Both old and new Malignants (which I hope the State will never trust, though most of them be Engagers)’. 75 A petition sent to the Parliament by the inhabitants of York six years later included a request that the House be ‘purged from all persons who have any way aided, abetted, or assisted the late King’, whether the Council now considered them to be well-affected or not.76 Many local officers were aggrieved by the legal amnesty proffered by the Act of Oblivion, with one member of the county committee for Devon lamenting that the Act ‘exceedingly heightens the spirits of the enemy, and makes them jeer at those whom they have wronged’.77

When, in 1657, a conversation in an East Sussex pub turned to the government’s treatment of the King’s former supporters, John Pellett grumbled to his companions that he would have had all Cavaliers sent to Jamaica. This was a measure which the Council of State had considered but ultimately dismissed, not least because the forced transportation of the Parliament’s enemies to Barbados during the 1640s had transformed the colony into a Royalist stronghold.78 Provoked by his companion, an opponent of the decimation tax, Pellett went on to claim that it was a ‘great mercy in the protector and council to let such irreconcilable enemies [as the Royalists] have a being’, for ‘the parliament did not admit them to composition, and pass the act of oblivion, to render the cavaliers able to cut the parliament’s own throats’.79 Though historians have generally been wont to emphasise the harshness with which the republican governments treated former Royalists, this was far from being the view of contemporaries, many of whom were decidedly critical of what they considered to be the unduly sympathetic treatment of their erstwhile enemies.80

In March 1649, local officials in Westminster placed additional restrictions on former Royalists, barring any person who had supported the King from obtaining a licence to run an alehouse and stipulating that anyone ‘well-affected to the Parliament’ would be favoured if they could ‘discover’ a Royalist who was currently licensed.81 This was not the first time that

76 Anon., To the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland, &c. The humble petition of divers of the inhabitants of the North-riding of the county of York (London, 1657; Thomason / 669.f.20[44]), n.p. For a similar petition signed by the inhabitants of Hereford in 1654 see TNA SP 19/74 f. 237.
77 Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), Calendar of the Committee for Compounding, 4 vols (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1889), i, p. 549.
79 Thurloe, v, p. 779.
80 See, for example, C. H. Firth, ‘The Royalists Under the Protectorate’, The English Historical Review, 52.208 (1937), 634-648; Hardacre, The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution.
the authorities had actively encouraged people to inform on their neighbours. Under the terms of the 1643 sequestration ordinance, citizens who successfully identified un-sequestered Royalist property were entitled to report estates eligible for sequestration in the hope that these could then be used to finance their claim. It was, however, one of the first incidences of local authorities placing formal restrictions on Royalist veterans over and above national regulations. Alehouses had a longstanding reputation as sites of disorder, discord, and dissent, and this additional regulation suggests that in the distinct political and geographical context of the capital the threat posed by malignant alehouse keepers was thought to be especially acute.

Further localised restrictions on Royalists keeping alehouses emerged in 1656, when orders to licence only ‘persons who have not adhered to the late King and his Party’ were passed by the justices in Hertfordshire, along with various other stipulations. It is likely that the decision to introduce these additional regulations was prompted by the rule of the major-generals, who were dispatched to the provinces in August 1655 with instructions to tighten security and further the cause of godly reform, including a reduction in the number of alehouses. However, though several other counties also introduced more stringent licensing regulations during this period, often incorporating a formal requirement that only those ‘well-affected to the Government’ could hold a licence, most appear to have stopped just shy of the blanket ban on former Royalists favoured in Hertfordshire. This geographical disparity in regulations suggest that there was some variation in the significance attributed to former service, not just in terms of the zealousness with which national restrictions were implemented, but in the severity of local responses. In addition, these regulations show that the ongoing significance of wartime service did not only affect those of the middling sort and
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above, who were most likely to be appointed to public office and to possess valuable estates; it could stretch right down the social scale even as far as alehouse keepers, who were usually expected to be on the margins of subsistence.\(^{87}\)

Moreover, while under the strictures of the 1652 Act of Oblivion individuals’ martial activities prior to 1649 could not in themselves be treated as criminal acts, when a person was suspected of being an ongoing threat to state security their prior military service was often cited in evidence and articles against them, alongside more concrete proof of their misdemeanours. For example, in 1656, the anonymous informant who gave information against John Brotherton, a Lancashire gentleman suspected of treason and conspiracy, chose to relay not just Brotherton’s recent misconduct but also his transactions during the wars. These included keeping a house as a garrison for the King and furnishing the Royalist cause with both money and men.\(^{88}\) Given that the ringleaders of several armed rebellions during the early- and mid-1650s were Royalist veterans – not least the leaders of the Gerard plot and Penruddock’s rising – it is perhaps understandable that Brotherton’s former military service was considered relevant to the case against him.\(^{89}\) The papers of Cromwell’s chief of intelligence, John Thurloe, bristle with statements given against suspected rebels that include information of a similar kind.\(^{90}\) When, in 1655, the gunsmith Oliver Williams gave information against one Mr Fryer, he relayed an incident from six years earlier and then explicitly justified this foray into the recent past, stating that ‘though the act for indemnity may have pardoned the said Fryer for past offences, yet [he] thought it necessary to declare how great and inveterate an enemy the said Fryer was and still remains’.\(^{91}\) Even lack of service could be thought worthy of a mention. In 1655, Richard Escott, a carpenter from Carhampton in Somerset, was accused of contravening a recent proclamation that former Royalists should not keep arms and other ‘argumentative’ behaviours. In his information against Escott, Lewis Everand stated that he believed Escott to be ‘a Malignant in the harte’.\(^{92}\) The evidence? That when, five years previously, Captain Bryant had been
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recruiting men to fight against the Scots at Worcester, Escott had ‘refused to list himselfe for yt Service and soe did two other of his brothers and he did diswad other men also’.  

The tendency to recall an individual’s wartime service was not restricted to cases – like suspected conspiracy – where it had some discernible relevance to the matter at hand. Rather, people continued to refer to the wartime activities of others in a wide range of legal cases throughout the 1650s. When, in 1657, the ale seller Robert Shingler was hauled before the Cheshire quarter sessions for brewing ale and allowing drunken disorder on the Sabbath, the presentment against him included the additional detail that Shingler was ‘a man in armes for the late King and was at the killing of Capt. Richard Litler in his quarters in Little Leigh and plundering the town’.  

This was a particularly damning recollection, for such an act contravened contemporary standards of acceptable wartime conduct, but it did not possess any strict legal relevance to the case brought against him. In the same year, the minister for the parish of Potterspury in Northamptonshire, Joseph Newell, presented charges against a local man, Robert Clarke, for a variety of moral offences ranging from blasphemy to absence from church, including an article which stated that Clarke was a man ‘that hath often fled from the parliaments protection, unto the late King’s and his forces’ during the 1640s.  

Similarly, when, in 1653, the Yorkshire man Thomas Dickinson gave information against his neighbour, Robert Watters, claiming that Watters had caused a disturbance in church and attempted to assault his family, he also chose to mention that Watters had ‘beene in arms against the Parliament, and an inveterate eniemy to them and all there friends’. 

As late as 1659, the husbandman Thomas Riddell supplied an information against his disorderly neighbour, Abraham Abberly, that made reference to his Civil War allegiance. Following a lengthy and detailed description of Abberly’s destruction of enclosures and the insults he had directed at local officials, Riddell concluded his account with a seemingly unrelated observation: ‘and further this Examin[an]t sayeth the sayd Abberly was a Trumpeter in ye Late Queenes Army against ye Parliam[en]t’. This reference to the Queen’s
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army seems to be a local variation, for it recurs in several other records in the Staffordshire quarter sessions but not elsewhere. It probably refers to the convoy of troops that moved southwards from York and through Staffordshire in 1643, accompanied by Queen Henrietta Maria. This incident received a significant amount of coverage in the Parliamentarian press at the time, not least because of the large number of French troops within the army’s ranks. The fears of cruel foreign mercenaries that were stoked by this material may help to account for its powerful mental afterlife in the areas affected.

There are two possible explanations for the prevalence of references to other people’s Civil War service in legal testimonies. First, there can be little doubt that, in many instances, informants chose to refer to a defendant’s wartime conduct in the hope of bolstering the case against them. For, as we have seen, former Royalists, though technically pardoned, remained subject to ongoing suspicion. In these circumstances, people perhaps believed that the case against a disorderly alehouse keeper, ungodly parishioner, or violent neighbour would be strengthened if they were shown to be one of the King’s erstwhile supporters. Although the extent to which the state’s opponents were ejected from local commissions of the peace varied both between localities and over time, various regional studies indicate that, at the very least, actively hostile magistrates and justices were removed, either directly, through purges, or indirectly, owing to the requirement that they take the Engagement Oath. As a result, when people gave informations to their local justice they could generally expect to be addressing a broadly loyalist audience.

A second interpretation is that the transactions of the wars, and their neighbours’ place within them, remained of such acute psychological significance to some citizens that they became embedded in their descriptive discourses. That is, people chose to recall wartime service less as a deliberate tactic, and more because it remained part of their everyday frame of reference, alongside names, occupations and so on. This interpretation is lent weight by the fact several diarists from the period also exhibited a propensity to describe people with reference to their Civil War allegiance, and, in these instances, it is less plausibly understood as a contrivance aimed at influencing the authorities. For example, in June 1653, the minister Thomas

Larkham, a zealous puritan who had received a less than enthusiastic reception from his rather more conservative Tavistock congregation, recorded in his diary that the doors of his church had been shut against him ‘by Hawksworth a late trooper in the Kings army’. 102 Similarly, when Adam Eyre described his stay at Otley in 1648, he noted that he ‘lay at one Tho[mas] Barker’s, an honest roundhead, I think’, and in an entry relaying the events of Christopher Love’s trial in July 1651 Ralph Josselin referred to Cornet George Joyce as ‘one Joyce that commanded the guard that surprized the King at Holmeby’. 103

On the other side of the coin, people often chose to recall their support for the Parliamentary cause as a way of demonstrating their credentials as loyal citizens of the republic. On some occasions, such recollections were a direct by-product of government policies that sought to constrain the actions of former Royalists. For example, the additional regulations introduced in the aftermath of Penruddock’s rising in March 1655 included tight restrictions on former Royalists’ freedom of movement, and, as a precaution against undue molestation, some Parliamentarian veterans travelled with certificates that affirmed their wartime service. 104 Thus, when, in 1656, the Bristol merchant John Crove travelled into the nearby county of Somerset he bore a character statement signed by four men – including the Bristol freeman Robert Purnell and the Major Walter Deyes – which stated that he was during the tyme of the late warrs […] very faithfull to the parlia[m]en[t] party and the interest of the Comonwealth and was in Armes at ye taking of Cirencestre and carried there by prince Rupert (prisoner) to Oxford where he remained till he was redeemed by fyne, and that during the tyme ye Kings forces held Bristol he was a great sufferer in his estate for his good affeccon to the Parliam[en]t, and was in Armes with the Glouc[ester]shire men at ye taking of Bristol by S[i]r Thomas Fairfax, And we doe believe and are of opinion that he still retiene[n]e ye saime affecon. 105

In this account, specific details of Crove’s military actions, financial contributions, and imprisonment were woven together in a statement intended to facilitate free movement by setting out his past and present loyalty to the republic.

102 Susan Hardman Moore (ed.), The Diary of Thomas Larkham, 1647-1669 (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2011), p. 67
105 SHC Q/SR/94/11.
On other occasions, the decision to recount past Parliamentarian service was less the side effect of a specific government policy than an attempt to demonstrate one’s good affection to the state more generally. When, in April 1655, Thomas Smith, the servant of a wool-draiper, was examined on suspicion of involvement in the previous month’s insurrection he defended himself not only by rebuffing the details of the accusation but by stating that ‘in case he would at all have risen, it should have been for the lord protector against the enemy, for that he hath been formerly in arms under captain Pyott, in the service of the commonwealth’. 106 Similarly, when Joseph Longbottom was examined about the aborted rising at Marston Moor in 1655, he claimed that he had refused to join with the rebels because he ‘had lost two brothers in the parliament’s service, and had been himself too, [and] he would never be false to them now’. 107 In the spring of 1650, the innkeeper Samuel Andrews denied fomenting a plot against the government, noting in his defence that ‘neyther himselfe or eytehr of his sonnes did ev[er] assist or serve under the Cavaliers’. 108 While, as we have seen, former Royalist service was often cited as evidence against those individuals suspected of threatening state security, when people had served for the Parliament – or simply not served against them – this could form an important part of their defence.

Indeed, petitioners hoping for sympathetic treatment by local justices often referred to the various deeds they had performed in support of the Parliament, both martial and financial, particularly if these actions could be shown to have contributed to their current predicament. In 1649, Anthony Whatly petitioned the Wiltshire quarter sessions for their help in securing a place of habitation. In his request, Whatly was careful to include details of both his extensive Parliamentarian service and the loss of a cottage belonging to his wife, which had been burnt down by the King’s forces. 109 Similarly, when Randle Shewyn petitioned the Cheshire Court of Great Sessions for the reduction of several fines that had been placed on his two youngest sons, he chose to begin his request with a lengthy account of his and his family’s wartime activities. This included the claim that one son had needed six bones taking out of his arm after he sustained a wound fighting for the Parliament at Beeston Castle. 110

In 1652, the yeoman Thomas Pile petitioned the Essex quarter sessions for a licence to run an alehouse. In his request, he explained that though this was something he was ‘loath to stoope
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to’, it was necessary because he had ‘freelye and willingly’ supplied over 300 pounds worth of goods to Sir William Waller’s troops and lost another 600 pounds to plunder by the King’s forces who, on hearing ‘how freely yo[u]r pet[i]tioner did lay himselfe out for the Parliam[en]t’, then also had him imprisoned.\(^{111}\) By recounting his significant wartime losses and making multiple references to the willingness with which he had gifted his goods to the Parliament, Pile sought to demonstrate both his economic necessity and political fidelity. Similarly, in January 1651, a statement supplied to the Somerset quarter sessions in support of Henry Gateway’s request for an alehouse licence referred not only to the establishment’s practical advantages, such as its location on the main road to Bristol, but also the fact that Gateway himself ‘hath adventured his life and fortune in the service of the Parliam[en]t’\(^{112}\). A licence was duly granted. Indeed, the frequency with which a person’s services for the Parliament featured in requests for alehouse licences from across the country suggests that Civil War allegiance was often judged to be a relevant factor when deciding whether a person was of sufficient ‘honesty’ or ‘good credit’ to run an establishment, even prior to the more demanding regulations introduced in some counties during the rule of the major-generals.\(^ {113}\) Such cases emphasise that the formal legal significance attached to a person’s wartime actions represents only a small fraction of the ways in which Civil War allegiances retained ongoing relevance in the lives of ordinary English men and women during the 1650s.

In reality, of course, former Parliamentarian service was no guarantee of continuing loyalty, just as former Royalism was no fail-safe guide to disaffection. When, in 1654, John Dallington gave information about a thwarted anti-government plot he noted that one of the conspirators, a Parliamentarian veteran, had reflected that ‘he had fought for his liberty, but had none, and that it was as good living in Turky as here’.\(^ {114}\) On the same note, the decision to recall either a neighbour’s former Royalism or one’s own Parliamentary service cannot necessarily be equated with fidelity to the state. For, as we have seen, people chose to remember former service for a variety of reasons, some of which – the removal of an unpopular official, the conviction of a disorderly neighbour, the desire for favourable treatment – had little do to with their loyalty, or otherwise, to the wider republic. While for some people their own military service and the actions of their former enemies remained of
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acute personal significance, to others the evocation of wartime allegiance was simply a means to an end.

Wartime memories were not, however, restricted to the service and allegiance of individuals. People also remembered the transactions of the wars themselves, and these recollections often exhibited a considerable degree of heterogeneity. The remainder of this chapter is concerned with the memory of Civil War events.

iii. From Edgehill to Execution: Memories of Civil War Events

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the event of the recent revolution that recurred most frequently in reports of dangerous speech from across the country was also the most extraordinary: the execution of Charles I. Usually, these references to the regicide took the form of a heated outburst by an individual speaking ill either of the state or its servants. In this respect, the words uttered by Nicholas Wiltshire to the husbandman John Napper during the year 1650 were fairly typical. Wiltshire apparently told Napper that ‘they that did put the king to death were all Rogues and he did hope to see the confounding of them, and their throates cutt’. 115 The yeoman Paul Williams and his wife Mary were indicted by the Middlesex quarter sessions for publicly declaring ‘that all those that belonged to the Parliament, Councell of State, and the High Court of Justice are rogues and murthers of the late King’, while in February 1656 the victualler Roger Plumstead was reported for saying that the army were ‘murthering rogues, that they had murdered their King, and that their hands were soe dipt in blood they could not wash it off’. 116

The use of the term ‘murder’ was common in hostile verbal reflections on the death of the King, and reveals the way in which many contemporaries understood this event. 117 For in mid-seventeenth-century England, as today, to describe a person’s fate as ‘murder’ had normative as well as descriptive force; it implied an unjust, wrongful element to the infliction of death. Though the Commonwealth state had made significant efforts to present the King’s trial as conforming to the due process of law, to men like Wiltshire, Williams, and Plumstead it nevertheless appeared to be little more than butchery.

115 SHC Q/SR/82/154.
117 See also TNA ASSI 45/5/4/7; Thurloe, vi, p. 570; Dobson (ed.), The Diary of John Evelyn, ii, p. 8; CRO DDX 384/1, p. 3; BL Add MS 37719 f. 199r.
Indeed, some people went beyond the latent constitutionalism inherent in such statements to express a definite opinion about the legal status of the King’s death, often articulating arguments of marked political complexity. One such man was the London tailor John Norris, who, in 1650, explicitly stated that ‘the late Kinge was illegally put to death’ and went on to say that ‘the power which they [i.e. the Commonwealth] have is mayntained only by the sword, and that they doe seek to infringe the libertye of the subjects, which they did formerly promise to maintaine’.\(^\text{118}\) Here, Norris passed judgement not only on the legality of the regicide but on the legitimacy of military force as a source of political authority, striking at the very foundations of the republican state. In 1657, Thomas Duncomb was reported to the authorities for conspiring against the government and for saying that the Lord Protector ‘came by the power he had, by rebellion and murther; and that he put the king to death for tyranny, and reigns by an army himself’, while Nathaniel Bunch, a cobbler’s servant, allegedly told a customer that he hoped to see the Lord Protector ‘suffer at Whitehall gate as the late King did’ because ‘the protector had a hand in putting the king to death, and now acteth the same things that the king did’.\(^\text{119}\) In both cases, the tyranny for which Charles I was supposedly executed was likened to the rule of the Lord Protector, casting doubt on the motives of the regicides and on the legitimacy of Cromwell’s regime. By recalling the regicide, people were able to express not only their disapprobation for the events of the past but also their discontent with the politics of the present.

In Somerset in 1651, Ann Barter’s comment that there was a ‘Companye of Rogues in the parlia[men]t house, that had hanged the Kinge’ embroiled her in debate with one of her companions, Mary Wadden, over the veracity of her account.\(^\text{120}\) First, Wadden responded with a correction – ‘they had not hanged but beheaded him’. She then went on to offer her own opinion on the matter, stating that it would have been far better ‘if he [Charles] had beene beheaded before he was married’, a comment presumably motivated by an anti-Catholic sentiment levelled at Queen Henrietta Maria.\(^\text{121}\) The incident suggests that on some occasions memories of the regicide could become more than just straightforward articulations of discontent; they could also prompt reflection, discussion, and debates amongst neighbours over the memory and meaning of the recent past.

\(^{118}\) Jeaffreson et al., *Middlesex County Records*, iii, p. 195.
\(^{119}\) Thurloe, vi, pp. 570, 624-625.
\(^{120}\) SHC Q/SR/83/176.
\(^{121}\) Ibid.
In laying the blame at the feet of a ‘Companye of Rogues in the Parliament house’, Barter’s explanation tallied with the Royalist press of the early 1650s, which assigned culpability for both the wars and the regicide to a traitorous faction within the Parliament.\(^{122}\) It was not, however, the only interpretation available. In March 1650, Martyn Everard, from Malmesbury in Wiltshire, expressed the view that it was in fact the Brownists and the Anabaptists, specifically, that had ‘undone the Kinge and this kingdome with theire practices’.\(^ {123}\) This line of thought reflected that of a speech given by Charles I himself in 1642, in which he had told his assembled troops that they should ‘meet with no Enemies, but Traitours, most of them Brownists, Anabaptists, and Atheists’.\(^ {124}\)

The extent to which printed material could frame memories of the King’s death, an event which relatively few people would actually have witnessed first-hand, is perhaps most clearly illustrated by a journal entry which Isabella Lady Twysden, wife of the sequestered Royalist Sir Roger Twysden, penned in her almanac for the year 1649. In her richly vivid account Twysden described how, on 30 January, a scaffold had been erected near the banqueting house at Whitehall and that

\[
\text{betwene 1 and 2 a clock in the afternone, when he was one the scaffold a flite of wild ducks came and flew over till his head was off, then thay flew awaye, a drack first stoping downe and touching his bill on the block, as many sad that was thereby at the time, and some the soulder stricke, and shuts at them, but hit none as many sed that was thereby.}\]

\(^{125}\)

What is most striking about this narrative, beyond the peculiarity of the story itself, is how closely it conforms to accounts of the execution circulating in the Royalist press. The Anglican minister Henry Leslie, for example, wrote in a contemporary printed sermon that at the time of the execution the ducks ‘forsook their pond at St James, and came as far as Whitehall, fluttering about the scaffold’.\(^ {126}\) It may be these kinds of text, as opposed to any eyewitness informant, that Twysden had in mind when she referred to the ‘many thereby’. In her account of the regicide, Tywsden exhibits not only a desire to record this momentous event but to describe it, and, in so doing, she demonstrates the way in which printed media could infuse and influence people’s representations and recollections of the recent past.

---
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Also remembered with relative frequency were the actions of the Scots. For example, when, in 1654, the Yorkshireman Richard Leigh became embroiled in a dispute with a local churchwarden over the payment of church lays he apparently declared ‘is Cromwell gott to bee Lord Protector [?] if hee be my Lord P[ro]tector he will sell us all as the Scotts sould the Kinge for sil[ver] hee havinge beene always a soldier of fortune’. Here, Leigh recalled an incident that had occurred in 1647 – the Scottish Covenanters handing the King over to Parliament following his rejection of the Newcastle Propositions – and used it to exemplify the kind of untrustworthy behaviour he expected from Cromwell. The surrender of Charles by the Scots was an event that had been well-covered in contemporary print and the language in which Leigh chose to describe it, especially his use of the verb ‘sold’, adhered closely to the way it had been characterised in wider discourses, both Royalist and Parliamentarian. In these accounts, the Scots’ actions were frequently described as a sale and likened to Judas’ betrayal of Jesus to the Jews, and this remains the lens through which Leigh remembered the event seven years later.

Meanwhile, when, in 1651, Thomas Tutin of Knaresborough in Yorkshire was accused of the murder of an elderly Scottish woman, he was reported to have defended his actions by saying that ‘ye woemen in Scotland had murthered many English and sayd that he would kill more of them if they came his way’. Tutin was a Parliamentarian trooper, and it is therefore quite possible that his words referred to a specific incident which he had witnessed, though evidence that corroborates his claim that Scottish women performed acts of such violence is yet to be found. Alternatively, Tutin may have been influenced by the reports of alleged massacres committed by Irish and Welsh women and had come to connect these acts, via a slide of association, with Scottish women too. In either case, that Tutin chose to locate his
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actions in the context of the apparently ruthless deeds committed by the Scots emphasises the powerful mental afterlife of their actions among the English populace, as well as the sometimes slippery line between memory and myth.

Such hostility towards the Scots, while common, was not universal. In the winter of 1651, Alice Harnat put a rather more positive spin on the actions of the Scottish forces when she said that ‘shee hoped the Scots would come again to cut all there [i.e. the Parliamentarians’] throats’. The timing is significant here, as this incident occurred shortly after Charles Stuart and the Scottish Covenanters were defeated at the Battle of Worcester. It was probably this joint venture that the word ‘again’ referred to and which explains why, for Harnat, the Scots functioned as a locus of hope and resistance as opposed to hostility and fear. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that, in spite of her approbation, Harnat continued to refer to the Scots as a distinct military force, separate from (even if allied to) the King’s own troops. Even in alliance, established ethnic divisions persisted. This case, like all the other examples relating to the Scots given here, comes from the north of the country where the Scots had been particularly active and visible during the wars. This geographic concentration suggests that an area’s localised experience shaped, at least in part, the events which its inhabitants were likely to remember, especially when these events were, like the sale of the King or the 1651 Scottish invasion, also of national import.

Other events that people recalled in the course of reported speech included military engagements, the Irish rebellion, and significant political events that had occurred in the run-up to the wars. As with the memories of the Scots and the regicide, these incidents were not remembered in homogenous ways. In the year 1657, a discussion between two men in Sussex turned to the events of the previous decade. On hearing Henry Woodcocke express his ongoing sympathy for the Royalist cause, his companion apparently responded that ‘the cavaliers had had fighting enough, wherein God was always against them’. He continued that the Parliament had ‘conquered the cavalier party at Marston-Moore, at Naseby, Cheriton, Oxford and all places else, where God had given signal testimonies of his power against the

---
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late king’s party’. Here, Woodcocke’s interlocutor expressed a providential interpretation of the Parliament’s military successes that conformed closely to the account proffered by its supporters, both in thanksgiving sermons and in print more generally. Though this correspondence may be one of correlation, not causation, it is again suggestive of the extent to which people’s memories of past events may have been coloured by the interpretations circulating in broader public discourses.

By contrast, the unknown speaker at a 1656 prayer meeting advocating multiple reforms, including the reduction of ‘tyrannous’ taxes and rates, justified their demands by arguing that it was the ‘faith of their prayer, which prevailed as much in the victorys of Naseby, Edge-hill, Newberry and Dunbarre, as Cromwell and his army’. This claim directly subverted the government’s preferred version of events, in which the Parliament’s Civil War victories were a sign of God’s support for Cromwell and the Protectorate government. By claiming at least partial responsibility for these victories, the speaker sought to marshal a providential interpretation of past military successes to buttress their own radical cause.

Meanwhile, in 1658, Ralph Smalwood, a yeoman from Egton in Yorkshire, fell into discourse with John Hitchmough, a clerk from the same town. Conversation turned to the events of the Irish rebellion seventeen years earlier, and Smalwood was reported to have spoken ‘of the evill cariage of things by the late king in Ireland when the rebellion was’ and declared that Charles I had employed ‘an army raised against the rebels in Ireland, to fight the protestants there’. This was a claim that Hitchmough strongly denied. Their dialogue suggests not only that people continued to discuss the events of the previous decade but that the memory and meaning of these transactions could be contested well into the 1650s. Similarly, in 1655, two former neighbours, Robert Gay and Bernard Waite, fell into conversation while on their way to London and quickly became embroiled in a debate over the actions of Charles Stuart. In the course of their discussion, Gay argued that the young Stuart was ‘guilty of high misdemeanors, as bringing in of the Scots army to Worcester, and fought against the parliament’s army’ and that if he were to be found in the country again he would likely incur ‘the same fate as his father’. An angry Waite retorted that Charles had only come in ‘as

---
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heir of the kingdom, and to seek his own right’ and that he was ‘innocent from all crimes’. Gay was sufficiently disquieted by the exchange that he subsequently reported it to the authorities, and his statement concluded with an avowal of his own ‘faithfulness to the commonwealth’ he ‘having [sic] actually served in arms against the publick enemy in Taunton and other places’.140

The tendency to recall the events of the turbulent recent past is not only discernible in cases of reported speech. The puritan minister Ralph Josselin, from Earls Colne in Essex, recorded significant military and political incidents in his diary on the anniversary of the date they had occurred. On the 4 January 1649, he wrote that ‘this day 7 yeares King Charles came to demand the 5 members, and it was thought with an intencion to have offered violence to the house’.141 The 23 October 1653 saw him note two such incidents – ‘this day 12 y(ear): the Irish rebellion: 11 y: the fight at Edgehill, the lord good to us in all our outward mercies’.142 This practice reflected the well-established almanac convention of printing notable events that had happened on a particular date within the relevant monthly calendar.

Prior to the Civil Wars, almanac calendars generally featured relatively few events from within living memory. Those events that did feature were relatively consistent: births and deaths of royalty, the beginning and end of reigns, meteorological marvels, and triumphs over foreign neighbours or domestic plots, especially the gunpowder plot, the Spanish armada, and the expedition to Cadiz. During the 1640s and 1650s, however, recent events – and particularly those of the domestic conflicts – came to be significantly over-represented.143 The way these incidents were framed often had clear political undertones. For example, while various Parliamentarian almanac compilers referred to the Battle of Naseby as a ‘memorable
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143 The calendar in the 1654 edition of Merlinus, Cambro Brittannus contained no fewer than 62 such events out of a total of 84. John Smith’s almanac for 1652 exhibited a similar single-mindedness; at least 119 events from a total of 159. See Schardanus Rider, Merlinus, Cambro-Britannus. Or the British Merlin demonstrating the true revolution of the year (London, 1654; Wing / A2243A), sig. B1-C4; John Smith, A new almanack and prognostication or the yeare of our Lord God, MDCLII (London, 1652; Wing / A2394), sig. A4v-B8r. For further discussion of the representation of the Civil Wars in almanacs and almanac annotations see Imogen Peck, “A chronology of some memorable accidents”: The Representation of the Recent Past in English Almanacs, 1648-1660, Historical Research (forthcoming 2018).
victory’, and a success ‘obtained by the honourable Fairfax’, to the Royalist George Wharton it was a ‘fatall blow’.144

However, it is evident from surviving almanac annotations that some readers could be as critical of these printed accounts as they were the opinions of their neighbours. For example, the anonymous, but probably contemporary, annotator of John Booker’s 1648 almanac chose to correct the printed description ‘Hereford taken by stratagem’ with a single word – ‘Treacherie’.145 The Parliament’s capture of the Royalist stronghold of Hereford in December 1645 had been achieved by sneaking troopers from the nearby Gloucester garrison into the city disguised as ice-breaking labourers. Though the Parliament immortalised their great victory in the pamphlet A New Tricke to Take Townes, Royalists regarded the loss of Hereford as the result of duplicity.146 This duality of interpretation is reflected in the contrast between the printed note and the annotator’s correction. Readers could add to, as well as dissent from, these texts. The owner of a copy of John Smith’s 1652 almanac (possibly, though not conclusively, the Oxford antiquarian Anthony Wood) supplemented the calendar’s printed entries with additional details: alongside ‘Scots routed by L. Gen Cromwell 1650’, they added the words ‘at Dunbar in Scotland. The same day 1651 K: Charles beaten at Worsester and the same day and same yeare Dundee taken Dundee stormed 1651’.147

Any attempt by the government to control the way in which the wars were remembered through public commemoration was fraught with similar potential for subversion. The hostile responses prompted by the national day of thanksgiving held on the anniversary of the King’s death in the year 1651 are clear examples. Though the government’s orders for the day stated that this was an occasion to give thanks ‘for the wonderful mercies and signal salvations’ of the previous year, carefully avoiding any explicit reference to Charles I’s death, the occasion

---
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nevertheless prompted antagonism. George Holdroyd, the minister for Foston in Derbyshire, was reported to the authorities by several different members of his congregation for having said, variously, that ‘it was rather a day of mourning’, that ‘there was nothing now, but cuttinge of throates’, and that the ‘slaughteringe and killinge one another of our [bre]thren […] was no cause of rejoicinge, alledginge some chapters and verses to prove the same as […] how David mourned and fasted for Saul, Jonathan and Abner when they were slayne’. Similarly, in February 1651, one William Farthing gave evidence against his local minister, Mr Loullurd, claiming that he had made the 30 January ‘A day of unthankfulnes or of disorder […] by Goeing about to make it Apeare by [manuscript damaged] Expressions That there was noe such Ackaysion […] as was pretened’. Moreover, he had said that the current government

Exersisse nothing but Opression and Tiarranny […] and order […] nothing but disorder nothing but Butchering and routing […] continuing raging for the space of A our [i.e. an hour] and upwards In Thesse and such like Expressions to the disonner of our Government And to the dishartining of those that did desire to be thankful And to the Incourraging of there Ennemis.

Some members of the public went even further, establishing their own alternative commemorations of the date. William Juxon, William Sanderson, and other Royalist Anglicans met privately every 30 January and ‘compil’d a private form of service for the day’ which was said to closely resemble the annual days of remembrance held on the same date after the Restoration. John Evelyn recorded in his diary that news of the King’s death had struck him ‘with such horror that I kept the day of his martyrdom a fast’, as did the Presbyterian curate Luke Milbourne. Both John Sharp Senior and the Cornish vicar Thomas Flavell vowed never to shave their beards again as a sign of mourning, while the former marshal of Shrewsbury, John Tench, swore not to cut his hair until Charles Stuart was
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restored to the throne. Even more idiosyncratic was the response of doctor Robert Ashton, who, after the regicide, claimed to be able to heal the king’s evil (scrofula) and reportedly memorialised the day of the King’s death not just annually but monthly ‘in a long white garment, with other ceremonies’.

Other public thanksgiving days met with similar hostility. When, in 1652, Edward Peerce presented a petition to the Somerset quarter sessions against Mr Francklen, minister for Doulting, one of his complaints was that Francklen had refused to observe the days of thanksgiving appointed by the Parliament. Indeed, on the day of thanksgiving for the victory at the Battle of Worcester he had absented himself from church entirely and instead spent the whole day in an alehouse. John Boyer exhibited the same spirit of non-compliance, and, in 1649, he was presented before the Cheshire Court of Great Sessions for ‘not observeinge orders and edicts for dayes of thanksgivinge and humiliation since the death of the late kinge’. When the Norfolk minister Mr Atkins received of a copy of the act that designated 29 August 1649 as a day of thanksgiving for the state’s victories in Ireland, including the siege at Drogheda, he stamped on the paper and declared that the sheriff should not ‘trouble him w[i]th such fidle fadles […] here is a victory to give thanks for; w[hi]ch is but the taking of a Forte’. Meanwhile, in 1658, several inhabitants of West Bromwich complained to the Staffordshire quarter sessions that while their minister Richard Hilton had preached on the thanksgiving ‘for his late high[ness]’ personall deliverance’ he had ‘never mencond his s[ai]d High[ness] nor his deliverance’ and ‘very much slighted, necklected and p[ro]phained’ the occasion. Such disobedience was sufficiently prevalent that, in the autumn of 1650, the Parliament ordered the Council of State to write to the militia commissioners, requesting that they provide the names of those ministers who failed to keep the days of thanksgiving, or who, ‘by preaching on that day, did deprave the present government’.

Even when ministers conformed to the government’s orders for a particular day, they could receive short thrift from the more hostile members of their congregations. In 1655, one Dr
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Dunne insulted a Wiltshire minister, saying that he should be turned out of his parsonage for preaching a sermon of thanksgiving for the Parliament’s victory at the Battle of Worcester and that such ‘parliament men did deserve to have their heads some of them cut off’.  

In an unusual case from 1651, John Adersley found himself before the Cheshire quarter sessions accused of attempting to subvert the meaning of the celebratory cannon fire that marked the Commonwealth’s victories over the Scottish and Irish. According to his neighbour, Randle Bathoe, Adersley had asked ‘the cause why the gunnes went off [in Chester] that nighte’, and when Bathoe replied that he did not know, Aldersley said ‘I’ll tell you newes (Judge Mackworth Gov’ner of Chrewsbury wil bee hanged, and I hope to live to see him and many more such rogues hanged)’.  

The governor to whom Aldersley referred was Humphrey Mackworth, the Parliamentarian governor of Shrewsbury, condemned by royal proclamation in 1642 but who died of wholly natural causes in 1654. Nor was this an isolated incident. On a subsequent occasion, Aldersley reportedly said several times that ‘the shutting off of the Canons was but a flash to incourage the Souldiers to goe ov’r into Irleand, but they would bee sconded when they came thiter’.

In this case, the cannon fire was reinterpreted not as a celebration of a mythical Royalist victory, but as a duplicitous effort by the Commonwealth to recruit soldiers for the wars in Ireland. On both occasions, Aldersley was prompted by a display of celebration for the Commonwealth’s victories to wilfully misinterpret its meaning and instead articulate an explanation that was hostile to the state’s cause. While Ralph Josselin celebrated a day of thanksgiving for the victories in Ireland by ‘rejoycing in god, who hath given them bloud to drinke, who had shed themselves so much’, for the republic’s opponents such occasions could inspire dissent rather than devotion.

**Conclusion**

The evidence presented in this chapter suggests that the events of the Civil Wars remained alive in the minds and discourses of the men and women of republican England throughout the 1650s. The choice to resort to the law – whether to petition, give information, or report the words of an acquaintance – was not a common occurrence for any particular individual. However, the frequency with which those who did so referred to the transactions of the
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internecine conflict suggests the significant extent to which people continued to recall, discuss, and deploy their memories of the recent past, as well as the many purposes that these memories could serve.

To some extent, the very nature of the post-war settlement, in which a person’s former service retained some legal and administrative relevance, helped to foster some of these recollections, particularly memories of wartime allegiance and service. Importantly, however, as this chapter has sought to emphasise, the propensity to remember wartime service was not – or not only – a side effect of government regulations. Many individuals and communities were fiercely critical of successive governments’ attempts to reintegrate former Royalists and could be rather more zealous than the national authorities in their efforts to penalise them, even if their motives were sometimes as much practical and tactical as they were partisan. By dwelling on notable examples of post-war reconciliation and amelioration between enemies, historians like Charles Carlton and Barbara Donagan have obscured the extent to which Civil War allegiances remained of ongoing significance for much of the English populace, both as a source of identity and hostility.166

In this respect, republican England may be regarded as one of the earliest exemplars of a point that has recently been recognised by scholars of modern post-war states, namely, that governments have a quite limited capacity to control or suppress wartime memory, and, consequently, the extent to which reconciliation and reintegration is achieved on the ground.167 As the social scientist Luc Huyse notes, ‘legal forgetting […] does not touch hearts and souls’, and the 1652 Act of Oblivion certainly did not prevent people from remembering either their own wartime deeds or those of others in a wide range of circumstances.168 Cases of reported speech indicate that the transactions of the wars remained a subject of discussion and debate, and while some people’s memories were influenced by interpretations


167 For example, shortly after World War Two, France and the Netherlands issued amnesty laws for those who had collaborated with the Germans in a move to bury the past and speed up reconciliation and national unity, but these did little to stem wider hostility towards former collaborators. The amnesty policies introduced to several Latin American countries in the 1980s were equally ineffective and did not discourage the families of victims from demanding justice and retribution. See Luc Huyse, ‘The Process of Reconciliation’, in Reconciliation after Violent Conflict: A Handbook, ed. by David Bloomfield, Teresa Barnes, and Luc Huyse (Stockholm: Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 2003), pp. 19-39 (p. 26).
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circulating in wider public discourses, individuals also had the capacity to subvert, reject, and even contribute to public scripts. In sharp contrast to Matthew Neufeld’s claim that the ‘reading public’ of Restoration of England ‘would learn the lessons […] government sanctioned] writings offered, and embrace the principles they exemplified’, the wartime recollections that people expressed during the 1650s were significantly more diverse.\textsuperscript{169} While people’s memories were not limited to local events, an area’s experience could influence both the events that people chose to recall and the way in which these were remembered; the invasion of the Scots and the passage of the Queen’s army through the Midlands had a stronger mental afterlife in the northern counties and in Staffordshire, respectively. Moreover, there is evidence to suggest that remembering the events of the wars was not the sole preserve of those who wished to express their approbation for or disapproval of past events: the conflict also became embedded in the descriptive discourses of the people. Thus, far from suffering ‘almost a form of amnesia’, the people of 1650s England continued to remember the turbulent events of the recent past.\textsuperscript{170} Hostilities did not cease when arms were laid aside, and memories of the Civil Wars functioned as both battlefields and weapons in republican England.

\textsuperscript{169} Neufeld, \textit{The Civil Wars after 1660}, p. 25.  
\textsuperscript{170} Carlton, \textit{Going to the Wars}, p. 344.
Chapter Four

Places of Memory

‘Should wee set up pillars in all places that God hath crowned with victories, our northern country would be as full of pillers as formerly of croses; witnesse, Welbecke, Bolsover, Wingfield, Sheffield, Walton, Montgomery, but especially Hull and Hessam [i.e. Marston] moore’.¹ So observed the puritan minister John Shaw in a sermon he delivered to the congregation of York Minster in late 1644 at the very height of Britain’s Civil Wars. Yet even after the Parliament’s apparently God-given victory, the execution of the King, and the establishment of a republican government in 1649 such structures were to remain entirely hypothetical: the vast majority of memorials were not erected on Britain’s Civil War battlefields until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.² Though the fields that staged even the bloodiest of battles were, in this respect, quickly reintegrated into the agrarian landscape, many sites of war nevertheless continued to exert a powerful psychological presence long after arms had been laid aside. Drawing on a wide range of sources, including civic records and churchwardens’ accounts, diaries and journals, petitions to both local and national authorities, monuments and epitaphs, and printed material, this chapter argues that memories of wartime events were often intimately connected with the physicality of the English landscape and that places functioned as both receptacles of, and prompts for, wartime memory well into the 1650s and beyond.

In his seminal essay on collective memory in twentieth-century France, Pierre Nora argued that the ‘acceleration of history’ – that is, the increasing velocity with which the life circumstances of individuals are transformed in the modern world, and the challenges this poses for a person’s grasp on their place in historical time – meant that memory was increasingly preserved through its attachment to shared signifiers that he terms ‘lieux de

memoire’, or ‘sites of memory’. While Nora was partially speaking metaphorically – a ‘site of memory’ may be a festival, a colour, an object – it is also often literally true, and much subsequent scholarship has dwelt on the relationship between place, memory, and commemoration, and particularly the construction and meaning of monuments and memorials in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

However, as Kate Chedgzoy has noted, the idea that places could act as the loci of memory is not one that would have been alien to the people of early modern England. For though Ian Atherton and Philip Morgan have convincingly shown that the religious changes sparked by the Reformation – especially the abolition of purgatory, pilgrimage, and intercessory prayers for the dead – challenged the concept of sacred space and had ultimately removed the theological need for memorials on battlefields by the time of the Civil Wars, in other respects people were acutely aware of the mnemonic power of the landscape. Works such as William Camden’s *Britannia* (1586), a chorography of England which used as sources not chronicles but monuments, transforming the whole of England into a vast memory space, and the commitment among scholars of the arts of memory to the use of places – both real and imaginary – to assist with recall, demonstrate that an understanding of memory as something that adheres to place was widely available in early modernity.

Indeed, as Adam Fox and Daniel Woolf have ably demonstrated, one of the most striking features of the perception of the past in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England was the extent to which it was inspired, nurtured, and perpetuated by the immediate physical environment. Distinctive landmarks, both natural and manmade, were the source of numerous local legends ranging from the historically plausible, such as the Roman ruins

---

which apparently denoted that the village of Overburrow in Lancashire had once been a far larger settlement, to fanciful tales of places inhabited by giants in times long past and natural features forged by demons and devils. In the words of Alexandra Walsham, this was an era in which ‘historical consciousness arguably revolved less around the passage of time than a sense of place’.

This chapter explores the ways in which places, and particularly places of war and wartime destruction, acted as sites of memory during the English republics. It is divided into three parts. The first section focuses on places that actively sought to commemorate their own localised wartime experience, with particular emphasis on the city of Gloucester, and considers the nature and purposes of these observations. The second section explores the ways in which the events of the wars became inscribed on the English landscape, both literally and figuratively, and argues that sites of war continued to exert considerable mnemonic power long after hostilities had ceased. The final section considers the impact of a very particular form of memory, monuments and memorials erected to commemorate deceased individuals, and suggests that these highly traditional structures could serve as lasting, and sometimes controversial, physical reminders of the divisions of the 1640s.

Taken as a whole, this chapter shows that the absence of battlefield war memorials did not necessarily mean that the sites of Britain’s domestic conflicts were straightforwardly ‘reabsorbed’ into the landscape, and argues that places acted as receptacles of, and prompts for, diverse forms of memory, from the collective and cultivated to the personal and painful.

These findings complicate some existing theories about the historical development of commemorative practices, and particularly the suggestion that the seventeenth century witnessed a large-scale shift from soil to ink as the main medium of memory. By viewing commemorative practices in the context of long-term historical trajectories, historians of commemoration have obscured those moments when the physical was, in spite of the widespread rhetoric about the power of the pen over stone and the absence of specific memorials, once again a powerful site of memory.

---

11 The term ‘reabsorbed’ is Atherton and Morgan’s. See Atherton and Morgan, ‘The Battlefield War Memorial’, p. 300.
12 Ibid., pp. 296-297.
i. ‘A City Assaulted by Man but saved by God’: Local Commemorations

On 14 June 1645, the Parliamentarian forces won a decisive victory at the Battle of Naseby. To mark the occasion, the Parliament issued orders that a day of thanksgiving should be held in all parts of England within Parliamentarian lines of communication, as had been decreed for other great victories. In Norwich, the occasion was kept with considerable zeal. In addition to holding services and shutting up shops, ceremonial gunshots were fired and the aldermen accompanied the Mayor to church dressed in their scarlet robes, observations that went above and beyond both what was required by the order and the rather more muted response of many other communities. After 1649, the observation of days of thanksgiving ordered by the Parliament became a national requirement, but there continued to be significant geographic variation in the enthusiasm with which these days were kept. In September 1649, the corporation of Northampton called an assembly to decide whether they should keep the thanksgiving that had recently been ordered to celebrate the state’s victories in Ireland. They agreed that the ministers of the town should mark the day but concluded that ‘it did not concern the Magistrate’. A minister was hired to preach for an hour, but the rest of the local clergymen refused to acknowledge the occasion, as did an estimated nine out of ten inhabitants.

The relative vigour with which commemorative occasions were celebrated was not the only way the memorial culture surrounding wartime events varied geographically. For though the Commonwealth government had ultimately decided not to establish an annual day of national commemoration to mark Britain’s domestic conflicts, some places were sufficiently keen to preserve the memory of the turbulent recent past that they created their own specific, localised commemorative occasions. Of these, one of the most notable was the commemoration of the raising of the siege of Gloucester in 1643, which was celebrated annually within the city throughout the 1640s and 1650s.

The summer of 1643 was the high point of the King’s military fortunes. In June and July, Royalist forces won commanding victories at Roundway Down and Adwalton Moor, and while there were many Parliamentarian strongholds still resisting – including Hull, Plymouth,

---

14 NRO NCR Case 16a/20 f. 453 v.
15 *A Modest Narrative of Intelligence [...] Fitted for the republique of England & Ireland*, no. 24, 8-15 September 1649 (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / 88:E.573[22]), p. 186.
16 Ibid. For further examples of resistance to national thanksgiving days see chapter three, pp. 177-180.
17 For further discussion of the state’s decision not to establish a national commemorative occasion see chapter one, pp. 75-77.
and Bristol – they were often isolated in areas under Royalist control. On 26 July, Prince Rupert successfully stormed Bristol. Gloucester alone now stood between the King and the entire Severn supply channel, and, after some indecision over whether to seize the city or march directly to London, Charles and his forces arrived outside Gloucester on 10 August. The King summoned the city to surrender but the garrison, which was under the command of the Parliamentarian governor Colonel Edward Massey, refused and the siege began. Following their swift victory at Bristol the Royalists anticipated a quick result, but the city held out for longer than expected. On 24 August, Charles again offered the city surrender terms, but these were once again rejected. By this time, beacons across the countryside suggested that relief was en route from London, and, on 5 September, troops under the command of the Earl of Essex marched down Prestbury Hill to lift the siege – and not a moment too soon, for the city was apparently down to its last few barrels of gunpowder. Not only had Gloucester successfully resisted the Royalist advance and been relieved in the very nick of time, but the casualties it had sustained during the siege were surprisingly light: not more than thirty people, most of whom had apparently been ‘shot in the head, in peeping through some holes at the enemy’. The relief was celebrated in the Parliamentarian press not just as a great military victory, but as a divine deliverance. The pamphlet Good newes from all quarters [...] particularly from Gloucester (1643) triumphantly reported that it was ‘the good hand of God, and His good will’ that had saved the city, while an account of the siege penned by Gloucester’s town clerk marvelled at the work of the Lord of Hosts ‘whose eye hath watched over us, and whose strong hand was with us [...] who made us a Citie of refuge to others, and hath now been a refuge to us in the time of our distresse’.


19 The exact number varies between accounts – three in John Dorney’s account, but only two according to the newsbook Mercurius Britannicus. See John Dorney, A brief and exact relation of the most material and remarkable passages that hapned in the late well-formed (and as valiantly defended) siege before Glocester (London, 1643; Wing / D1931), p. 13; Mercurius Britannicus, no. 4, 12-19 September 1643 (Unknown, 1643; Thomason / 12:E.67[26]), p. 29.

20 Henry Foster, ‘A true relation of the diurnall marchings of the red and blew regiments’, in Bibliotheca Gloucestrensis: A Collection of Scarce and Curious Tracts Relating to the County and City of Gloucester, ed. by John Washbourn (Gloucester: Washbourn and Son, 1823), p. 261. This estimated fatality figure is confirmed by the absence of any increase in deaths recorded in the surviving parish registers. See Atkin and Laughlin, Gloucester and the Civil War, p. 137.

21 Anon., Good newes from all quarters of the kingdome; particularly from Gloucester (London, 1643; Thomason / E.250[9]), sig. A2v; Dorney, A brief and exact relation, p. 14.
In this spirit of gratitude for God’s mercy, in 1644 Gloucester’s Common Council ordered that 5 September ‘shall be observed in this City as a day of publique Thanksgivinge for the raising of the Siege’ and that ‘a memoriall of that deliverance the fifth of September yeerely henceforth shall be observed’. 22 As with national thanksgiving days, this was to be a primarily religious occasion. The order stipulated that to mark the day all masters and wardens of the city’s companies should process with the mayor to church both morning and evening, presumably to hear an appropriate sermon. 23 Sadly, the sermons themselves appear either not to have been printed or not to have survived. However, in a speech he gave at the annual election of officers just a few weeks later, the town clerk John Dorney quoted directly from the local minister Mr Halford, and, in so doing, gives a sense of their probable tone. Referring to the recent siege, the clerk told residents that

Your City is a famous City, famous for fidelity, and famous for constancy in the cause of God and of the Common-wealth. Yea, your City is a blessed City, a Domino Benedicta, the blessed of the Lord. He was in the midst of it, when the enemies besieged it; he fought for you when they fought against you; He in his great mercy preserved you from their great fury, and for it Benedictus sit Dominus, Let the lord be blessed. When your passages were stopt on earth, there remained a way open to heaven, to use the sweet expression of one of your Divines [Mr Halford]. 24

In short, the recent siege was evidence not just of the city’s loyalty to the Parliamentarian cause, and, by extension, to God, but of the divine favour which He had heaped upon the city and its inhabitants. Thus, the Council’s desire to commemorate Gloucester’s relief can partially be explained by a perceived theological duty to give thanks to the Lord for the mercies He had bestowed on them, and the corresponding onus on recipients to adequately remember them. 25 Dorney made this connection between acts of providence and the theological necessity of remembrance quite explicit. He claimed that ‘gracious acts of divine providence do deeply engage us [i.e. the people of Gloucester] to praise the Lord of Hosts with our hearts, lips, lives’, and, in a speech delivered in 1651, he warned Gloucester’s citizens that they ‘deserved a scourge for our unthankfulnesse for former mercies’, and particularly their failure to keep the raising of the siege at the forefront of their minds. 26

22 GA GBR B3/2 f. 307r.
23 Ibid.
24 John Dorney, Certain speeches made upon the day of the yearly election of officers in the city of Gloucester (London, 1653; Wing / D1932), p. 2.
25 For further discussion of the link between providence and memory see chapter one, pp. 64-78.
26 Dorney, A brief and exact relation, p. 14; Dorney, Certain speeches, p. 72.
providential interpretation of this earthly act did more than simply offer a way for people to understand the recent past; it also gave them a reason to remember it.

However, Gloucester’s annual commemoration day also served a second purpose: it reinforced the city’s civic identity as a godly, puritan town. Gendered descriptions of Gloucester as a ‘Maiden’ and ‘Virgin’ city, a place unpenetrated by external forces, were commonplace and equated the city’s deliverance with the virtues of the town itself – purity, loyalty, godliness. Indeed, though accounts of the siege were always careful to note that God had been ‘the principall author [sic]’ of the city’s preservation, contemporaries also lavished praise on Gloucester’s local officials and citizens. A pamphlet printed in 1643 praised the ‘constancie of resolution’ of the citizens and soldiers, the ‘vigilant care and unwearied endeavours’ of the ‘valiant’ officers, and the ‘cheerfull readinesse of the yong [sic] and old of both sexes’ who had helped to build the fortifications, while a series of verses published in 1644 celebrated the role of the city’s governor, Colonel Edward Massey.

Gloucester’s wartime experiences also served to elevate her above other cities in the surrounding area, and especially Worcester, Hereford, and Bristol, all fellow Parliamentarian strongholds that had at some point fallen to the Royalists. In a speech given to the inhabitants of Gloucester in 1651, Dorney reminded his audience that theirs was ‘a Maiden City, not hitherto ravished by any sons of violence, as the three sister Cities have been, whilst this City hath been a City of refuge, and a port of safety’. By recounting Gloucester’s wartime experience, Dorney reminded its citizens of the favours God had bestowed on them and emphasised that these were far greater than those He had granted to any other local city.

Gloucester’s peers were no longer her neighbours in Worcester and Hereford, but the biblical cities of Ramoth-Gilead and Ebenezer (a city of refuge and a monument to a great Israelite victory, respectively). By commemorating annually the relief of the city, Gloucester’s leaders were doing more than simply encouraging inhabitants to recall an act of God; they were attempting to project an image of the city as industrious, loyal, and godly and to
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27 Dorney, Certain speeches, pp. 22, 71, 72.
28 Ibid., p. 3.
29 Dorney, A brief and exact relation, p. 13; Anon., Verses on the siege of Glocester, and Col: Massey (Unknown, 1644; Thomason / E.257[9]).
30 Dorney, Certain Speeches, p. 71.
31 Ibid., sig. A2r, p. 71.
construct a sense of civic identity that turned around Gloucester’s citizens’ role as the ‘conservators of the Parliament of England’.  

The ceremony that surrounded the commemoration – not least the stipulation that it would be one of the few days of the year when local officials should wear their scarlet robes – helped to weave the occasion into the city’s existing calendar of civic celebrations. In 1650, a feast was arranged to mark the day, which, as the result of an order made in 1646, was always held on the Tuesday nearest to 5 September (in this case the 9th), and the city accounts show that large quantities of wine and venison were purchased for the occasion. There are also records of expenditure for bell ringing at the College on the day of the commemoration every year from 1650 until 1657, usually at a cost of 10 shillings. Nor was this a solemnity that was reserved for the city’s main church. The churchwardens’ accounts for the church of St Michael’s, which sat at the intersection of North and South street, include expenses for ringing on ‘our Gloucester Holliday the 5th of September in commemoration of our deliverance at the seidge’ every year between 1648 and 1659 (except 1653, when the church appears to have been closed for repairs). That these records explicitly refer to the event as ‘our’ holiday and a day for ‘commemoration’ suggests a degree of awareness among local inhabitants of both the geographic specificity and memorial purpose of the occasion. By 1659, bell ringing on this date was being referred to alongside gunpowder treason day as an ‘old custom’, and according to the nineteenth-century antiquarian John Washbourn the occasion was marked every year until 1660, ‘each citizen put[ting] on his best apparel; the civil and military authorities attended at the cathedral; the bells rang; the corporation feasted; and the neighbours saluted and reminded each other of the great things that had been done this day’.  

The memory of the siege was woven into the fabric of city life in other rather more tangible ways too. Though in the immediate aftermath of the attack the Parliament’s supporters

32 This was the title which Judge Sergeant Wilde apparently gave the city, upon the sitting of the assize court in 1646. See Dorney, Certain Speeches, p. 23.  
33 GA GBR B3/2 f. 319r. The other days were the day for the election of local officers, gunpowder treason day, Christmas day, Easter day, Whitsunday, Trinity Sunday, and the anniversary of the King’s coronation. For an interesting discussion of the role of urban ceremony in the city during the 1640s and 1650s see Amy Calladine, ‘Public Ritual in English Towns, c. 1629-1679’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Nottingham, 2016), pp. 127-155.  
34 GA GBR B3/2 f. 381r; GA GBR F4/5 f. 433v.  
35 GA GBR F4/5 f. 412v, f. 438v, f. 460r, f. 487v; GA GBR F4/6 f. 25, f. 81, f. 132, f. 203. They may also have been rung in 1658 and 1659: the records for these years include payments for ringing on several unspecified thanksgiving days. See GA GBR F4/6 f. 272 and f. 315.  
36 GA P154/14/2/2.  
37 Ibid.; Washbourn, Bibliotheca Gloucestrensis, p. lxxvi.
downplayed the material damage which the city had sustained, Gloucester’s resistance had come at a considerable cost. Whole suburbs surrounding the city had been levelled to assist with its defence and enemy bombardment had damaged numerous public buildings, including the Tolsey [town hall], the Crypt school, and several churches. In 1646, a survey of the damage ordered by local officials valued the city’s losses at over £26,000.38 One victim of the siege was the city’s south gate, which had been badly damaged by Royalist batteries. When it was repaired in 1644 it was adorned with a commemorative inscription that read: ‘A City Assaulted by man but saved by God ever remember the Fifth of September, 1643, give God the glory’.39 While no image of this new structure survives, it seems to have been an ornate affair. The total cost for the ‘new building of Southgate’ came to at least £90 and the inscription was placed ‘in large characters […] round the arch’.40 In 1644, Dorney described the commemorative gate as an object of ‘strength and ornament’.41

In early modern England city walls and gates were more than simply defensive structures; they also had a symbolic purpose as a physical embodiment of civic authority. As Mark Stoyle has noted, prior to the Civil Wars this authority was intimately connected to that of the crown, and, as a result, gates often featured royal as well as civic arms in a symbiotic display of civic and regal power.42 The reconstructed south gate built on this tradition, but it also subverted it for a subtly different purpose, using the gate to project Gloucester’s identity as a godly, Parliamentarian city, loyal to the commonwealth rather than the King. Moreover, by turning a structure that had been destroyed in the siege into a means of its commemoration, the gate also possessed a second layer of symbolic significance: it transformed what had been a physical embodiment of the city’s weakness into a show of its strength. By rebuilding the once ruined south gate as a reminder of Gloucester’s role in the wars, the civic authorities sought not to erase the memory of the recent past but to interpret and control it. A site of wartime destruction was translated into a self-conscious symbol of God’s deliverance and stood as a reminder of the city’s wartime experience throughout the 1640s and 1650s.

40 GA F4/5 f. 242v; Washbourn, Bibliotheca Gloucestrensis, p. lxxvi.
41 Dorney, Certain Speeches, p. 10.
The new coat of arms which the Garter King of Arms, Sir Edward Bysshe, granted to the city in 1652 also integrated Gloucester’s Civil War experience. Its crest featured a lion holding a sword and a trowel, a nod to the role played by the military and the citizenry during the siege, while the motto ‘Fides Invicta Triumphat’ (‘faith indomitable wins through’) reflected the dominant Parliamentarian interpretation of Gloucester as a city that had been saved by her faith and constancy (see fig. 4). The new arms were displayed across the city: painted at the Booth Hall; on the ‘Iron that holds the sword at the Colledge’; even stamped on the city farthings. Once again, Gloucester’s wartime experience was embedded in the city’s physical environment.

When, in 1653, John Dorney printed a collection of the speeches that he had made on the day of the civic elections between 1643 and 1652, the frontispiece featured an image of the city’s new arms. This was accompanied by a poem about the siege penned by the local minister Sam Kendrick, a verse which dwelt on the familiar themes of Gloucester as a city of refuge and divine deliverance, and concluded with an exhortation that ‘our people ever thankfulle [should] be / To the great God of our felicitie’. In the main text that followed, Dorney mentioned the siege in almost every speech, and, while his interpretation was always a variation on the themes of thankfulness, the need for remembrance, and the glory of the city, he also shows how this reading of the event could be adapted to address particular political circumstances. For example, in 1649, in the aftermath of the King’s execution and the fracturing of the Parliamentarian alliance, Dorney drew on the memory of the siege in order to demonstrate the need for unity. He outlined how, through the honour they had gained in the siege, ‘not a few persons in Gloucester but Gloucester itself’ had become ‘the object of their [i.e. the Royalists’] malice’. As a result, he argued, it would be safer for the people of Gloucester to embrace the Commonwealth state and to ‘conjoyn for your preservation’, rather than to support the government’s opponents, whom he claimed were an ‘enemy enraged, and upon professed terms of revenge’.

---

44 GA GBR F4/6 f. 26; GA F4/5 f. 488v.
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46 Ibid., p. 55.
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Fig. 4: Gloucester’s coat of arms, engraved frontispiece, in John Dorney, *Certain speeches made upon the day of the yearly election of officers in the city of Gloucester* (London, 1653).

It was not, however, an account of the recent past that was flexible enough to survive the Restoration. In 1660, both the College and St Michael’s rang for the return of Charles II and the custom of ringing on 5 September was tactfully dropped. In 1662, the King ordered that the city’s walls should be pulled down and in 1671 the inscription on the south gate was removed, once again transforming the mnemonic landscape of the city. It was replaced with the royal arms and the words ‘Henry Fowler, soldier, Royal Mayor of the city by special proxy, curated the restoration of these royal arms destroyed by the cruel recent rebels with the greatest violence, 1671’, an inscription that simultaneously erased and evoked the gate’s

48 GA GBR F4/6 f. 364; GA P164/14/2/2.
previous memorial significance. Nevertheless, for the period of the republics, the city authorities had consistently sought to commemorate a particular interpretation of the city’s wartime experience and to embed this in the urban environment. Gloucester had functioned as a place of memory on two levels: on the one hand, the story of their godly deliverance became an intrinsic part of the city’s sense of civic identity; on the other, the built environment of the city was used to project and preserve this very particular interpretation of Gloucester’s recent past.

The experience and commemorative practices of another south-western town – Taunton, in the county of Somerset – shared some marked similarities with those of Gloucester. Like Gloucester, Taunton was a Parliamentarian garrison that had been heavily besieged by the King’s forces during the first Civil War – from September to December 1644, March to May 1645, and June to July 1645. The second siege was particularly notorious in Parliamentarian circles owing to the ferocity of the fighting and the sheer extent of the damage: around two-thirds of the town was destroyed. Also like Gloucester, during the second siege Taunton had been relieved ‘in the very nick of time’, when the defenders’ ammunition was all but exhausted and the assailants were actually entering the town, and the date – 11 May – was observed within the municipality as a day of annual thanksgiving and commemoration. As one local minister put it, 11 May was a ‘day set apart for the Annuall Commemoration of the Deliverance of that Town [i.e. Taunton], by the Relief which they received’.

Moreover, surviving copies of the sermons preached on this occasion show that the relief of Taunton was similarly interpreted by local Parliamentarians as a divine deliverance, one that necessitated thankfulness, remembrance, and adequate godly reformation on the part of its citizens. For example, in a sermon published to mark the first anniversary of the relief in

---

50 The exact text, in Latin, read ‘Insignia hæc regia a nuperis rebellibus cruentis summo scelere demolita Henricus Fowler, armiger, hujus civitatis ex speciali mandato Regio Major, restituenda curavit. 1671.’ See Daniell, Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1671, p. 420.
53 Henry Jeanes, The works of heaven upon earth, or, The eccellencie of praise and thanksgiving in part displayed in a sermon, enlarged into a treatise, preached at Taunton in the county of Somerset May 11. 1648 (London, 1649; Wing / J513), sig. A2r.
1646, the minister of one of Taunton’s two parishes, George Newton, likened the events of the 11 May to the rescue of the Israelites from the Assyrians, and warned that Tauntonians must

let not such a sweet and precious mercy dye with you. Let not that bee charged upon you which DAVID chargeth on Israel, That you forget the workes of God, and the wonders that hee hath shewne you. That you forget the time when the Enemy was entring, and God sent Reliefe from Heaven, and restrained his fury. Oh let this day bee alwaies solemn to you, a day of gladness, and of Feasting, and a good day, to all generations.54

That is, the mercy which God had shown Taunton imposed upon the town’s inhabitants a duty to remember the transactions of 11 May and to transmit the memory of this event to future generations. Similar themes recurred in the anniversary sermon Newton delivered six years later, in which he claimed that it was necessary not only to ‘keep these rare and extraordinary mercies in our minds ourselves’ but to also to ensure ‘that others may be mindfull of them, and that while the world lasts, that the Lord may have his glory kept afoot in following ages’.55 In an anniversary sermon preached in 1648, and published the following year, Henry Jeanes made it clear that inadequate thankfulness for, and commemoration of, God’s mercies was partially to blame for England’s ongoing troubles, and that ‘annuall commemoration of your [i.e. Taunton’s] deliverance, if there be vigour and life in it’ would help to secure both England’s peace and God’s ongoing protection of the town.56 The commemoration of 11 May was necessary, then, not just because it enshrined a particular account of the recent past, but because such recollections might have a direct bearing on the future.

The Taunton sermons also provide some suggestion of the way the anniversary day was kept. Jeanes, for example, emphasised that citizens were to mark the day by recalling not just the moment of their relief but the transactions of the siege itself, including the many hardships and losses suffered, and that they should not ‘stifle and imprison these thoughts’ but use the anniversary as an opportunity to express them publicly to their fellow citizens.57 Meanwhile, in 1652, Newton noted that Taunton’s residents enthusiastically engaged in celebratory

54 George Newton, Mans wrath and Gods praise. Or, A thanks-giving sermon, preached at Taunton, in the county of Somerset, the 11th May (a day to be had in everlasting remembrance) for the gratious deliverance of that poore towne from the strait siege (London, 1646; Thomason / E.344[6]), p. 26; Ivan Roots, ‘Newton, George (1601/2-1681)’, ODNB <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20054> [accessed 31 May 2017].
55 George Newton, A sermon preached on the 11 of May 1652. In Taunton, upon the occasion of their great deliverance, received upon that day (London, 1652; Thomason / E.670[13]), p. 19.
56 Jeanes, The works of heaven upon earth, p. 30.
57 Ibid., pp. 77-79 (p. 78).
bellringing, bonfires, and feasts to mark the occasion. In 1648, Thomas Hill, the pastor of Titchmarsh in Northamptonshire, suggested that Taunton should ‘set up some Marble Pillar of Reformation, to record such a mercy’. There is, however, no evidence that such a structure was ever erected, and in his 1648 sermon Jeanes rejected the suggestion that adequate commemoration necessitated a physical memorial. Instead, he claimed that it was ‘lesse chargable, but more acceptable unto God’ for the people of Taunton to engrave the memory of their relief on their hearts and minds. Similarly, when, in 1652, Newton lamented the absence of a permanent monument to commemorate the siege he recommended not the creation of a physical structure but works of charity and acts of piety.

Though the purpose and content of Taunton’s 11 May commemoration had much in common with the Gloucester holiday it does not appear to have been woven into the material fabric of the town to the same extent. Perhaps the sheer magnitude of the damage had rendered the construction of physical memorials financially unviable, an explanation that is lent some weight by Jeanes’ concern with finding observations that would be ‘lesse chargable’. Instead, it was the people of Taunton themselves who were to ‘perpetuate the memory of this mercy’ through their words and deeds, transforming both the town and its inhabitants into a kind of living monument to Taunton’s wartime experience.

Commemorations of local wartime events were also held in other towns and cities throughout the 1640s and 1650s, though none are as well documented as the anniversary days held in Gloucester and Taunton. The borough accounts of Barnstaple in Devon suggest that the local authorities continued to mark 1 July – the date on which the town had been successfully defended from Prince Maurice’s troops in 1644 – with celebratory cannon fire until at least 1656. In 1648, the church of St Martin’s in Leicester rang the bells on 18 June to mark ‘the day of thanksgiving for [the] regaining of Leicester’ by the Parliament in 1645, a practice that continued every year until the close of the Commonwealth. In Norwich, the Mayor’s Court Books for 1656 include an order that 24 April ‘shalbe kept as a daye of thankgivinge in
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remembrance of the Cityyes deliverance from the muteny when the Committee was blowne up’.66 This was a reference to the ‘great blow’ of 1648, when, amidst riots and disorder in the town, the barrels of gunpowder stored at the Committee House on Upper Newport Street exploded, killing several people and scattering debris across the city.67 Meanwhile, a letter penned to Mercurius Politicus in 1650 suggests that Hull held an annual commemoration to memorialise the lifting of the Earl of Newcastle’s siege on that town in 1643. The anonymous author noted that on

This day [i.e. the 11 October] we kept a solemn day of Thanksgiving and Praises to God in memoriall of that signall turning mercy to the whole Kingdome in generall, but this Town in a special manner, in raising the siege from before our walls, and beating and routing New-Castles army in the North of England (when the Parliament was in a very low condition).68

The eighteenth-century antiquarian Joseph Partridge claimed that the inhabitants of Nantwich commemorated the raising of the Royalist siege of the town on 25 January 1644 and ‘upon every anniversary of it, ‘till of late, wore sprigs of Holly in their hats in token of victory, and the day itself upon that account was called Holly-Holy-Day’.69 Partridge does not specify precisely when this practice ceased, but the journal of the Cheshire man Sir Thomas Mainwaring suggests that it endured throughout the 1650s: he records annual thanksgiving sermons or holidays in the town in 1652, 1654, 1655, 1656, and 1657.70 Charles Bracken has made similar claims about the town of Plymouth, noting that a memorial erected in Freedom Park stated that ‘For many years it was the custom to celebrate the anniversary of […] the Great Deliverance of the protracted siege’ on 3 December 1643, the date that the Parliamentarian garrison had routed a Royalist army that threatened to seize the town.71 In fact, Plymouth sustained no fewer than five Royalist sieges between 1642 and 1645, and it has been suggested that the town’s civic motto, ‘Turris fortissimo est nomen Jehova’, or ‘the
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name of God is the strongest defence’, referred, as in Gloucester, to the town’s wartime experiences.\textsuperscript{72}

In all the cases discussed thus far, attempts were made to integrate a specific wartime event (usually the relief of a siege) into the memorial culture of the town or city affected. They illustrate the ways in which places tried to commemorate and project a particular, providential, Parliamentarian interpretation of their own local wartime experience. Though by far the most prevalent, this was not the only type of localised, geographically specific commemorative practice that existed. In an unusual case from Portsoken ward in east London, the residents of the parish of Botolph without Aldgate commemorated annually an event that had occurred some 60 miles to the west: the first Battle of Newbury in 1643. The explanation that the inhabitants of Botolph offered for this occasion was that the ward’s trained band, while on their way back to London after the relief of Gloucester, had been engaged at Newbury and that

that remnant of them who through the providence of God were in the memorable battle at Newberry wash preserved and came home alive have ever since annually sett apart (vizt) ye 20\textsuperscript{th} of September being ye day on w[hi]ch they were engaged at Newberry wash, to blesse the Lord for his greate mercy towards them in their deliverance.\textsuperscript{73}

The day was apparently marked by a special memorial sermon delivered at 10am in the parish church. It only survives on the historical record because in 1657, after running for over a decade without incident, the local minister, Zachery Crofton, took exception to the residents’ choice of preacher – the admittedly controversial Fifth Monarchist, John Simpson – and barred him from speaking.\textsuperscript{74} Outraged, the following year the residents petitioned the Lord Protector, complaining that they had been forced to hold their service in a church in an adjacent parish and requesting that this year Cromwell would overrule Crofton’s decision and allow Simpson to preach.\textsuperscript{75}

The residents’ insistence on preserving the commemoration day and holding it in their parish church, with their choice of preacher, is suggestive of the diverse ways in which geographically specific communities of memory might form. In Botolph without Aldgate, the
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impetus for commemoration did not stem from a local experience that was subsequently enshrined by Parliamentarian civic authorities, but from an experience that, while geographically distant, had been shared by a large number of local inhabitants who actively chose to continue remembering it. In this respect, the actions of the Botolph veterans have some marked parallels with modern war veterans, many of whom choose to collectively commemorate their experiences and lost comrades after they return home. However, in the absence of the kind of mass communication that facilitates many veterans’ commemorations in modernity, in Botolph it was the fact that a large number of former soldiers from the same unit returned to the same area – where they would, presumably, be surrounded by the relatives of their fallen comrades – that facilitated the creation of a distinct and geographically specific community of memory. Indeed, it is quite possible that this is not a unique case, and that geographically organised regiments from other areas also chose to commemorate their collective wartime experiences, unmolested and therefore unrecorded.

Geographic communities, then, could act as the locus of a particular kind of commemorative activity, preserving the memory of locally significant wartime events and attempting to embed these in the minds of inhabitants – and, in the case of Gloucester, in the physicality of the city too. While the twin challenges of resistance and reconciliation had ultimately dissuaded the national government from establishing an annual commemorative occasion, despite the many theological incentives, the same was not always true for local authorities, and particularly those, like Gloucester, that were of a staunchly Parliamentarian and puritan bent. Indeed, even towns that had been relatively divided during the wars experienced, with the victory of the Parliament, the victory of a particular, providential, public narrative of the recent past. Norwich and Taunton, both of which had a considerable Royalist faction, continued to celebrate their deliverance from the Parliament’s enemies. In these towns, commemoration served a dual purpose: on the one hand, it reminded local people of the threat which the government’s enemies had posed to their safety, while on the other it


77 The Portsoken commemoration day is not mentioned in the St Botolph without Aldgate churchwardens accounts, where the only reference to a particular political occasion is ringing ‘when ye Lord Protector came to ye cittie’, though there are many records of payments made to various guest preachers. This suggests that it is unlikely to be possible to prove (or disprove) the existence of similar occasions through the study of churchwardens’ accounts, and until further examples can be identified my suggestion that Portsoken seems unlikely to be a unique case is necessarily speculative. See LMA P69/BOT2/B/012/MS 09235/002/001.
perpetuated a partisan version of the recent past, one in which the hand of God had been firmly with the Parliamentarians.

There are some clear parallels between these highly localised occasions and the commemoration of domestic conflicts elsewhere in early modern Europe. In the aftermath of the French Wars of Religion – and in spite of the royal ‘oublience’ which ordered that ‘the memory of all that has occurred on both sides since the troubles began in our kingdom […] shall be snuffed out’ – Catholic towns across France held annual processions to commemorate failed Huguenot sieges. The Dutch cities of Leiden and Alkmaar celebrated annually the raising of their respective sieges by the Spanish during the Eighty Years War, while Breda memorialised the incident of the ‘peat barge’ which had successfully reclaimed the town for the Dutch republic. Thus, the decision by some English towns to commemorate their local experiences is reflective of a wider tendency across early modern Europe for communities that had experienced the vicissitudes of war to construct and entrench a particular version of their turbulent past. Though these continental occasions had their own distinctive features – large-scale parades, for example, only really occurred in France – the existence of public, performative commemorations in the context of puritan England challenges Philip Benedict’s claim that public ceremony played a more significant role in the social memory of Catholic communities than it did those of Protestants and suggests that confessional divisions in commemorative culture were not consistent across early modern Europe.

These cultivated, collective commemorations were not, however, the only way in which a particular place might prompt recollection. This chapter now turns to consider some of the other, more subtle ways in which sites of conflict could act as receptacles of, and cues for, Civil War memories.

---

ii. ‘An Epitaph of Rubbish’: Description, Destruction, and Memory

In 1649, John Taylor published an account of his journey through the south of England and into the West Country, from London to Land’s End. On his travels, Taylor passed through the town of Farringdon in Oxfordshire and he noted that there the battle scars left by the wars were still clearly visible ‘for the Kings Party burnt one part of the Towne, and the Parliaments fired the rest, so that between them there was a good handsome Market Towne turned into Ashes and Rubbidge’.81 He was similarly moved by the sight of Exeter, which he described as ‘a faire sweete City, a goodly Cathedrall Church (not yet quite spoyled or stabled) and it had large Suburbs, with long streets, and many fine dwellings till this fire of contentions turned all into ruines, rubbidge, cinders, Ashes and fume’.82 For Taylor, the damage caused by the wars kept the memory of the recent past alive, the rubble and the ashes acting as their own grisly monuments to the nation’s internecine divisions.

Indeed, there is some evidence that contemporaries were acutely aware of the potential mnemonic power of wartime destruction and attempted to limit it wherever possible. For example, a letter sent from the Committee of Both Kingdoms to the Parliamentary Committee of Salop in 1646 advised against the destruction of a house near the recently reduced garrison of High Ercall, explaining that they did not ‘think it fit that all houses whose situation or strength render them capable of being garrisons should be pulled down. There would then be too many sad marks left of the calamity of this war’.83 The orders governing the conduct of armies issued by both sides in 1642 prohibited, in similar terms, the burning of buildings without the express order of a commanding officer and were intended to prevent the gratuitous destruction of property by common soldiers.84

However, in spite of such efforts, there can be little doubt that the damage caused by the wars was extensive. Estimates suggest that around 200 towns and villages in England and Wales suffered significant damage, including the loss of around 10,000 houses which left 55,000 people (roughly 1% of the total population) homeless.85 Not all damage was caused by enemy
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assaults. In towns that were garrisoned, it was often necessary to pull down the outer buildings and suburbs to assist with the defences. Large swaths of the outskirts of Exeter were destroyed for this purpose; in 1646, a local merchant, John Cupper, complained that the value of his estate had been halved owing to the defensive destruction undertaken by Sir Thomas Fairfax’s troops.86

Though the extent of the damage varied and was generally far less in those areas that were under constant Parliamentarian control, few regions escaped entirely unscathed. East Anglia, for example, was little affected by the first Civil War, but saw considerable action during the second, not least the siege of Colchester, in which at least 186 houses were destroyed.87 The pace of the rebuilding work also varied significantly, and some buildings that were not repaired at all stood as relics of the war throughout the 1650s and beyond. The mansion of Basing House, in Hampshire, was so badly damaged that it was left in ruins, and by 1674 the church of St Michael’s at the Mount in Lincoln was said to be ‘in so ruinous a condition as to be past repair, nothing left but bare walls’.88 Though historians have attempted to enumerate the physical costs of the wars, less attention has been paid to the links between material destruction, place, and the mental afterlife of the conflict: this is the main subject of this section.

That the damage inflicted during the 1640s might act as a reminder of Britain’s recent conflicts is evident from Taylor’s account. While traversing the British landscape, Taylor could not help but gaze on the physical remains of the wars and this moved him to both remember and record them. Of Aberystwyth he noted that ‘many fair Houses […] are transformed into confused heaps of unnecessary Rubbidge’, Harlech was described as ‘all spoild, and [made] almost [un]inhabitable by the late lamentable troubles’, while at Lichfield he encountered a ‘ruin’d church’ and ‘sigh’d to see that sad confusion’.89 On his travels
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through England in the mid-1650s, the diarist John Evelyn was similarly struck by the enduring scars of war. On his visit to Colchester in July 1656, Evelyn described the place as a ‘fair town, but now wretchedly demolished by the late siege, especially the suburbs’, while at Worcester he noted that he ‘found the Cathedral much ruined by the late wars.’

When, in 1649, the Essex minister Ralph Josselin recorded in his diary his trip to Melford, in Suffolk, to attend to some business, he likewise chose to dwell on the physical damage that had greeted him: ‘I saw a sad divided towne: I saw the ruines of that great [house]’ (probably Long Melford Hall, the Countess Rivers’ residence) ‘plundered out desolate without inhabitant’. On a visit to Lichfield just after the Restoration, the physician Edward Browne was fascinated by the city’s ruined cathedral and recorded in his journal that though this structure had ‘been horribly defac’d and a great deal beaten down in these wars, yet the very ruines are so curious, that they caused in us no smal admiration’.

In 1652, the anonymous author of the polemical tract *The Life and Reigne of King Charles: or, the Pseudo-Martyr Discovered* made the link between physical destruction and the mediation of memory quite explicit. As part of an attempt to demonstrate Charles’ blameworthiness for the Civil Wars, the author wrote that ‘If no innocent blood can be found to witnesse against him [Charles I]’ then they should ‘let the dum stones of these demolished palaces of Basing, Ragland, Belvoyer [Belvoir], and infinite others speak’.

For this writer, the visible skeletons of ruined houses were far from silent; they were powerful reminders of the recent past. The author of the 1654 verse *Stipendariae Lacrymae* made a similar point, albeit from the opposing political standpoint. As the narrator of this poem related his vision of Charles I, his heroic soldiers, and a nation plunged into conflict, he described how he saw

Northward a Map of Martilll cruelty,
A sack’t, burnt, dead, and buried (whilom) Town
Under an Epitaph of Rubbish ley.

In these lines, the ruins of war were transformed from a chaotic accumulation of rubbish and rubble into an ‘epitaph’, a lasting monument to the brutality of the conflict. Meanwhile, for
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the author of a 1656 pamphlet, it was the ‘spoyling’ and ‘consuming with fire’ of the county of Berkshire, and especially the damage inflicted on Twyford, Okingham, and Farringdon, that best gave ‘testimony’ to the ‘sad Record’ of the wars. 95 Speaking, memorialising, testifying: in these texts, the silent physicality of wartime damage was re-imagined as something that had agency and voice, and that kept the memory of the wars alive even in times of peace.

Rather more functionally, the damage caused by the fighting meant that those communities that had been most severely affected were often forced to recount the transactions of the wars as part of their petitions for financial assistance. Requests for money to help with rebuilding work flooded into the Parliament at such a rate that in 1648 they established a committee ‘to examine and consider how, and in what Manner, such Churches, Towns, or Houses, as have been burnt, demolished, or spoiled since these Wars, may be repaired’, otherwise known as the Committee for Burning. 96 However, the scale of the problem was such that this failed to establish a satisfactory solution. In 1651, officials and residents from Gloucester petitioned the committee for the second time, stating that they were yet to receive adequate assistance with what amounted to over £26,000 in damages, and in 1653 the Parliament was still complaining about the sheer volume of requests. 97 These petitions continued throughout the 1650s, and often included detailed accounts of precisely how buildings had been destroyed, and by whom.

For example, in May 1658, the minister and twenty-two inhabitants of Edgbaston, in Warwickshire, wrote to the Lord Protector requesting a patent for a charitable collection to assist them with the costs of rebuilding their parish church. In their petition, they described at some length how the church – ‘a handsome Decent structure’ – had ‘in the late warrs [been] partly burnt and the residute [sic] w[i]th the steeple and bells utterly demolished and puld downe by ye appointment of Collonell Fox then Governour of the Garrison thereto neare Adjacent’. 98 Similarly, in July of the previous year, the inhabitants of Oswestry in Shropshire had explained that during the wars their local church, which stood ‘without the walls and neere unto the sayd Towne then a Guarison for the parliam[en]t’, had been ‘pulled downe and totally Ruined for the Safety and preservation of the sayd Guarison’: they were duly awarded
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a brief for a charitable collection. In late 1649, the residents of Preston in Lancashire had apparently complained to the Council of State that ‘on the invasion of the Scotts […] the Army then under the Comand of L[ieutenant]t Gen[era]l Cromwell, comeing thither, were in some want of some bullet’ and had been ‘necessitated’ to ‘take the lead w[hi]ch covered the Chancell of the Church’, while in 1655 John Clench relayed how, eleven years previously, the inhabitants of Stowbury in Dorset had ‘willingly permitted their Towne to bee burned to the ground to the number of 100 families for ye p[re]servation of the Parliament garrison of Wareham’. The specification of such precise details was one way of enhancing the veracity of an account, and, wherever possible, petitioners were careful to emphasise that damage had been sustained in the service of the Parliament, presumably in an effort to engender sympathy, and money, for their plight.

Not all repairs necessitated appeals to national government. Much of the outstanding damage was dealt with through requests to local quarter sessions and these petitions, like their national counterparts, often included detailed accounts of exactly how damage had been sustained. For example, in the spring of 1652, two yeomen from Avon petitioned the Wiltshire quarter sessions on the behalf of their fellow residents. In their account, they explained that ‘in the late tyme of warre’ a nearby bridge had been ‘broken downe by the apoyntme[n]t of some of the Parl[iamen]t Comanders to stop the passage of the late Kings forces from doeinge mischief to the country there beyond’ and requested assistance with its repair. Similarly, in 1649, the parishioners of Church Chrislington and Barrow in Cheshire reported that a local bridge now lay in ruins after being ‘severall times pulled downe both by the Enimies p[ar]tie and the Parliam[en]ts p[ar]tie’ and that they could not afford to replace it. In 1652, Robert Warburton, along with several churchwardens and inhabitants from the parish of Weaverham in Cheshire, described how their town had been ‘soe envyed by the Cavalleere party […] that they defaced the sayd Schoolehouse and broke downe both the door[es] and windowes and otherwise abused the same, breaking the seates in peeces so that it is not fit to keepe Schoole in’. In this petition, not only was the damage inflicted recounted

99 TNA SP 18/155 f. 189 and f. 190.

100 TNA SP 25/94 f. 525; TNA SP 18/98 f. 116. For other similar examples see: TNA SP 18/19 f. 47, SP 18/181 f. 4, SP 18/128 f. 248.


102 CRO QJF 77/2/47.

103 J. Bennett and J. Dewhurst (ed.), Quarter Sessions Records with Other Records of the Justices of the Peace for the County Palatinate of Chester (Chester: Record Society for the Publication of Original Documents relating to Lancashire and Cheshire, 1940), p. 159. For other similar examples see LRO QSP 55/3; CRO QJF 76/2/40; Bennett and Dewhurst, Quarter Sessions Records, p. 159.
in some detail; the violent attack was reinterpreted as a positive reflection on the locality. Through the process of petitioning, communities were forced to recall and recount the events that had led to the destruction of their property, in addition to the physical reminders – ruined churches, broken windows, stripped roofs – that confronted them each day.

Repair and rebuilding did not erase the memory of war from urban townscapes. Many buildings were reconstructed in different layouts or even entirely different locations to their predecessors, and some new constructions carried quite overt reminders of the destruction that had preceded them. For example, when, in 1648, the Gloucester resident Dennis Wise erected a monument in Gloucester Cathedral to replace a family memorial that had been pulled down, along with the rest of St Owen’s church, in 1643, he noted on the new plaque that its predecessor had been ‘defac’d and ruinated by the dissolving and taking down the Parish Church of St Ewens without the South Gate of this City, in the late unhappy Wars and Divisions of this Kingdom’. At Lincoln Cathedral, the pictures that stood above the west doors had been ‘broke down in the late troubles’ and though these images were subsequently repaired, the poor quality of the handiwork meant that the previous damage remained clearly visible. Meanwhile, when, in 1659, the steeple of St Mary’s church in Scarborough collapsed the residents were quick to recall that during the wars there had been ‘threescore pieces of ordnance discharged against the steeple of the upper church there’ and attributed the calamity (perhaps not wholly unreasonably) to this past event.

Memory was mediated through the physicality of the ruined post-war landscape and, even in those places that lacked visible scars, the intangible power of past events became psychologically rooted in places of conflict. This is perhaps most clearly demonstrated by the supernatural stories that circulated around battlefields and places of execution. Several months after the Battle of Edgehill, there were reported sightings of dead soldiers who had apparently returned to the site of the battle in ghostly form (including one that was specifically identified as the slain Royalist commander Sir Edmund Verney). To observers,
the reappearance of these men at the place of their death was no coincidence and printed reports made a clear link between the impact of the battle on the land and the enduring presence of the dead. One pamphlet that relayed the incident commented that the Lord ‘had permitted these infernall Armies to appeare, where the corporeall Armies had shed so much blood’. Another explained, rather more graphically, that Edgehill ‘Whose trouble[d] peete of earth plastred with English goare and turned unto a golgotha of bones is now become the plot of feare and honour’, its earth ‘groning with the weight of lives whose last beds there were maid to sleepe upon’. Through their ghostly appearances, the bodies of the dead that had become an imperceptible part of the English soil once again took a visible form, one that was intrinsically tied to the land where their remains still lay.

Reported sightings of spectral soldiers persisted into the 1650s, and though these were not necessarily the explicit reanimation of the dead allegedly witnessed at Edgehill, several incidents were linked to a particular battlefield. In 1659, two armies apparently appeared in the sky over Marston Moor where their forces engaged in a lengthy aerial fight, and on New Year’s Day 1656 there were sightings of ghostly armies that resembled the forces that had fought at Naseby. Meanwhile, in 1654, there was a sighting of a phantom army that was linked not to a particular place but to a date, 3 September, which, as one pamphlet noted, was the day of the ‘two notable and famous Victories’ at Dunbar and Worcester. Indeed, when, in 1656, a sceptical author took issue with the veracity of the Naseby visions, he scathingly added that perhaps the reporter should have waited until the anniversary of the Battle of Naseby in June, when it could have been said that ‘the departed slain on both sides, were anniversarilys allowed weapons on this day, to renew the memorie of their Combate’.

Reports of such sightings in print were rarely politically neutral, and both supporters and opponents of the republican states attempted to present these visions as warnings from
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God. The apparition that appeared at Marston Moor in 1659 was interpreted by one author as a representation of the forces of the Commonwealth ‘vanquishing their Enemy’ and a sign that in the face of ongoing political instability people should ‘unite together, for the recovery of our long-lost Liberties, and dear-earn’d Privileges’ – that is, the return of the Purged Parliament and the ‘good old cause’ for which they had fought. At the other end of the spectrum, the appearance of Charles I’s headless body floating above Whitehall in the early months of 1649 was interpreted by the Royalist press as a clear portent of God’s displeasure. By consciously connecting the appearance of spectral visions to sites of wartime violence, observers delineated these places as spaces where the events of the past continued to echo in the present.

At Colchester, it was alleged that the grass would not grow on the spot where the Royalist commanders Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle had been executed following their unsuccessful defence of the city, literally transforming the site into a place marked by the events of war. The tale drew on an older folkloric tradition of plants that would not grow where blood had been shed, as well as longstanding martyrological tropes that lent power to a martyr’s mortal remains. The story was initially reported in Royalist newsbooks and it later appeared in an account of the siege published in 1650, in which the author explicitly noted that this area ‘bare of grasse’ might act as ‘a monument to that cruell murder to all eternity’. In the absence of an actual stone memorial it was another absence – a patch of land devoid of plant life – that was to serve as a lasting physical reminder of this event. On a visit to Colchester in 1656, John Evelyn remarked on the phenomenon, as did the topographer Thomas Baskerville in 1662.
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It is entirely plausible that the site at Colchester was in fact deliberately kept barren, an effect that was achieved at some European sites of execution by the sprinkling of salt. Alternatively, it is possible that the sheer number of visitors prevented the grass from growing, thus creating the very sight that these people had come to observe (this was the explanation Philip Morant favoured in his 1748 book, *The History and Antiquaries of Colchester*). If the latter, this is itself suggestive of the enduring power of place and reveals a pilgrimage-esque desire to visit the site of the men’s violent deaths and the subsequent ‘miraculous’ clearing of the ground.

It was certainly true that after the Restoration the publication of Thomas Blount’s *Boscobel* (1660) – an account of Charles II’s ‘miraculous Preservation’ after the Battle of Worcester, including the now famous story of his concealment in an oak tree – sparked a slew of visitors to Boscobel House in Shropshire where the tree was located. By 1680, the number of people taking home parts of the ‘royal oak’ as souvenirs was such that the owners of Boscobel were forced to erect a tall brick wall to protect it, complete with a carved stone rehearsing its importance. It is, of course, also possible – though perhaps unlikely, given the sheer quantity of witnesses – that the Colchester story was simply a Royalist fiction. Yet, even then, it is noteworthy that in this tale a place of bloodshed was physically transformed by the incident that had occurred there, the impact of blood on soil creating a lasting, visible, reminder of a wartime event. Similar rumours circulated around the sites of other Royalist executions, not least the spot where John Burley was put to death at Winchester, where a spring of blood had apparently appeared soon after his death.

Given the hostility of many puritans to the concept of sacred space, it is not surprising that the ‘miraculous’ sites at Winchester, Colchester, and Boscobel were theatres of Royalist memory for which there was no Parliamentarian equivalent. However, as we have seen, reports of supernatural happenings that adhered to a particular place were not solely the

---

120 Barbara Donagan, ‘Myth, Memory and Martyrdom: Colchester 1648’, *Essex Archaeology and History*, 34 (2004), 172-180 (p. 178).
123 Ibid, p. 29. For further discussion of the story of the King’s escape from Worcester and its significance after 1660 see Brian Weiser, ‘Owning the King’s Story: The Escape from Worcester’, *The Seventeenth Century*, 14.1 (1999), 43-62.
124 *Perfect occurrences of every dayes journall in Parliament, and other moderate intelligence*, no. 59, 4-11 February 1648 (London, 1648; Thomason / 81:E.520[38]), pp. 403-404.
125 Walsham, ‘Sacred Topography and Social Memory’, p. 36.
preserve of Royalists, and there is also evidence that even in the absence of spectral visions or miraculous marks places might still mediate memory. On arriving in Gloucester in 1654, John Evelyn noted in his journal that though he perceived the ‘Severn gliding so sweetly by’ he could not ‘without sad thoughts […] see the Town, considering how fatal the siege had been a few years before to our good King’. For Evelyn, the mere sight of Gloucester was enough to remind him of the King’s ignominious defeat over a decade earlier. Similarly, when, in 1658, the minister for Watton at Stone in Hertfordshire, Marmaduke James, described the hills around Nottingham, likening them to Jerusalem, he recalled that this had been the place where the King had first raised his standard in 1642. In 1666, the ejected Lancashire clergymen Oliver Heywood recorded in his journal the liberty of worship permitted at Penistone church and reflected that this seemed particularly remarkable given that ‘Sr Francis Wortley in the warre time kept that church as a garrison for the King’, while, for Ralph Josselin, Carisbrooke Castle on the Isle of Wight would always be known as ‘the Kings prison’. For these individuals, particular places remained intimately connected with their role in the recent conflicts and continued to prompt memories of these events even after the hostilities had ceased.

As the years passed, there is little doubt that this connection between place and memory gradually gave way to the ‘tendency to spin an imagined past around visible topographical features’ that is deeply ingrained in many human cultures. As Ronald Hutton has demonstrated, the folk memories of the Civil Wars collected by many eighteenth- and nineteenth-century antiquarians, in which buildings, ruins, and places were a common anchor, often bear no relation whatsoever to the historical facts and were probably later inventions. Nevertheless, the unreliability of these topographical tales should not blind us to the significance of place in the immediate aftermath of the conflicts, when sites of war and destruction often possessed considerable mnemonic power.

126 Dobson, The Diary of John Evelyn, ii, pp. 84-85.
127 Marmaduke James, The best fee-simple, set forth in a sermon at St Peters in Cornhil, before the gentlemen and citizens born in the county of Nottingham, the 18. day of February, 1657 (London, 1658; Thomason / E.955[2*]), p. 36.
iii. Monuments and Memorials

Marston, and famous York will Pillars raise,
With large inscriptions for thy greater praise:
Naisby Triumphall Arches will compile,
Excelling far the Pyramids of Nile.131

So wrote Thomas Manley in his 1652 poem Veni, Vedi, Vici, a translation of Payne Fisher’s Latin panegyric that celebrated the virtues and successes of the Lord General Oliver Cromwell. Yet though in these lines Manley deployed the locations of major Civil War battles as signifiers of the Parliament’s military triumphs, the pillars and arches that he evoked were intended to be figurative rather than literal. For as we have already observed, no memorials were erected on Britain’s Civil War battlefields during the seventeenth century, an absence that scholars have attributed primarily to the religious changes wrought by the Reformation, and particularly the abolition of the theological tenets of purgatory and intercession.132 Rather less attention, however, has been paid to the way the memory of the Civil Wars was preserved in another form of commemorative structure: monuments to deceased individuals.133 The final part of this chapter focuses on the role of funerary monuments within the wider memorial culture of post-war England and argues that these structures could serve as lasting, sometimes controversial, physical reminders of the divisions of the 1640s, embedding the memory of the domestic conflicts in the fabric of local churches.

The debates over the relationship between idolatry and images sparked by the Reformation had a marked impact on funerary monuments. Structures that at the start of the sixteenth century had regularly featured religious imagery became increasingly secular in their iconography, siting, and overall significance as the theological role of monuments shifted from inspiring intercessionary masses for the dead to demonstrating a good life to the living.134 Various proclamations issued by Elizabeth I had attempted to rehearse the

133 I use the term ‘monument’ and ‘memorial’ interchangeably in this section, though some scholars make a distinction between the two, with ‘monuments’ used to refer specifically to structures that include some form of three-dimensional imagery.
arguments in favour of monuments and suppress iconoclasm, but these longstanding tensions over the appropriate role of monuments in churches were further inflamed by the religious turbulence of the 1630s and 1640s. Though Parliament expressly exempted tombs and graves from the 1643 ordinance that directed ‘the utter demolishing, removing and taking away of all Monuments of Superstition or Idolatry’, a minority of puritans rejected the legitimacy of these structures. The clergyman Edmund Gurnay, for example, dedicated the second half of his text An Appendix unto the Homily Against Images in Churches (1641) to a repudiation of funerary monuments, primarily on the basis that to bury individuals with pomp and glory was a falsification of the state of the dead, who until their resurrection remained corrupted. Reports of iconoclasm against tombs were a staple of the Royalist press throughout the 1640s. Though historians have cast some doubt on how widespread this kind of damage actually was, the notebooks of the iconoclast William Dowsing show that some monuments, at least, were thought to fall the wrong side of that thin line between images and inscriptions and idolatry and superstition.

Nevertheless, in spite of such ambiguity – and, in some cases, outright animosity – memorials to the dead continued to be built throughout the 1640s and 1650s, albeit in fewer numbers than during the 1630s. The cost of these structures limited who might commission them. Elaborate monuments were clearly the preserve of the wealthy, and though a modest inscription on a brass or ledgerstone might be obtained for a few shillings, space within a church was more likely to be granted to individuals of some local standing. Stefanie Knoll has shown that the construction of a monument was usually the work of more than one individual, with most involving a complex web of negotiations between family, craftsmen,

135 Llewellyn, Funeral Monuments, p. 269.
137 Edmund Gurnay, An Appendix unto the Homily Against Images in Churches (London, 1641; Wing (2nd ed.) / G2259A), pp. 77-94.
138 See, for example, Anon., An elegy upon the most incomparable K. Charles the I. persecuted by two implacable factions, imprisoned by the one, and murthered by the other, January 30th 1648 (Unknown, [1649]; Wing / K499), p. 8.
140 Llewellyn estimates that around 450 monuments were erected during the 1630s, 200 in the 1640s, and 225 in the 1650s. See Llewellyn, Funeral Monuments, p. 10.
and church authorities; she terms these various participants ‘senders’.\textsuperscript{142} Therefore, while the deceased may have had a hand in planning their memorial, it was equally possible that a particular monument might be the brainchild of a living patron. Partially for this reason, memorials could trail the death of their subject by several years, and, as a result, the date of death can be an unreliable guide to when a monument was erected. While every effort has been made here to identify monuments commissioned before 1660, it can be harder to distinguish with any certainty between monuments erected in the mid-to-late 1640s and the 1650s and this section includes examples of both.

The preservation of memories of the domestic conflicts on memorials is perhaps most conspicuous on structures dedicated to officers who had died in combat, which often included details of who the deceased had fought for as well as how and where they had lost their life. The Verney family monument at Middle Claydon in Buckinghamshire – commissioned by Sir Ralph Verney in 1650 and completed in 1653 – gave pride of place to the wartime deeds of the Royalist Sir Edmund Verney, who died at the Battle of Edgehill in 1642 (see fig. 5). Initially, Sir Ralph had intended this tomb to be a memorial to his wife, Mary. However, after several rounds of revisions it was ultimately Sir Edmund who took centre stage, a decision which Lawrence Stone has attributed to Sir Ralph’s distaste for the policies of his former Parliamentarian allies and his growing sympathy for his father’s Royalist allegiance.\textsuperscript{143} The inscription at the head of the main tablet foregrounded Sir Edmund’s Civil War service at the expense of almost all of his other achievements, both civic and domestic. It read

\begin{quote}
Sacred to the memory of the ever honoured Sir Edmund Verney, who was Knight Marshall 18 years, and Standard Bearer to Cha. I In that memorable Battayle of Edge Hill, wherein he was Slayne on the 23d of October 1642, Beinge then in the two and 50th year of his age.\textsuperscript{144}
\end{quote}

The monument to Francis Glanville, commissioned by his mother and erected in the church of St Peter ad Vincula at Broad Hinton in Wiltshire, placed a similar emphasis on its subject’s military service (fig. 6).\textsuperscript{145} Glanville had died fighting for the Royalist cause at Bridgwater in

\begin{footnotes}
\item[145] The exact date this monument was constructed is difficult to ascertain. However, it was clearly already in situ when John Aubrey visited the church in the 1660s and this circumstantial evidence, combined with the rather muted political tone, suggest that it was erected prior to the Restoration. See John Edward Jackson (ed.), Wiltshire: The Topographical Collections of John Aubrey, 1659-70 (Devizes: Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, 1862), p. 337.
\end{footnotes}
1645 and his monument comprised a large alabaster likeness of the young Cavalier resplendent in his battle armour. The Latin inscription around the edge of the figure recorded that Glanville had been ‘a Lieutenant-Colonel in the Service of King Charles the First […] at the siege of Bridgwater in Com. Somerset’, and concluded with the assurance that though ‘A greater hero England never saw, happily she did oft produce his equal’.146 Meanwhile, the monument commissioned by the baronet and MP John St John in the late 1640s for St Mary’s church in Lydiard Tregoze, Wiltshire, also featured a life-size figure of the deceased: the young Royalist commander Edward St John, who died from the wounds he had sustained at the second Battle of Newbury.147 In his effigy, Edward was depicted in three-quarter length cavalry armour, while at the base of the monument was a relief that showed him in action at the head of a troop of sixteen horsemen (see fig. 7).
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146 Ibid.
147 Turton, Alan, ‘The Monument to Edward St John’, Friends of Lydiard Tregoz, 37 (2004), 64-65. Given the monument was commissioned by Edward’s father, who died in 1648, it seems reasonable to assume that the textual inscription, dated 1663, was a later addition.
This emphasis on a subject’s Civil War service, both in imagery and text, built on the wider cultural practice of representing the virtues and accomplishments of the deceased, including their military deeds, on their memorial.\footnote{Sherlock, Monuments and Memory, p. 151.} In contrast to other wars, however, the decision to memorialise an individual’s role in the recent domestic conflicts was one that was fraught with the potential for controversy. It was probably for this reason that monuments to fallen Royalists erected prior to 1660 used predominantly factual language to represent the events of the recent past, carefully avoiding any overtly partisan statements about the cause for which the deceased had fought. Even the Glanville monument, which used the rather more suggestive word ‘hero’, was careful to reserve such praise for its subject’s military valour, rather than the Royalist cause more generally.\footnote{BL Add MS 37719 f. 268v.}

![Fig. 7: Relief on the base of the Edward St John monument, St Mary’s Church, Lydiard Tregoze, Wiltshire (c. 1645-1648).](image)

By contrast, the epitaph which the Royalist veteran Sir John Gibson sketched for himself in his colourful 1650s prison journal was far less circumspect. It began: ‘Sir John Gibson Kt: of Welburne, Captaine / of the North-Rydinge Horse under / King Charles the / Martyr’, a description of his Civil War service that carried clear normative connotations.\footnote{For examples of other post-1660 memorials that use the language of the cult of Charles the martyr see John le Neve, Monumenta Anglicana: being inscriptions on the monuments of several eminent persons deceased in or since the year 1600 to the end of the year 1718, 5 vols (London: Printed by W. Bower, 1719), i. p. 69; Edward Robinson, A Discourse of the Warr in Lancashire (Manchester: Printed for the Chetham Society, 1864), p. xxi.} Luckily for Gibson, he lived to see the Restoration when epitaphs that referred to a person’s service for ‘Charles the Martyr’ became not just acceptable, but relatively common. It is doubtful whether this politically charged epitaph would have been successfully translated onto stone a decade earlier.\footnote{For examples of other post-1660 memorials that use the language of the cult of Charles the martyr see John le Neve, Monumenta Anglicana: being inscriptions on the monuments of several eminent persons deceased in or since the year 1600 to the end of the year 1718, 5 vols (London: Printed by W. Bower, 1719), i. p. 69; Edward Robinson, A Discourse of the Warr in Lancashire (Manchester: Printed for the Chetham Society, 1864), p. xxi.} Such political considerations, in addition to the acute financial pressures facing many notable Royalist families during the 1650s, may explain why many Royalists
slain during the wars did not receive physical memorials until after the return of Charles II. For example, the monument to Sir Edward Fitton, who had died at Bristol in 1643, was not built until 1663 when his sister’s son (Fitton’s heir) commissioned a structure. This included a lengthy recital of the military feats Fitton had performed in the service of ‘King Charles, the blessed Martyr’, including the fact he had ‘triumphed’ and ‘perished’ at Bristol (though it neglected to mention that he had died of a fever in a camp on the outskirts of the town, rather than in combat).  

Indeed, in the changed political climate of the 1660s, the relatives of some former Parliamentarians played rather fast and loose with political reality and attempted to utilise memorials to their ancestors as a way of aligning their family with the Royalist cause. One such man was Ralph Port, who in the early 1660s decided the time was right to commission a monument to his father, the Parliamentarian captain John Port (d. 1651). The epitaph Port selected drew a discreet veil over the specific part Port had played in the wars, but the lines ‘Who, while he mortal was, unrivall’d stood / The crown and glory of his ancient blood: /Fit for his prince’s, and his country’s trust’ heavily implied – without ever explicitly stating – that Port had supported the King.

Funerary monuments erected in memory of deceased Parliamentarian officers appear to have been somewhat scarcer than their Royalist counterparts. In part, this may reflect the anxiety among some puritans about the theological legitimacy of these structures and many officers (not least Oliver Cromwell himself) were buried without memorials. In part, however, it is also because those structures that were erected were often destroyed after the Restoration. One of the few memorials to a prominent Parliamentarian to survive the change of regime in 1660 was the monument to the New Model Army colonel Sir Hugh Popham, located in Westminster Abbey, which was allowed to stand only as a favour to his loyalist brother – and, even then, the inscription tablet was removed.

Nevertheless, those few structures of this type that have survived on the historical record, albeit generally in antiquarian books rather than in churches, suggest that the senders of memorials for Parliamentarians might make a considerable effort to record not just their
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subject’s military service but to frame the cause for which they had fought. For example, the memorial to William White (d. 1646), a captain in Edward Massey’s regiment and later the Parliamentarian governor of Berkeley Castle, erected in Gloucester cathedral, featured an acrostic that read:

What Man more was valiant than he that lies
Intombd here after his Victories;
Let such as his undaunted Courage knew,
Live to report and witness what is true.
In famous Berkley Castle he was known
As governor, tho’ aged but twenty-one:
Maintaining still the Cause which much renoun
Which he at first for Right and Just did own.
His Name and House since conquering William’s Days
Is registered, his Life’s deserving Praise;
Till death at Ragland Castle, by a Wound,
Ended his Days, that so he might be crown’d.154

This verse combined traditional epitaph references to the subject’s virtues – his family name, his valiant actions, his ‘undaunted courage’ – with quite specific references to White’s Civil War activities. Moreover, it also attempted to record for posterity precisely what it was that White believed he had fought for: a ‘Right and Just’ cause. Such exposition was as much an attempt to justify White’s Parliamentarianism as it was to describe it. Similar language was used on the monument to Major General Crawford, a Presbyterian officer killed at the siege of Hereford.155 Crawford’s inscription noted that he had fought ‘to vindicate rights human and divine’ and had served ‘the british senates’ for the benefit of ‘The publick interest’.156 This wording is suggestive of the way a Presbyterian Parliamentarian understood, and wished to convey to future generations, the nature of their cause: as a battle for the ‘rights’ of British citizens in defence of the ‘publick interest’, rather than as a war for the Parliament or against the King. There are clear parallels here with the monuments erected some forty years later to commemorate the participants of the Monmouth risings, which also sought to use inscriptions to communicate to posterity the righteousness of their cause. For example, the memorial of William Kiffin in Lyme Regis recorded that he had died ‘for the Protestant Religion and

155 His funeral was held at Gloucester, where the Mayor ordered that the city bells be rung in memory of the deceased ‘Scotch Knight’. See GA GBR F4/5 f. 280r.
156 Le Neve, Monumenta Anglicana, i, p. 220.
English liberty against Popery and Slavery’, an interpretation of the rebel’s motives that was considered sufficiently provocative to be later removed.\textsuperscript{157}

In comparison with the White and Crawford memorials, the monument to the Parliamentarian commander Ferdinando Lord Fairfax (d. 1648) at All Saint’s Church in Bolton Percy was rather more muted in its presentation of its subject’s wartime activities. From a lengthy Latin epitaph of eighteen lines, only four referred to Fairfax’s military service: ‘Loving public quiet / But insurmountable in war / Sword in his right hand, holding the balance [of justice] in his left / He brought back praise and victory trophies of both’.\textsuperscript{158} These lines, in common with the rest of the verse, dwelt primarily on the virtues of Fairfax himself rather than on the merits of the Parliamentarian cause. In fact, the epitaph carefully avoided any specific reference to who Fairfax had in fact fought for, or in what capacity, and such vagaries probably go some way to explaining why, unlike the Crawford and White memorials, this structure survived the Restoration period unscathed. Given that within a few years of Ferdinando’s death, his son, the one-time Lord General Sir Thomas Fairfax, had begun to grow increasingly distant from the Parliamentarian cause, we might speculate that such equivocation perhaps reflects the ambivalence of one of the tomb’s probable commissioners.\textsuperscript{159} In this respect, monuments were as much a preservation of a particular political moment as they were the life and virtues of the individual they purported to represent.

Though by far the most prevalent, descriptions of the deceased’s military service were not the only way the events of the 1640s were memorialised on tombs; the epitaphs of some civilians also recorded their subject’s wartime experiences. The memorial of one Gyles Eyre Esq. (d. 1655) at All Saint’s Church in Wiltshire, for example, featured an unusually lengthy description of the hardships Eyre had suffered during the 1640s. The inscription began by stating that Eyre had been ‘A man much oppressed by publick power for his laudible opposition to the measures taken in the Reigns of James and Charles the First’.\textsuperscript{160} It then went on to describe, in some detail, the precise nature of these sufferings, including the fact he had...


\textsuperscript{158} Francis Drake, \textit{Eboracum: or the history and antiquities of the city of York, from its original to the present times, together with the history of the cathedral church}, 2 vols (London: Printed by William Bowyer, 1736), ii, p. 387. With thanks to Dr Ian Calvert for providing this translation.

\textsuperscript{159} Hopper, \textit{Black Tom}, pp. 93-124.

been ‘plundered at Brickworth by the King’s Soldiers of £2000 value’ and subsequently ‘imprisoned for refusing to pay the sum of £400 illegally demanded of him by two instructs under the privy seal’ in 1643. For Eyre (or his heirs) this resistance to Charles’ rule, and the hardships he had suffered for it, were among the most significant of his earthly deeds, and his memorial offered an opportunity to both justify and record them. Similar, if rather less detailed, was the epitaph on the monument of William Kirby, erected by his son at Wargrave in Berkshire sometime between 1649 and 1650. Here, the short inscription made reference to the fact that Kirby had lived through a time of war, and, though it was light on specifics, stated that ‘By fate I [Kirby] acted on a warlike Stage’, but was ‘By Warrs not vanquish’d, nor by bloudy Foes’. Meanwhile, a small brass erected in memory of the Cirencester clothier Hodgkinson Paine featured a verse that recorded the deceased’s sufferings during the 1643 storming of the town.

The decision to record a person’s wartime experiences on their memorial suggests that these events could form an important part of an individual’s identity, one which they (or their relatives) wished to convey to posterity. As Peter Sherlock has noted, memorials are one of the few places where historians are able to observe early modern people as they themselves wished to be remembered. We should not, therefore, overlook the importance that some soldiers and civilians placed on memorialising their own wartime actions, sufferings, and experiences. Moreover, in addition to memorialising the deeds of a particular individual, these structures might also have served as lasting physical reminders of the wars more generally. It is hard to encounter something as spectacular as the Glanville monument and not consider its impact on the congregation of Broad Hinton church, who would have gazed each week, possibly more, on the image of a man killed fighting against his fellow Englishmen, resplendent for all eternity in his battle armour. Monuments that referred to the transactions of the wars embedded the memory of these conflicts in the very fabric of local churches, creating another possible site of memory, one that was geographically distant from the places these individuals had lived, fought, and died, but which might nevertheless continue to evoke memories of the turbulent recent past.

161 Ibid.
164 Sherlock, *Monuments and Memory*, pp. 3-5.
Conclusion

The evidence presented in this chapter suggests that physical places were an important locus of Civil War memory throughout the 1650s. Towns and cities that had been ravaged by the wars, such as Gloucester and Taunton, created their own, localised commemorative occasions in an effort to preserve a particular (providential, Parliamentarian) version of the recent past in the minds of their inhabitants – and, in the case of Gloucester, in the built urban environment of the city too. While such occasions were usually efforts by civic elites to memorialise a significant local event, the experience of Botolph without Aldgate in London shows that this was not the only type of geographically specific community of memory that existed. In Botolph, the shared military experience of a large number of local inhabitants provided the impetus for a sustained – and sometimes controversial – commemorative occasion.

Monuments erected in memory of deceased individuals, and particularly fallen officers, preserved for posterity the wartime deeds of their subject, and, in so doing, embedded the memory of the domestic conflicts in the fabric of churches, creating an alternative site of memory. Meanwhile, the physical damage caused by the wars ensured that these events were quite literally inscribed on the English landscape, and, even in the absence of visible scars, some places of war continued to possess considerable mnemonic power. Battlefields and sites of execution, in particular, though unmarked by memorials, were not seamlessly reintegrated into the landscape, and observers delineated these places as spaces where the events of the past continued to echo in the present.

Thus, while there can be no doubt that print did play a significant role in the commemoration of Britain’s Civil Wars, the claim that the early modern period witnessed a shift from ‘soil to ink’ as the main medium of memory conceals the extent to which places of conflict retained mnemonic power. The absence of memorials on battlefields did not mean that places of war were straightforwardly reabsorbed into the agrarian landscape, and, in this respect, soil, if not necessarily monumental stone, remained an important site of memory. Indeed, to some extent, the rise of print actually reinforced, rather than replaced, the psychological power of place. Without access to print, it is doubtful whether when, in 1654, John Evelyn looked out from York Minster tower he would have been aware that he was surveying the site of ‘the famous and fatal Marston Moor’; and yet, the fact he had encountered this battle on the page

did not prevent him being moved by the sight of its actual physical location. The relationship between landscape, memory, print, and place was multifaceted. It cannot be adequately understood through a straightforward polarisation of print and soil, or through the study of commemorative monuments in isolation. As the newsbook *Mercurius Pragmaticus* put it, the ‘Seven yeers bloody Disputes’ had made ‘the Earth as paper receive the Impious Impressions of our murderous Characters’. The English landscape was a canvas, written upon in letters of blood, and for many English men and women these words of war could still be read in ruins, in sites of conflict, and in the landscape throughout the 1650s.

---

167 *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, no. 45, 13-20 February 1649 (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / 84:E.544[9]), sig. A2r.
Chapter Five

Narratives of War

In 1655, Sir Hugh Cholmley, gentleman, Civil War veteran, and one-time MP for Scarborough, sat down to write his memoirs. As Philippa Kelly, Lloyd Davis, and Ronald Bedford have noted, autobiographical writing is often triggered by an event or experience. In Cholmley’s case, the event in question was the death of his wife, Elizabeth, and the project began as an effort ‘to imbalme her great virtues and perfections to future ages’. However, Cholmley quickly decided that it was not possible to write a suitable account of the qualities of that ‘prime flower’ without reference to the whole ‘Garland’, and the scope of the text was duly broadened to include both a family history of the Yorkshire Cholmleys and Sir Hugh’s own life story, including his participation in Britain’s Civil Wars.

The resulting narrative is one of only very few memoirs penned during the period of the republics that includes an account of the author’s experiences as a combatant in the recent domestic conflicts. The rather better-known memoirs of Lord Thomas Fairfax, Richard Baxter, and Richard Atkyns were all produced after 1660, while the diary of the Parliamentarian cavalry officer John Sanderson was written during the 1640s, often in the midst of military campaigns. Drawing on two veterans’ memoirs from the 1650s that do
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3 Ibid., p. 61.
4 Following Yuval Noah Harari, I define memoirs as ‘synthetic narrative texts; written retrospectively; written to a considerable extent on the basis of personal memory; dealing with a considerable time-span; in which their authors appear as protagonists’. Yuval Noah Harari, Renaissance Military Memoirs: War, History, and Identity, 1450-1600 (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2004), p. 17.
5 Baron Fairfax (ed.), Short Memorials of Thomas Lord Fairfax, written by himself (London: Printed by Richard Chiswell, 1699); Matthew Sylvester (ed.), Reliquie Baxteriane, or, Mr. Richard Baxters narrative of the most memorable passages of his life and times (London: Printed for T. Parkhurst, J. Robinson, F. Lawrence, and F. Dunton, 1696); Peter Young (ed.), Military Memoirs of the Civil War: Richard Atkyns and John Gwyn (London: Longman, 1967), pp. 7-32; P. R. Hill and J. M. Watkinson (ed.), Major Sanderson’s War: The Diary of a Parliamentary Cavalry Officer (Stroud: The History Press, 2008). For an excellent discussion of the Fairfax memorials see Andrew Hopper, ‘Black Tom’: Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 224-232. For other accounts penned after the Restoration see Isaac Littlebury (ed.), Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Esq: lieutenant general of the horse, commander in chief of the forces in Ireland, one of the council of state, and a member of the Parliament which began on November 3, 1640, 2 vols (Vivay: Unknown, 1698); Thomas Wright (ed.), The autobiography of Joseph Lister; to which is added a contemporary account of the defence of Bradford and capture of Leeds by the Parliamentarians in 1642 (London: Russell Smith, 1842); Richard Parkinson (ed.), The life of Adam Martindale written by himself (Manchester: Chetham Society, 1845); J. Horsfall Turner (ed.), The autobiography of Captain John Hodgson: of Coley Hall, near Halifax; his conduct in the Civil Wars, and his troubles after the Restoration (Brighouse: A. B. Bayes, 1882). For another account written prior to 1649 see Sir Ralph Hopton’s narrative of his campaigns in
survive, and also on the war stories contained in the petitions of maimed soldiers and war widows, this final chapter explores the ways in which individuals chose to narrate, structure, and recall their own wartime experiences, and those of their family, during the 1650s – and also speculates as to why so (comparatively) few elite Englishmen and women saw fit to commit them to paper.

The first section analyses the memoirs of two Royalist veterans, Sir Hugh Cholmley and Sir Richard Grenville, and argues that when these men recounted their wartime experiences they were primarily concerned with presenting and preserving a favourable account of their military service to both contemporaries and posterity, a feat in which selective forgetting was just as useful as partial remembering. The second and third sections explore war stories that were composed by a far larger number of people and for a quite different purpose: the petitions of maimed Civil War soldiers and war widows. While writing one’s memoirs was the preserve of a small literate elite, these petitions offer a statistically significant collection of war narratives in which disabled veterans and the wives of deceased soldiers related their own, or their husband’s, military careers in an effort to secure a pension.6

On 28 May 1647, under rising pressure from the army, the Parliament passed an ordinance which stated that injured Parliamentarian soldiers, and the widows and orphans of deceased servicemen, could petition local justices of the peace for a pension.7 This replaced an earlier ordinance from October 1642, which had acknowledged the state’s responsibility to provide for soldiers injured in the Parliament’s service, and their dependents, and which attempted to administer appropriate relief, primarily through the Treasurers of the Committee for Sick and Wounded soldiers.8 The 1647 ordinance shifted the onus for provision away from the central government and on to local authorities. To apply, claimants were required to present their petition and a certificate from the relevant regimental commander to the justices in their place of settlement, who would then order interim relief (if necessary) until their petition could be


7 ‘May 1647: An Ordinance for Relief of Maimed Soldiers and Mariners, and the Widows and Orphans of such as have died in the service of the Parliament during these late Wars’, in A&O, i, pp. 938-940.

8 ‘October 1642: Ordinance for Maintenance to be given to the Wives and Children of those that are killed; and to maimed Soldiers’, in A&O, i, pp. 36-37; Eric Gruber von Arni, Justice to the Maimed Soldier: Nursing, Medical Care, and Welfare for Sick and Wounded Soldiers and their Families during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum, 1642-1660 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 64-68.
considered at the next quarter sessions. In September 1651, a further act was passed to provide for victims of the conflicts in Scotland and Ireland.\textsuperscript{9} Though a degree of confusion persisted, and petitioners continued to apply for – and receive – relief at national, county, and parish level throughout the 1650s, this legislation formed the backbone of the military relief system until the Restoration.\textsuperscript{10}

Petitions, then, were not straightforward autobiographies but narratives created for a purpose: to elicit a pension or other financial assistance from the authorities. What was important in a successful petition was the claimant’s ability to convince their audience that they were a particular kind of person – in a veteran’s case, this meant showing oneself to be a loyal Parliamentarian disabled through military service (the King’s former soldiers, maimed or not, were ineligible for a pension). A widow, meanwhile, needed to demonstrate that her husband had served the Parliament, that he had died as the result of his military activities, and also her own precarious financial situation. As a result, the kinds of stories that petitioners told were guided by their desire to present themselves as a worthy cause for relief and undoubtedly contained many strategic elements.\textsuperscript{11} For example, in spite of the high levels of side-changing that occurred, soldiers were careful to portray themselves as having been consistently loyal to the Parliament, while widows almost always referred both to their husband’s political fidelity and to their charge of children, whom they invariably described as ‘small’.\textsuperscript{12}

Moreover, as with most legal records, the vast majority of petitions were not written by the claimant, but by literate local officials such as parish clerks, scriveners, and schoolmasters.\textsuperscript{13} This raises the thorny question of how far the narratives which they contain reflected the accounts given by the petitioners themselves. There are certainly some phrases which are sufficiently commonplace and formulaic as to suggest a degree of scribal intervention.

Petitions nearly always began with the phrase ‘humbly sheweth’ and closed with promises that ‘your petitioner shall (ever) pray etc’, a formulation that dated back to petitions from the early seventeenth century. In between these customary bookends, however, petitions often contained a surprising degree of variation. As Mark Stoyle notes, scribes would have been forced to ‘rely on claimants’ own memories in order to draft those sections of a document which related to the events of the war itself’, and as claimants were expected to attend sessions alongside their petitions any account that strayed too far from the subject’s own version of events would have proven problematic. Indeed, there are a number of petitions that move from the more typical third-person into the first-person signifiers of ‘I’ and ‘we’, slips that imply that some scribes, at least, were transcribing the narrative of the petitioner more or less word for word. Thus, though the types of stories that petitioners chose to tell were shaped by legislative requirements, there remained within those strictures the potential for linguistic and descriptive autonomy.

In his study of maimed soldiers’ petitions submitted to the Devon quarter sessions between 1660 and 1730, Stoyle has demonstrated how, through close attention to these subtle linguistic features, it is possible to use petitions to reconstruct the ways in which ordinary Civil War veterans viewed their own wartime experiences in retrospect. Using a similar methodology, this chapter analyses the war stories of 139 maimed soldiers and 132 war widows who petitioned either their local quarter sessions or the national government for relief between 1649 and 1659. The changed political context of the Restoration – in which only former Royalists, as opposed to former Parliamentarians, were eligible to petition – and Stoyle’s narrower geographic focus means that this chapter does not provide a direct comparison with his work. Nevertheless, Stoyle’s findings do offer a point of contrast, and,

16 WSHC A1-110 Michaelmas 1650 f. 229; DHC QS/B, box 54, petition of John Pester; CRO QJF 77/4/107; LRO QSP 80/7 and 111/7.
17 Stoyle, ‘Memories of the Maimed’, pp. 204-226.
18 Each petitioner has been counted once, even if they petitioned multiple times. Petitions that feature multiple widows or soldiers have been counted as one petition. The quarter sessions I have referred to are Devon, Essex, Norfolk, Somerset, Staffordshire, Wiltsire, Cheshire, and Lancashire, while the petitions to national government are from the state papers. For petitions from the later 1650s, it is not always entirely clear whether a petitioner served in the Civil Wars or in a foreign conflict (particularly the Anglo-Dutch wars). While I have not utilised any petitions that refer explicitly to these later conflicts, in some cases it is ambiguous; I have used my judgement and circumstantial evidence to distinguish, as far as possible, between veterans of domestic and foreign conflicts.
19 Statues, v, pp. 389-390.
as such, they are referenced here when they are suggestive of ways in which Parliamentarian soldiers may have remembered their wartime experiences differently to their Royalist counterparts.

Taken as a whole, this chapter offers an analysis of the ways in which English men and women who had lived through the domestic conflicts recalled their personal experiences of war. It emphasises the power of forgetting as a narrative device, the similarities and differences between the memories of Parliamentarian and Royalist veterans, and the extent to which public scripts influenced the way that people described their experiences.

i. ‘I am engaged to vindicate my Honour’: The Memoirs of Sir Hugh Cholmley and Sir Richard Grenville

In the opening pages of his Memoirs, Sir Hugh Cholmley made it clear that the text which followed was intended not for public consumption, but for a select, private audience: his sons, William and Hugh, and their future progeny. Its purpose, he explained, was to preserve for posterity his distinguished ancestry, something which might prove useful for ‘pedegrees and the evidenceing of titles’, and to furnish his descendants with a family history that would encourage them to ‘immetate the good and avoide the ill’ – a kind of inspirational exemplar, heraldic guide, and cautionary tale combined. The text begins with an account of Cholmley’s forbears, starting with his distant ancestor, Sir Roger Cholmley, knighted at Flodden in 1513, and finishing with Margaret Cholmley, Sir Richard Cholmley’s second wife. Ancestry concluded, Sir Hugh then moves on to narrate the story of his own life, an account which occupies the bulk of the text.

In Sir Hugh’s descriptions of his formative years the cautionary and educatory tone which inflected his portrayals of his ancestors is still very much in evidence. Though Sir Hugh acknowledged that it was far harder for a man to discern his own ‘blemishes and imperfections’ than those of others, he nevertheless endeavoured to include stories that demonstrated not only his strengths but also some of his weaknesses: his proclivity for drinking, his neglect of his studies, and an incident from his childhood when, out of ‘folly and waggery’ he kicked a pig and was attacked by an angry sow. As Sir Hugh moved from his early life into adulthood, however, and especially as he began to recall the events of the

---

20 Binns, Memoirs and Memorials, p. 61.
21 Ibid.
22 Ibid., pp. 79-80, 82-83, 81.
late 1630s and early 1640s, the tone of the text shifts. Hereafter, Sir Hugh appears to have been less concerned with encouraging his sons to learn from his mistakes than with justifying his actions to posterity, and particularly his decision to take up a commission for Parliament in September 1642 and his subsequent defection to the Royalists six months later.23

When recounting the outbreak of hostilities in 1642, Cholmley went to great lengths to distance himself from the antagonism between the King and Parliament and to emphasise his repeated attempts to preserve the peace. The rising tensions between Charles I and the Parliament he attributed not to any substantive political disagreement but to that popular contemporary bogeyman, a faction of ill-intentioned men who were deliberately ‘fomenting distractions’.24 On more than one occasion he referred to his unwillingness to raise forces against the King, including his refusal to marshal the trained bands for the Parliament in May 1642, explicitly stating that ‘to beginne the warre […] I intended not’.25 Perhaps as significant as what Sir Hugh chose to remember of these years, however, is what he chose to forget; for, as Jack Binns notes, the Memoirs were largely silent on Sir Hugh’s not insignificant role in many of the contentious political disputes of the day.26 For example, though Sir Hugh did refer to his falling-out with his one-time patron the Earl of Strafford, he did not mention that he had sat on the committee that drew up the charges against him, or that he had voted for the bill of attainder. He similarly neglected to mention that he had spoken out in Parliament against the King’s abuse of his prerogative through the levying of Ship Money on no fewer than three occasions – for which he was deprived of his commissions and reprimanded by the Privy Council – that he had publicly condemned monopolies and forced loans, or that he had voted, albeit with some misgivings, for the Grand Remonstrance.27

When Sir Hugh did finally get around to his decision to take up arms for the Parliament, he was keen to stress both his reluctance and the defensive nature of his actions. He explained that he had accepted a commission from the Earl of Essex only because

---

24 Binns, Memoirs and Memorials, p. 104.
25 Ibid., pp. 103-105 (p.103).
27 In particular, Cholmley disapproved of the clause in the Grand Remonstrance which declared that bishops had introduced idolatry into churches. See Hopper, ‘Fitted for Desperation’, pp. 139-140; Jack Binns, ‘Cholmley, Sir Hugh, first baronet (1600–1657)’, ODNB <https://doi.org/10.1093/odnb/9780192683120.013.5341> [accessed 18 October 2017].
conceyveing these preparations of warre would end in a treaty and that my selfe who desired nothing but that the
King might enjoy his just rights as well as the subjects theirs and that I should in this matter be a more
indifferent arbitrator then many I saw take armes and more considerable with my sword in my hand and in better
capaserty to advance a treaty then by sitting in the house of Commons where I had but a bare vote.28

That is, he supported the Parliament not out of hostility to Charles I, but out of a desire to
promote peace and preserve the liberties of both the King and his subjects. He had resorted to
arms only to encourage a negotiated settlement and had hoped that his moderate designs
might help to temper the worst excesses of some of his fellow combatants. In line with much
Parliamentary rhetoric from the early 1640s, Sir Hugh maintained that he had always acted in
the interests of both the King and Parliament.

This explanation of why he had supported the Parliament – a desire for moderation, peace,
and the preservation of liberties – informed Sir Hugh’s account of his eventual defection.
This turned on two claims: first, that he had only ever sought the preservation of religion and
the liberties of both sovereign and subjects, and, second, that the Parliament had changed
their ends, abandoning the cause for which they had originally fought. As Cholmely put it

I did not forsake them Parlament till they did faile in performeing those perticulars they made the grounds of the
warre when I was first ingaidged vidz. the preservation of Relegion protection of the Kings person and lyberties
of the subject nor did I quit them then for any particular ends of my owne, but meerely to performe the duty and
alleagence I owed to my Soveraigne.29

By these lights, it was not Sir Hugh who had deserted the Parliamentarian cause; rather, the
Parliament had deserted him.

Side-changing – or turncoating, as it was derisively termed – was presented in much
contemporary print as a mark of dishonour. As Andrew Hopper has demonstrated, to change
sides contravened one of the key determinants of nobility and honour, namely, constancy,
and, as a result, ‘the language used to describe side-changers in print consisted of a colourful
vocabulary of insult’.30 For the gentry, this often involved attempts to strip individuals of
their gentility, as well as accusations of self-interest, cowardice, and comparison with the
most infamous of biblical betrayers, Judas Iscariot.31 Sir Hugh did not escape this treatment.

When news of his defection first began to circulate, the Parliamentarian press initially

28 Binns, Memoirs and Memorials, pp. 104-105.
29 Ibid., p. 105.
30 Andrew Hopper, Turncoats and Renegadoes: Changing Sides during the English Civil Wars (Oxford: Oxford
31 Ibid., pp. 142-152.
expressed their scepticism, maintaining that ‘a Gentleman of his worth’ would not debase himself by deserting the cause. However, as it became clear that the rumours were true and Cholmley had in fact secured Scarborough for the King, Sir Hugh became subject to vitriolic attacks on his character and honour. In early April, the Parliamentarian newsbook *The Kingdom’s Weekly Intelligencer* described Sir Hugh as a ‘base treacherous (Apostate) perfidious man’ who ‘deserves not the name of a Gentleman’. *A Perfect Diurnall* referred to him as ‘the treacherous Apostle Sir Hugh Cholmley’, and *The Scotish Dove* simply as ‘Judas Cholmley’. Though defection to one’s own cause was actively encouraged by supporters of both sides, it was difficult for individuals who had switched allegiance to avoid accusations of treachery, self-interest, and disloyalty. As one newsbook put it, even Royalists would ‘take him [i.e. Cholmley] to be such an unfaithfull wretch, as is not fit to be tursted [sic] either by Kinge, Queene, or Parliament’.

In part, then, Sir Hugh’s preoccupation with justifying his change of allegiance was the result of the hostile accusations that had been levelled at him in the popular press. By presenting himself as having been consistent in his desire to preserve the peace and protect Charles I, Sir Hugh sought to cultivate an image of constancy and loyalty to the King from actions which, on the surface, might seem to suggest he had been anything but. As he stated in his *Memoirs*, he had changed sides ‘meerely to performe the duty and allegence I owed to my Soveraigne, and which I did in such a way as was with out any deminution of my honour ether as a gentleman or souldier’. In this respect, Cholmley’s account of his defection had much in common with the public self-fashioning of other side-changers during the 1640s, in which one of the main defences deployed against accusations of treacherous betrayal was to emphasise that the subject had *not* in fact defected, but had held ever constant to a cause, and that it was the political winds around them that had changed.

In an effort to buttress his assertion that he had been consistently loyal to the King, Cholmley went on to emphasise the extent of his support for the Royalists after March 1643. In

33 *The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer sent abroad to prevent mis-information*, no. 14, 28 March-4 April 1643 (Unknown, 1643; Thomason / 17:E.95[2]), p. 110.
34 *A perfect diurnall of some passages in parliament and from other parts of this kingdome*, no. 33, 11-18 March 1644 (London, 1644; Thomason / 43:E.252[24]), p. 259; *The Scotish dove, sent out and returning bringing intelligence from their army*, no. 71, 21-28 February 1645 (Unknown, 1645; Thomason / 45:E.270[33]), p. 556.
35 *The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, 28 March-4 April 1643, p. 110.
particular, he dwelt on the number of men that he had supplied for the King, often at his own charge, and his determination to defend Scarborough when it was besieged by the Parliament in 1645. He exaggerated the length of time that the castle had resisted – twelve months, as opposed to the actual six.

Details of the siege of Scarborough itself are scarce in the Memoirs, and for a more thorough narrative of this event and the transactions of the wars more generally Sir Hugh referred his readers to an account that he had written in 1648 at the request of the historian Edward Hyde: Memorialls touching Scarborough. That Sir Hugh chose to refer the private readership of the Memoirs to this self-consciously public text is itself telling. It suggests that though Sir Hugh was not afraid to ‘cast dust in the faces’ of his ancestors for the betterment of his progeny, when it came to his own Civil War service he had no further meditations on his conduct over and above those observations that he had been willing to share with a public audience seven years earlier.

In Memorialls, Sir Hugh offered the same explanation for his initial Parliamentarianism and subsequent change of allegiance as in the Memoirs, namely, ‘how ill the Parliament prosecuted those grounds and pretences they [had] made when hee was first embarqued in there employment’. Of his activities between September 1642 and the eventual surrender of Scarborough to the Parliament in July 1645 he said a little more – though, as with his account of the years leading up to the wars, what he chose to omit here is quite as telling as what he chose to include. In particular, though Sir Hugh noted that he had successfully fulfilled his commission from the Parliament to secure Scarborough, he was silent on the many other military services he had performed during his short stint as a Parliamentarian colonel. Among the most notable omissions were his advance as far as Stamford Bridge in November 1642, the occupation of Malton in January 1643, and his decisive victory over the Royalist forces at Guisborough on the 16th of that month. In the latter engagement Sir Hugh had taken over one hundred men prisoner, including the Royalist colonel Guildford Slingsby, while his own forces had suffered negligible losses. Given his preoccupation with presenting himself as, at most, a reluctant Parliamentarian there are obvious strategic reasons why Sir Hugh might not

38 Binns, Memoirs and Memorials, p. 106.
39 Ibid., p. 108. As Jack Binns shows, this was not the only place in his writings where Sir Hugh exaggerated the length of his resistance against the Parliament. See Binns, Memoirs and Memorials, pp. 158, 160.
40 Ibid., p. 105.
41 Ibid., p. 61.
42 Ibid., p. 143.
43 Ibid., p. 142.
have wished to dwell on the full extent of his military service in the early months of the war. In sharp contrast to the military memoirists of the sixteenth century, for whom recording their every memorable deed was the very purpose of writing, for Sir Hugh the impulse to relay his military triumphs to posterity was trumped by his desire to fashion himself as a loyal supporter of the King and preserver of the peace.\footnote{Harari, Renaissance Military Memoirs, pp. 112-113.}

Where Sir Hugh did go into significant detail about his military experiences was in his account of the siege of Scarborough. He lavished fulsome praise on his troops, who had shown themselves to be ‘as stoute resolute Men as was in the worlde’, and recounted numerous incidents that demonstrated either the bravery of the defenders or the foolishness of the enemy, from failed assaults to a Parliamentarian commander’s unfortunate tumble off a cliff in high winds.\footnote{Binns, Memoirs and Memorials, pp. 155, 158, 156.} He also chronicled, often at some length, the personal sacrifices that he had made as governor of Scarborough. For example, when he described the financial affairs of the garrison he proudly noted that there had been ‘not one pennie imposed upon any person with in the Garryson’ to support more than twenty weeks of billeting.\footnote{Ibid., p. 159.} The reason? Sir Hugh ‘boare the greatest parte of itt upon his owne chardge and purse’, and, even as supplies began to dwindle, he apparently refused to seize the citizens’ goods against their will.\footnote{Ibid.}

In line with early modern life writing more generally, Cholmley recorded nothing of his own emotional state during the assault and his descriptions even of close hand-to-hand fighting tend to be largely factual.\footnote{Danielle Clark, ‘Life Writing’, in The Oxford Handbook of English Prose, 1500-1640, ed. by Andrew Hadfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 452-467 (p. 458).} When he did attempt to evoke the vicissitudes of war, his narrative lacked the experiential language to which we are accustomed in modern military memoirs. This is a feature of early modern war writing that Yuval Noah Harari has attributed in part to the greater similitude between the hardships of war and everyday life in early modernity – death, disease, and cold were, for the average citizen, never far away – and in part to the problematic status of the body as a source of knowledge in early modern thought.\footnote{Yuval Noah Harari, The Ultimate Experience: Battlefield Revelations and the Making of Modern War Culture, 1450-2000 (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), pp. 95-100; Harari, Renaissance Military Memoirs, pp. 88-89.} Nevertheless, within these parameters, Sir Hugh did make a considerable effort to recount the
hardships experienced by the garrison, especially in the final days of the siege. He remembered how

At length the miseries of the Castle began exceedinglie to multiply, halfe of the soldiours were either slaine or dead of the scurvy […] There dyed tenn a night, and manie layed two dayes unburied for wante of helpe to carry them to the grave. There was corne sufficient, but not hands to make the mills goe, in soe much that most of the Garrison had not eaten a bitt of bread for divers dayes before the render […] there was neither bread, water, nor poother, medecine for the sicke or wounded, and in leiu of guards there were not persons with in the walls able to stand sentynells, and in a weeke longer probable there would scarce have beene one able to looke over the walls. 50

In part, this passage may reflect Sir Hugh’s desire to record for posterity the bravery and sufferings of the people in the garrison. In part, however, it also served to contextualise and justify his decision to surrender the castle to the Parliament; a final piece of self-fashioning in a war narrative that was primarily concerned with cultivating a favourable image of its author.

Such selectivity and the deliberate self-fashioning of past actions in order to preserve the honour of the subject in the present was even more pronounced in Sir Richard Grenville’s short life story, a Defence against all Aspersions of malignant Persons (1654).51 Written while Grenville was in exile on the continent and sparked by his expulsion from the royal court for an ill-advised accusation of treason levelled at Edward Hyde, the Defence was intended for a public readership and was printed in Holland in January 1654. In the very opening sentences, Grenville explicitly stated that he was ‘engaged to vindicate my Honour’, and the text that followed was an overt attempt to defend his conduct from ‘some Persons Aims to asperse it unjustly’. 52

Sir Richard began by asserting that both he and his ancestors had been ‘ever constantly for Services of the Crown of England’ – a bold claim for a man who had served in the Parliamentarian army for several months until his spectacular defection to the Royalists en

52 Ibid., p. 230. Grenville certainly had no shortage of critics. The Parliamentarians labelled him ‘skellum’ and ‘Red Fox’, while his disagreements with fellow commanders led to disputes within the Royalist alliance. See Amos Miller, Sir Richard Grenville of the Civil War (London: Phillimore, 1979); John Barratt, Cavalier Generals: King Charles I and his Commanders in the English Civil War, 1642-6 (Barnsley: Pen and Sword Books, 2004), pp. 141-158.
route to Basing House in March 1644.\(^\text{53}\) In contrast to Sir Hugh, Sir Richard did not seek to explain or justify this change of allegiance: instead, he simply airbrushed it from history. Such selectivity endured throughout his account of the Civil Wars, which moved seamlessly from his service for the King in Scotland in 1639 to his ‘good successes’ in Ireland in 1642 and then onto the victories he achieved for the King in England between 1644 and 1646, without any reference to his interlude as a lieutenant-general under William Waller or the fact he had taken the Solemn League and Covenant.\(^\text{54}\)

Of his services for Charles I in England Grenville provided few specific details, except to say that he had ‘prevailed fortunately’ until he was thwarted by the interference of some members of the Prince’s Council.\(^\text{55}\) It was these men that Sir Richard held directly responsible for the Royalist defeat in the west and he argued that, had he not been wrongly imprisoned for his refusal to serve as a lieutenant-general under Lord Hopton in 1646, far fewer Royalist troops would have deserted and the west might have been saved from the King’s enemies. Later that year Grenville had departed for Holland, and the remainder of the tract was given over to a defence of his activities while in exile, and particularly the accusation of treason that had seen him banished from Charles II’s presence in disgrace.

Grenville’s account of his wartime experiences was brief – but, like Cholmley’s, it was carefully sculpted to reconcile the events of the past with the author’s self-conception as a faithful Royalist in the present. In this respect, both memoirs exhibit something akin to what Graham Dawson terms ‘composure’: the creation of a narrative past which can be lived in ‘relative psychic comfort’ in the present.\(^\text{56}\) By the mid-1650s, both Sir Hugh and Sir Richard viewed themselves as constant, loyal sufferers for the Royalist cause, and for this identity to be maintained it was necessary either to explain (or, in Grenville’s case, to erase) any suggestion that they had ever sought to oppose the King.

---


\(^{55}\) Ibid., p. 234. Grenville had already provided a narrative of his campaign in the west, published in 1647. Unlike Cholmley, however, he did not refer readers to his earlier account, perhaps because this text, written to defend his conduct and counter the version of events being prepared by Sir Edward Hyde, would have further inflamed the tensions surrounding his denouncement of Hyde. See ‘Sir Richard Grenville’s Narrative of the Proceedings of His Majesty’s Affairs in the West of England, since the defeat of the Earl of Essex at Lestwithiel in Cornwall A.D. 1645’, in *A collection of original letters and papers, concerning the affairs of England from the year 1641 to 1660*, ed. by Thomas Carte, 2 vols (London: Printed by James Bettenham, 1739), i, pp. 96-109.

Thus, in contrast to Renaissance military memoirs, in which a record of martial deeds was the primary means of demonstrating the honour of the author, the nature of civil war put at centre stage the issue of for whom, exactly, a military deed had been performed. As Harari argues, the ‘principle that, because impact and service are irrelevant, all honourable deeds are autonomous and equal, and deserve equal treatment, was the guiding light of Renaissance military memoirs’. This was demonstrably not true of Civil War memoirs, in which the side a person had served for was given far greater import than their individual acts of martial valour. It is this acute concern with allegiance, loyalty, and honour that perhaps helps to explain why none of the Civil War memoirs written in the 1650s were penned by steadfast Parliamentarians or Royalists, who would presumably not have felt the same impulse to defend their actions to contemporaries or to set the record straight for posterity. It is certainly worth noting that the only other text (that I am aware of, at least) that has a plausible claim for inclusion as a 1650s Civil War memoir is William Waller’s *Vindication of the character and conduct of Sir William Waller*. As the title suggests, this tract was also principally a defence. Waller’s aim was to refute the charges of malignancy that the Commonwealth government had brought against him, and to demonstrate that he had not lost his ‘first love’ [i.e. the Parliamentarian cause] and ‘that the metamorphosis [was…] in them that would impute this charge’ against him.

Of course, it is also possible that in the perilous political climate of the 1650s, few Royalist veterans were willing to risk producing written celebrations of their services for the King, while Parliamentarians may have felt it prudent to destroy similarly incriminating paperwork on the eve of the Restoration. Those few texts that have survived, however, were deliberate, self-conscious acts of memory – acts which, somewhat paradoxically, necessitated a healthy dose of forgetting in order to produce a suitable account of the past for the present and future.

### ii. ‘Stript, plundered, lamed, and imprisoned’: Maimed Soldiers’ Stories

In spite of their very different form and purpose, the petitions of maimed soldiers shared a kinship with Civil War memoirs in that they were highly concerned with presenting the loyalty of their subject to a particular cause. In contrast to Cholmley and Grenville, however,
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58 William Waller, *Vindication of the character and conduct of Sir William Waller, Knight, Commander in Chief of the Parliament Forces in the West* (London: Printed for J. Devrett, 1793). Though this text was primarily concerned with Waller’s political and religious beliefs and gave little space to the events of the wars themselves. It remained in manuscript form until its publication in 1793.
59 Ibid., p. 21.
the strictures of the maimed soldiers legislation meant that it was necessary for veterans to demonstrate that they had served for the Parliament. Petitions, therefore, typically began with an affirmation that the claimant had fought for the Parliamentarian cause and the names of the commander(s) under whom they had served, often with added reassurances that they had done so ‘faithfully’ or ‘constantly’. Side-changers were not entitled to a pension, and it seems probable that soldiers who had switched allegiance chose, like Grenville, to conveniently forget this part of their Civil War history; there are no references to side-changing in any of the soldiers’ petitions analysed for this chapter.

Though citing one’s Parliamentarian service was an essential, there was nevertheless a degree of variation in the way petitioners understood and described this cause. ‘The Parliament service’, the ‘Commonwealth’, and the ‘states servis’ were the most prevalent, and, as Matthew Neufeld notes, these statements of fidelity represent a unique strand of identification among ex-servicemen in English history. For perhaps the first time, the notion of fighting for one’s country was not intrinsically linked to fighting for one’s King, and soldiers instead expressed their loyalty to an impersonal state.

To some extent, petitioners’ choice of descriptor tracked national political developments and the changing interpretation of what it meant to be well-affected. In 1655, Richard Boulton explained to his local quarter sessions that he had fought for ‘ye Parliam[en]t of England the keepers of the libtees [sic] of the same The Comon wealth and nowe the Lord Protector his excellencie’, a delineation that suggests he regarded each political entity as a distinct cause. Those soldiers who had fought against the Scots and Irish after 1649 tended to refer to their service as having been for the state or Commonwealth, rather than for the Parliament, even if they did not generally differentiate, as Boulton had, between the different forms of republican regime. During the 1640s, references to service for the ‘King and Parliament’ were commonplace. However, from 1649 onwards, only a small minority of soldiers continued to describe their service in this way as the phrase for ‘King and Parliament’ – a statement of intent rendered somewhat implausible by Charles I’s execution – began to drop out of
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60 CRO QIF 77/4/41, QIF 82/2/172, QIF 80/2/165, QIF 78/1/19, QIF 78/3/16; WSHC A1-110 Hilary 1649 f. 189, A1-110 Michaelmas 1659 f. 221 and f. 229, A1-110 Michaelmas 1659 f. 120; NRO C/S 3 box 44, petition of John Belt; SHC Q/SR/99/4, Q/SPET/1/147; DHC QS/B, box 55, petition of Richard Vigers; LRO QSP 109/7; ERO Q/SBa 2/82, petition of George Osborne and petition of John Busbie; Q/SBa 2/91, petition of Daniell Wright; SRO Q/SR/279/4, Q/SR/297/15, Q/SR/299/11; TNA SP 46/97 f. 142b, SP 18/100 f. 53.
61 See, for example, LRO QSP 52/7; CRO 82/1/175; SRO Q/SR/284/7. Neufeld, The Civil Wars after 1660, p. 64.
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The petition of the Lancashire man John Corles (1658) was highly unusual in describing its subject as a soldier for ‘King and Parliament’. Clearly Corles remained sufficiently attached to the cause for which he believed he had originally fought – or insufficiently unaware of the potential for controversy – that he continued to characterise his service in this way over a decade later.

In addition to averring their fidelity to the Parliament, many petitioners also referred to the circumstances of their recruitment and stated whether they had been impressed, formed part of a local militia, or had joined up voluntarily. Unlike statements of service, however, the means by which a person had joined the Parliament’s forces possessed no legal relevance, and was rarely considered of sufficient consequence to be recorded in the quarter sessions’ order books.

In part, the decision to include the details of one’s recruitment may have been a veracity strategy. In 1650, the Wiltshire man Joseph Bennett informed his local quarter sessions that he had been impressed for the Parliament and his petition was signed by the constables of Warminster, who explicitly certified that ‘ye petition[er] was pressed by us […] to serve the Parliam[en]t’. In part, however, it may also have reflected the prominence of these experiences in petitioners’ own memories.

For some men, the transition from civilian to combatant was of sufficient import that they chose to describe their recruitment in some depth, even when these details may actually have weakened their efforts to present themselves as a dedicated, loyal Parliamentarian. In 1649, Richard Richards, a carpenter from East Knoyle in Wiltshire, recalled, with some bitterness, that he had been ‘pressed formerly a soldier at Rudge’ while he had been at work in the town

64 The phrase reappeared in the petitions of maimed soldiers after the Restoration, as some Parliamentarian veterans attempted to retain their pensions by claiming that they had served ‘King and Parliament’ and that their ‘intencons [in] geoinge foorth were wholly to serve his late sacred Majesty’. See Howard Cunnington (ed.), Records of the County of Wilts, being extracts from the Quarter Sessions Great Rolls of the Seventeenth Century (Devizes: George Simpson and Co., 1932), p. 234.
65 LRO QSP 154/19. For the only other example from my sample see SRO Q/SR/284/11.
66 Though it is worth noting that Corles’ unconventional turn of phrase did not prevent the Lancashire quarter sessions from ordering that he should receive a weekly allowance towards the cost of maintaining his three children. See LRO QSO 2/30.
67 The first was the most common. For impressment see ERO Q/SBa 2/78, petitions of Jeremiah Maye and John Crammor; WSHC A1-110 Trinity 1649 f. 175, A1-110 Michaelmas 1649 f. 198, A1-110 Trinity 1650 f. 106, A1-110 Easter 1656 f. 142; SHC Q/SR/94/17; SRO Q/SR/279/3, Q/SR/288/3, Q/SR/299/29; DHC QS/B, box 65, petition of John Rutly; LRO QSP 62/9, QSP 63/48, QSP 92/11, QSP 139/6. For militia see SRO Q/SR/274/6; CRO QJF 79/4/107, QIF 80/1/132. For references to voluntarism see DHC QS/B, box 54, petition of John Pester; CRO QJF 77/4/55.
69 WSHC A1-110 Trinity 1650 f. 106.
‘only out of Mallice to save one of their Tythinge at home’, an account that dwelt on the perceived injustice of his impressment for a habitation that was not his own.\(^{70}\) In 1651, the clothier Edmund Stephens explained that he had joined the Parliament’s forces only because ‘through ye falce dealeinge of divers and ye great losses w[hi]ch he recea
ved by trusting of his goods and wares, as alsoe by his losses and hinderances’ he had found himself in ‘great poverty’.\(^{71}\) The gunsmith William Leake also stated that he had been forced to take up arms out of financial necessity, while in 1651 the shoemaker John Farrar recalled that his predecessor, Randull Robinson, had deserted Colonel Brook’s regiment and that he had joined up because one of Major Broomhall’s ensigns had offered him good money to take Robinson’s place.\(^{72}\) These are hardly the declarations of great enthusiasm that one may expect from veterans keen to assert their devotion to the Parliament, and their inclusion in petitioners’ war stories implies that the process of enlistment could be a critical, and memorable, personal experience.\(^{73}\)

After establishing the necessary preliminaries, veterans generally went on to give an account of their time in the Parliament’s service. To do so, they very rarely used specific dates.\(^{74}\) Instead, soldiers’ memories of their military exploits were more commonly structured around place and sequential movement in space, a form of narrative device that the anthropologist Elizabeth Tonkin terms a ‘geochronology’.\(^{75}\) In this respect, the petition that William Yorke presented to the Essex quarter sessions in 1655 was fairly typical. Yorke stated that he had been ‘imployed in the late warres and ingaged in the fights at Yorke Maston More [sic] Nasby Bristow Newberry Lamport and many others Twoe yeares and more’.\(^{76}\) Similarly, in 1656, William Rashwood estimated that he had served the Parliament for about eight years, from the ‘seige against Oxford untill it was yealded And from thence he marched w[i]th the rest of his company unto Worcester and likewise lay seige against it untill that was surendred’.\(^{77}\)

\(^{71}\) WSHC A1-110 Hilary 1651 f. 189.
\(^{72}\) CRO QJF 84/4/120, QJF 79/4/126.
\(^{73}\) Mark Stoyle identifies a similar tendency to dwell on the details of recruitment in the petitions of Royalist soldiers after 1660. See Stoyle, ‘Memories of the Maimed’, pp. 211-212.
\(^{74}\) A rare exception is the petition of Nicolas Lawrence, which stated that he had served ‘from May the 5th 1643 till May 11th 1647’. It is, however, worth noting that Lawrence was a trooper, and therefore probably of a higher social status than the majority of the petitioners considered here. See WSHC A1-110 Trinity 1656 f. 142.
\(^{76}\) ERO Q/SBa 2/91, petition of William Yorke.
\(^{77}\) WSHC A1-110 Easter 1656 f. 142.
Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that Civil War engagements served as navigable temporal benchmarks not just for former soldiers, but for the civilian population more generally. It has been well-attested that in the early modern period time was often measured with reference to meaningful communal benchmarks (such as agricultural seasons, local funerals, and religious festivals), and one notable feature of petitions and depositions from the 1650s is the use of local Civil War events as a metric of time.\(^78\) To give but one example, in 1651 Mary Rogers informed the Colchester sessions of the peace that she had been married not in 1647, but ‘about a yeare before the late seige at Colchester in the summer tyme’.\(^79\) Clearly, for Mary, the siege of the town held a significant place in her own mental universe – but she also anticipated that this event would act as a meaningful frame of reference for local justices too.

As a rule, veterans tended to be rather more precise when recalling engagements that had occurred in England than in Scotland or Ireland. Though a large number of maimed soldiers claimed to have served either north of the border or across the sea, only three of the 139 petitions studied here referred to specific places in Scotland or Ireland – Heddington Gate and the Battle of ‘Dumfarlee’ in Scotland, and ‘Letterkenny in the county of Ulster’, Ireland.\(^80\) By contrast, the names of English towns, cities, and battles were commonplace. To take one example out of many, in 1653 Robert Parsivall, a soldier and trumpeter from Manchester, informed the Lancashire quarter sessions that he had fought in both England and Scotland, but mentioned only the siege of Chester and the Battle of Rowton Heath by name, despite the fact he had contracted his final, debilitating illness somewhere north of the border.\(^81\) To some extent, this lack of specificity may have been the result of epistemic limitations. It is worth noting that one of the veterans who supplied an Irish or Scottish place name was a captain, and therefore probably rather better educated than the average soldier. He was certainly more likely to have been aware of where exactly he and his troops had traversed.\(^82\) Equally, however, it may also have reflected the Anglocentrism of the English population more generally.


\(^{79}\) ERO D/B5 Sb 2/9, information of Mary Rogers. For other similar examples see TNA ASSI 45/3/2/119, ASSI 45/5/3/9.

\(^{80}\) ERO Q/SBa 2/82, petition of George Clarke; TNA SP 18/125 f. 164; SRO Q/SR/274/8.

\(^{81}\) LRO QSP 80/9.

\(^{82}\) TNA SP 18/125 f. 164.
Some petitioners certainly exhibited a particular animosity towards their foreign enemies, especially the Scots. Richard Gill, for example, explained that he had been ‘comanded forth as a souldier […] to repell or keepe back the Army of the Scotts’ and that he had done so ‘knowinge the sufferings of the subjects where they [i.e. the Scots] came and to be a defence to others from the like misery’. The widow Dorothy Owen described the Scots as ‘that great potent eniemy’, while in 1651 a group of men from Cheshire referred to ‘the cruelty of the invaded Enemy’. Such hostility was particularly prevalent in the northern counties and in Staffordshire, areas that had been acutely affected by the 1651 invasion and lengthy periods of Scottish quartering. Even veterans who refrained from such overtly venomous descriptions often chose to specify the nationality of their opponent. Richard Malton stated that he had served ‘against the Scottish Army’ in England, Robert Coller ‘against the Welch’ [sic] in the Forest of Dean, and a petition written on the behalf of the orphan Henry Graves specified that the infant’s father had been killed ‘by the Irish Armes’ at Beeston Castle in Cheshire. The Cheshire veterans Richard Amery and Richard Wilkinson were far from unusual in describing the Battle of Worcester as the ‘designe against the Scotts’, as opposed to Charles Stuart or the Royalist cause more broadly, a delineation which suggests that the Commonwealth’s efforts to characterise this conflict as a distinct war against their northern brethren may have met with some success.

In addition to citing a specific foreign opponent, other descriptors that former soldiers used to refer to their adversaries included the ‘Comon enemie’ and the ‘publique enemy’, as well as the more explicitly partisan the ‘late King and his p[ar]ty’ and the ‘late kings p[ar]tye’. Nicholas Ward, from Somerset, described the King’s forces as the ‘bloodthirsty Enemy’ and the ‘mercylesse enemy’, a hostility which may have been the result of the particularly harsh way his wounds were inflicted: he had apparently had his ‘eyes and nose cutt in a most cruell and hored [sic] manner’. Several petitioners recalled having fought against a specific enemy commander, especially when they had been confronted by their forces for a relatively prolonged period during the defence of a town. Richard Marchant referred to Lord

---

83 SRO Q/SR/274/9.
84 CRO QJF 79/4/85, QJF 79/3/83.
85 CRO QJF 79/3/89; WSHC A1-110 Michaelmas 1659 f. 120; CRO QJF 82/4/129.
86 CRO QJF 79/3/139. For other petitions that characterise the Battle of Worcester as a fight against the Scots specifically see CRO QJF /79/3/89, QJF 79/4/118. For the Commonwealth’s attempts to portray the third Civil War as an Anglo-Scottish war, rather than a continuation of the domestic conflicts, see chapter one, pp. 72-73, 95-97.
87 ERO Q/SBa 2/182, petition of John Busbie; CRO QJF 84/4/120; NRO C/S 3 box 44, petition of John Belt; WSHC A1-110 Michaelmas 1659 f. 120.
88 SHC Q/SPET/1/116.
Grandison’s attempt to seize Nantwich, Thomas Dulton to the attacks Lord Capel and Sir Thomas Aston made on the same town, and John Hyde to Lord Goring’s assault on Manchester.

In his study of the Devonshire maimed soldiers’ petitions, Mark Stoyle noted that there was a widespread reluctance among the King’s former soldiers to refer directly to the enemy, a reticence that he attributed to a genuine desire to smooth over the divisions of the past. Parliamentary veterans, by contrast, do not seem to have been constrained by a similar wish to forgive and forget.

Another notable disparity between the narratives of Parliamentarian and Royalist veterans was the way that they referred to military engagements. As Stoyle has shown, Royalist petitioners scarcely ever employed the word ‘battle’, an absence that he attributes to their general reluctance to dignify events that they remembered as messy, inglorious bloodbaths with this title. The word ‘fight’ was usually deployed instead. Parliamentarian veterans also used the word fight, especially when describing smaller skirmishes, but they were markedly less antipathetic to the word battle. The term was most commonly applied to the Parliament’s decisive victory at Worcester, though it was also occasionally used to refer to smaller engagements such as the Battle of Bolton. Perhaps, as the victors of war, Parliamentarian veterans experienced less cognitive dissonance between their own wartime activities and idealised war narratives than their defeated Royalist counterparts, particularly when recalling their final ‘greate victory’.

The requirements of the maimed soldiers legislation ensured that there was one aspect of their military experience that all veterans, both Parliamentarian and Royalist, were compelled to include in their war stories: the injuries that they had sustained while in service. In some cases, these recollections of impairment were rather vague, with petitioners offering little more than the necessary affirmation that, as a result of their military activities, they were no longer able to maintain themselves. Roger Walmsley, for example, simply stated that he had been ‘A souldier for divers yeares and by reason of severall wounds and hurts receaved is become lame and blynde’.

---

89 CRO QJF 77/4/55, QJF 77/4/41, QJF 77/1/21. For a reference to Prince Rupert see LRO QSP 52/7.
90 Stoyle, ‘Memories of the Maimed’, pp. 221-222.
91 Ibid., p. 213.
93 CRO QJF 79/3/89.
94 LRO QSP 142/10.
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Many more soldiers took the opportunity to describe their experiences in some depth. John Middlewick recalled that he had received ‘a cuitt from the enemy throughout the face and had his bowells trode out with the horse and was run through with a Turk [a short sword with a curved blade]’, while John Pester, from Sidbury in Devon, explained that he had ‘his musket brocken in service and the peces of the stocke strock his eyes that one of his eyes rotted in his head and […] his hand was brocken’. George Jennings told the Staffordshire quarter sessions that he had been ‘soe dangerously wounded that he was unfitt for any future service’ for ‘his scull was cut, a pece of silver put in to supply the Breach, his eare shott through his cheeke cuitt, his Jawbone broken his right arme utterly maymed, his side runne through […] in 2 severall places w[i]th broadheaded pikes’. In 1653, Richard Parker regaled the Somerset quarter sessions with a colourful story of his exploits at the garrison of Wellington House, where he had been taken prisoner by the enemy and afterwards endeavoring to escape from them was taken againe and condemmd to be hanged and was cast of the ladder but god in mercy to yo[u]r pet[itioner] broke the rope and lyeing along time dead in the place yet providence restored yo[u]r pet[itioner] to life againe: by means of w[hi]ch cruell usage yo[u]r pet[itioner] hath continued ever since in a very weake condicon.

Such references to the Lord’s providence were not restricted to tales of miraculous escape. For some soldiers, the infliction of pain and injury was also understood to be the work of God. Thus, in 1650, Andrew Smyth explained to the Wiltshire quarter sessions that while bound for Ireland ‘it [had] pleased God to Inflect a Grevious desease on me which compelled me to forsake my Company’, Anthony Baker that ‘by the alwise pr[ovidence of god [he] fell off from his horse and broke his legg’ at the insurrection at Salop. In their studies of maimed soldiers’ petitions, both David Appleby and Matthew Neufeld have commented on the dearth of references to either God or providence in petitions from the 1650s. Consideration of a larger number of cases from across England tells a different story, and shows that some Parliamentarian veterans did choose to interpret and recall their experiences – both the unpleasant and the seemingly miraculous – as part of a divine plan.
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95 SHC Q/SPET/1/121; DHC QS/B box 54, petition of John Pester.
96 SRO Q/SR/274/10.
97 SHC Q/SPET/1/147.
98 For other references to God in the context of preservation or assistance see CRO QJF 79/3/139, QJF 79/4/126; ERO Q/SBa 2/78, petition of John Crammor.
100 Appleby, ‘Unnecessary Persons?’, p. 215; Neufeld, The Civil Wars after 1660, p. 65. Appleby’s study was restricted to Essex, while Neufeld analysed a relatively small number of petitions from the years before 1660. The absence of references to providence that Appleby identifies in Essex does, however, raise the intriguing question of whether there were geographic variations in patterns of providential language.
Not all the afflictions that soldiers recounted served the straightforward strategic purpose of evidencing disability, and men also often included in their petitions descriptions of injuries or hardships that had no particular bearing on their ability to work. For example, Thomas Hinchcliffe, from Kettleshulme in Cheshire, stated in his petition that he ‘had his left eare wholly cut away from his head’ – an unpleasant experience for him, no doubt, but one that was inflicted on many petty criminals each year. Others related the sufferings which they had endured off the battlefield. In his 1649 petition, John Head, from Easton in Wiltshire, recalled that he had been ‘many tymes plundred and ymprisoned [sic] by the Kings Forces’, and in 1656 Nicholas Lawrense stated that he ‘was five tymes taken Prison[er] by the enemy’. In 1652, Richard Hillard reported that, in addition to sustaining disabling wounds and bruises, he had endured ‘much misery in Taunton during the Seidges’. Several ex-soldiers evoked the pains of long periods spent in the cold. Neither the 1647 or the 1651 act gave any particular weight to non-disabling injuries, and it therefore seems probable that soldiers remembered such hardships less because they hoped they would strengthen their case for relief, and more because these traumatic experiences loomed large in their own memories, forming an integral part of their war stories.

For some men, their injuries served as a form of mnemonic device, one that allowed them to recall and recount their service accurately. Typical, in this respect, was the petition of the Devonshire veteran George Gibbs, which began with assurances that he had fought for the Parliament ‘ever since the beginning of those distractions’ and went on to detail that he had

Att Modbury fight his hand split asunder, The Sunday fight att Plymouth shoote in the left shoulder, Att mount Edgcombe houze, dangerously shoote in the head; w[i]th the Earle of Essex in Cornwall one shoote above the theigh of eighteene Inches, And drawn from Foy upon a waggon as far as Wardo [i.e. Wardour, in Wiltshire] beeing of a weake and sicke constitucon often tymes deprived of the faculty of useing his lims.

Gibbs’ wounds, and the places where he had sustained them, were the touchstones around which he structured his war story, his body a map of where he had served.

---

101 CRO QJF 79/4/132.
103 SHC Q/SPET/1/115.
104 LRO 138/9; WHSC Hilary 1651 f. 189.
105 DHC QS/B, box 54, petition of George Gibbs.
106 For further discussion of the connection between bodies and memory see Ian Atherton and Philip Morgan, ‘The Battlefield War Memorial: Commemoration and the Battlefield Site from the Middle Ages to the Modern Era’, *Journal of War and Culture Studies*, 4.3 (2013), 289-304 (p. 295).
For other claimants, wounds provided not just a narrative structure, but also a lasting verification of the truth of their version of events. In 1651, Nicholas Smale recounted that he had received an injury to his hand at Oxford, and also ‘sev[er]all wounds yett to be seen’ while serving in Cornwall.  

This reference to wounds ‘yett to be seen’ clearly implies that Smale anticipated that the Somerset justices would study his injuries and read the truth of his story in his scars. Similarly, in 1653 Richard Overton explained to the Staffordshire quarter sessions that during the wars he had received numerous injuries, ‘as the scarres upon his body doe shew’.  

This tendency to view wounds as a lasting means of both commemoration and verification was not unique to veterans of the British Civil Wars. In his memoirs, the French historian Pierre de Bourdeille de Brantome described a Spanish soldier who rolled up his sleeves and used his battle scars to narrate his military service.  

Similar, if fictitious, were the words that Shakespeare’s Henry V spoke to his soldiers before the battle of Agincourt: he asserted that the survivors would commemorate the battle each year and ‘strip his sleeve and show his scars. And say “These wounds I had on Crispin’s day”’.  

Wounds, then, acted as proof, they confirmed identity, and they were lasting reminders of a man’s wartime experiences.

iii. Women’s Words: The Tales of Parliamentarian War Widows

While loyal service and disability were the cornerstones of a successful maimed soldier petition, widows needed to evidence their husband’s service, his death, and their own financial distress. As a result, their petitions necessarily differed from those of soldiers, not least because the war stories that they provided were a combination of their own personal experiences and those of their spouse, which had been relayed to them second or even third hand. Moreover, unlike veterans, who were almost entirely silent on the subject of death, whether comrade or enemy, widows had no choice but to refer to at least one death: that of their husband. In this respect, their petitions offer a rare glimpse of the ways in which the people of early modern England narrated and interpreted the deaths that inevitably accompanied a decade of domestic conflict.

107 SHC Q/SPET/1/119.
108 SRO Q/SR/284/11.
111 The few veterans who did mention death in their petitions referred to the loss of a relative which had compounded their own financial hardship. For an example see LRO QSP 180/13.
112 For recent studies that examine the self-fashioning of Civil War widows in their petitions, and particularly their use of the language of poverty and loyalty, see Worthen, ‘The Experience of War Widows’, pp. 151-200.
The most common way for a woman to describe her husband’s death was with the word ‘slain’. 113 While in modern day parlance this term carries connotations of butchery and violence, in seventeenth-century England it referred to any death inflicted by external means, and could be accidental as well as deliberate. In 1647, Lettice Doe stated that her husband Henry had been ‘by a rotten tree slaine’, just as in 1655 Margaret Seeley explained that her husband had been ‘slaine in the late warre’. 114 Other popular descriptors, particularly if a man had died away from the battlefield, included ‘died’ and ‘lost his life’. 115 In 1652, the Lancashire woman Jane Dobson stated that her husband had ‘either [been] slaine or dyed upon sicknes’, a description which suggests that she made a clear distinction between death inflicted in the heat of combat and death that arose as a side effect of military service. 116

While petitioners needed to demonstrate that their spouse had died in the service of the Parliament or republics, the widow Elizabeth Crant was unusual in choosing to interpret her husband’s death as a self-conscious act of sacrifice for the cause – she explained that he had ‘laid downe his life as a pledge of his Trust and Fidelity’ at the Battle of Rowton Heath. 117 Far more prevalent were women who supplemented their descriptions of death with the language of providence: phrases such as ‘it pleased the Almighty god that your petitioners said husband was slaine’; ‘it pleased god to take away the life of my said husband’; and ‘it pleased God to unfit […]her husband w[i]th a longe lingring Disease’ were commonplace. 118

Such language was reflective of a wider tendency, one that was deeply embedded in both puritan and Anglican religious culture, to view worldly events as part of a divine plan. Though a person’s preservation might be a sign of God’s favour and require adequate remembrance, the infliction of hardships and death were not necessarily a sign of His wrath.


113 There are at least fifty widows’ petitions in my sample that use this term. For a selection see: CRO QJF 79/3/96, QIF 79/4/85, QIF 80/1/116, QIF 82/4/133, QIF 85/3/157; DHC QS/B box 54, petitions of Katheren Coller and Elizabeth Roxford, QS/B box 65, petition of Joane Gullibrowne; LRO QSP 26/7, QSP 91/16, QSP 115/8; SHC Q/SR/94/14; SRO Q/SR/274/14 and 15; TNA SP 18/95 f. 180.

114 CRO QIF 75/4/77; LRO QSP 115/8.

115 For examples of each see CRO QIF 79/4/119, QIF 80/2/162; ERO Q/SBa 2/78, petition of Sarah Bott; LRO QSP 118/3, QSP 148/25, QSP 164/13; SRO Q/SR/299/12; TNA SP 18/66 f. 184; WSHC A1-110 Michaelmas 1654 f. 189.

116 LRO QSP 71/24.

117 TNA SP 18/100 f. 218.

118 CRO QIF 79/4/85; ERO Q/SBa 2/82, petition of Martha Eming; WSHC A1-110 Easter 1656 f. 157. See also DHC QS/B, box 59, petition of Elizabeth Cawsey; ERO Q/SBa 2/78, petition of Sarah Bott; LRO QSP 32/27; SRO Q/SR/274/6; TNA SP 18/131 f. 131; WSHC A1-110 Trinity 1656 f. 156.
Rather, they might be a form of trial through which He tested His truest believers or part of a larger, inscrutable design. For widows, as for veterans, the flexibility of providential thought meant that it was a framework that could be used to understand and ascribe meaning to both losses and gains, victories and defeats, preservations and inflictions, sometimes simultaneously. In her 1656 petition, the Somerset widow Maud Carpe explained that by ‘the Windome [sic] of God [she] hath by her industry and labour’ managed to maintain herself, ‘but it hath [now] pleased the lord so to visett her and on[e] of her children with sicknesse that she is not of her selfe able to subsist’. For Maud, both her former industry and her present illness were the result of divine intervention.

If, however, a woman had reason to believe that her husband’s death was the result of unjust actions on the part of earthly actors she could be significantly less sanguine. In her petition to the Wiltshire quarter sessions in 1659, Alice Carawaye, from Penly, did not state that her husband had been slain, died, or had lost his life, but that he had been ‘in a barbarous Man[ner] upon coole bloud’ put ‘to yt most shamefull death of hanginge’ by forces under the command of ‘that blody tyrant Sir Francis Dordington [i.e. Doddington]’. The incident that Alice described here was the execution of a dozen Parliamentarian prisoners, most of them clothiers, by Royalist forces at Woodhouse, near Frome, in June 1644, in retribution for the six Irish Royalists that Colonel Sydenham had executed at Wareham several weeks earlier. Alice had initially been awarded a pension in October 1648, which, in recognition of the role that Doddington had played in her husband’s death, was to be taken out of his sequestered estates. However, following the discharge of the sequestration and the sale of these lands, Alice’s payments ceased and she petitioned the quarter sessions for their reinstatement several times over the course of the 1650s. On each occasion the violence of her language remained undimmed. Nor was she the only woman who was so aggrieved. In 1649, Agnes Young also petitioned the Wiltshire justices for financial relief, stating that ‘S[i]r Francis

120 SHC Q/SR/94/14.
121 WSHC A1-110 Trinity 1659 f. 156.
123 Ibid., p. 117.
Doddington (yt bloudie tyrant) hanged y[ou]r petico[n]ers said husband w[i]th 13 souldiers more of ye said garrison’. 125

A similar sense of outrage lay at the heart of Elizabeth Dey’s account of her husband’s death. In 1657, she told the Lancashire quarter sessions that ‘when the Garrison of Liv[er]poole was taken by Prince Rup[er]ts force’ he [i.e. Henry Dey] ‘was cruelly murthered in the s[ai]d towne’. 126 Unlike slain, the term murdered implied an unjust, wrongful element to the infliction of death. In this case, the incident in question was Prince Rupert’s storming of the garrison of Liverpool in June 1644, just a few weeks after the infamous Bolton massacre. 127 The taking of Liverpool was equally bloody. According to the newsbook The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer, the Prince denied the defending soldiers quarter and instead had them killed, along with many civilians in the town, actions that clearly contravened contemporary standards of just war. 128 Elizabeth was not from Liverpool itself but from Whitson, around thirty miles to the east, and it is unlikely that she would have witnessed this incident first-hand. Thus, it is probable that her emotive description of Henry’s death was coloured by accounts circulating in the Parliamentarian press that detailed the cruelty of Prince Rupert and his ‘pious Irish rebels’, whether read for herself, or, perhaps more likely, transferred orally. 129 In Dey’s case, personal and public scripts were intertwined, with the latter inflecting the way she chose to narrate an event to which she had an intimate personal connection. 130

For other women, the death of their spouse at war was less of a certainty than an educated guess. While women of status, like Dame Frances Fairfax, could be pretty certain of their husband’s fate – Frances received a personal visit from the MP Sir Thomas Widdrington offering his condolences – the information contained in the petitions suggests that the ways women received the news of a death, and the accuracy of this intelligence, varied considerably. 131

125 WSHC A1-110 Trinity 1649 f. 166.
126 LRO QSP 147/8.
127 For contemporary accounts of the Bolton massacre, in which Royalist forces apparently cornered retreating Parliamentarians in the ungarrisoned town, resulting in brutal hand-to-hand combat and many civilian casualties see Anon., An exact relation of the bloody and barbarous massacre at Bolton in the Moors in Lancs, May, By Prince Rupert (London, 1644; Thomason / E.7[1]) and Anon., The devils whiteboyes; or, A mixture of malicious malignants, with their much evil and manifold practises against the kingdome and parliament (London, 1644; Thomason / E.14[11]), p. 7.
129 Ibid.
130 Ibid.
131 TNA SP 18/97 f. 15.
First, and most clear cut, some sick and wounded men returned home for a period before their death. In 1657, Margaret Bulkley, from Nantwich, described in some depth the injuries her husband had sustained at the Battle of Worcester. These had continued to trouble him long after he was discharged, until he eventually died while undergoing treatment. Second, news could be brought back by fellow soldiers returning from the conflict. In her 1653 petition, Elizabeth Fowler explained that her husband had been shot in Ireland and that this had been ‘credibly certified’ to the court by Samuel Downes, ‘a soldier in the service att the same time’. Not all reports of death supplied by third parties proved to be entirely reliable, however, as the accidental bigamist Alice Bococke found to her cost. In 1651, Alice gave information to the northern assizes about her marriage to John Bococke, which had been rendered illegal by the reappearance of her first husband, Thomas Barton, back from the wars and very much alive. In her defence, Alice stated that Barton had gone to Scotland to serve as a soldier and that she

hath not heard any thinge from him untill one Richard Naske of Skipton a soldi[er] w[hi]ch was then latly come out of Scotland and tould this exam[inant] that hee was by and present when her s[ai]d husband Thomas Barton was buried in Scotland soe that she could not expect any further helpe or comfort from him for that hee did helpe to lye him in his Grave.

Third, and most problematic, a man could simply have been away for so long that he was presumed dead. In 1651, Mabel Greatrakes lamented to the Cheshire justices that since her husband’s departure for Ireland under Colonel Venables ‘shee hath not heard from him, neither doth she know wheather he be alive or dead’. A man could not be presumed dead until he had been missing for at least seven years, and uncertainty alone was not enough to qualify a woman for a formal widow’s pension.

To some extent, the varying amounts of detail that women supplied about their husband’s military career may have been the product of these discrepancies in how a report of death was received. In particular, the narratives of women whose husbands had died after returning from service often contained rather more specific details than those of women who had

132 CRO QJF 85/2/171.
133 ERO Q/SBa 2/84, petition of Elizabeth Fowler.
134 TNA ASSI 45/4/3/6.
135 CRO QJF 79/4/127.
received the news second or third hand. Mary Hawkinson, for example, whose husband died of a wartime sickness not long after his return from Ireland, described her husband’s service in considerable depth, stating that he had been

in Col[onel] Duckenfield his Regim[en]t of foot in the Garrison at Chester [and] was one that was allotted and drewne forth of the said Regim[en]t for the service of Ireland, wherein he continued above one yeare under Comand of Captaine Dene in Col[onel] Venables his Regim[en]t. Where the service being very hot and sharpe and all necessaries very scarce, [you]r pet[itioners] husband was brought into a weakenes and lingering sicknes whereof aft[er]wards hee dyed.137

Mary’s account of where her husband had served, under whom, and of the difficult conditions in Ireland, both militarily and materially, suggest her husband had been back in England long enough to describe in some detail the hardships he had suffered. Likewise, Jane Heyes narrated her husband’s experience at the Battle of Worcester, where he was apparently ‘cast downe and many more of his fellowes accidentally fell upon him’ his body being so ‘bruised and crushed w[i]th the waight yt it blackened’. She knew this because he had been brought to a house where ‘w[i]thin a few dayes after [he] deyed’.138

Though their husband’s service and eventual death were an essential part of a successful widow’s petition, not all women were content to relay just their spouse’s story; some also chose to include an account of their own wartime experiences. In most cases, these narratives concerned the loss of property and other hardships that might help to buttress the petitioner’s claim to poverty. When, in 1651, Jane Jukeman petitioned the Wiltshire quarter sessions she began, not with her husband’s enlistment as a surgeon in Fairfax’s army, but with a description of the Irish Rebellion: ‘the unheard of Rebellion and Murther […] in that nacon by which yo[u]r pet[itioner] with her husband and children were inforced to leave house and land and all that they had to returne into England’.139 Clearly the extent of Jane’s losses underlined her financial need. However, it is also possible to detect in her choice of language and the use of a rhetorical triad a degree of emotion and wistfulness, a desire to impart to the sessions not just the financial cost but the difficulty and violence of her experience. Similarly, when, in 1650, Katherin Stubbs petitioned the Cheshire quarter sessions she recounted both the loss of her husband and the destruction of her house, with the latter receiving far more attention than the former. Stubbs recalled that

137 CRO QJF 80/2/150.
138 CRO QJF 79/4/109. For other particularly detailed examples see CRO QJF 85/2/17; SRO Q/SR/272/13.
haveing her habitacon without the walles of Northwich in the tyme of the Garrison And being her house joyned unto the outmoste guard upon the comeing of Prince Rupert against the towne as the Officers and Souldiers within the towne suspected the Offices and gentlemen within the towne caused fower bayes of her building to be puld downe for feare of giving advantage to the Enimyes soe that your poore petitioner sustayned great losses there after a greate and former losse vizzt loosing her deare husband in the service.

Here, Katherin shows a good knowledge of the military tactics that lay behind suburb clearing, and it is possible that she provided these specifics in the interests of verisimilitude. However, it is also possible to read the inclusion of such superfluous detail as a narrative choice, one that suggests that the significance of remembering and recounting this difficult personal experience extended beyond the purely tactical.

More rarely, women chose to remember not just their experience as a civilian, but their own active participation in the wars. One of the most detailed narratives of this type was the petition of Margaret Knowlesley, presented to the Cheshire quarter sessions in 1657. Like other widows, Margaret opened with an account of her husband’s fidelity and death. Unlike other widows, she went on to state that

yo[ur] pet[itioner] hath been true and faithfull for the Comon wealthes good not onely against the Enimye att the siege att Namptwich but ventured her life in her journey to Wemm to prevent betraying of yt by the Kings partye and al soe att Lichfeld [sic] and Stafford and other places.

In some ways, Margaret’s account conformed to the expected and accepted virtues of widow petitioners, her participation acting as evidence of her fidelity to the state. In other ways, it was highly transgressive. For rather than emphasise her misery, her helplessness, or her victimhood, the picture Margaret painted was of an active and willing participant.

The petition of the Bristolian Sarah Norris, presented to the Lord Protector in the spring of 1659, was similarly unusual. Sarah explained that during the 1640s she had beene utterly ruined and six smale Children by ye Comon enemy in the loss of her husband whoe Dyed in prison and her estate utterly ruined for her good affection and service done to this Comonwealth by her contynuall impoyeing several persons from the said Cittie [i.e. Bristol] to give intelligence to the Armies of this

---

140 CRO QJF 78/1/20.
141 CRO QJF 85/4/124. The role played by female civilians during the 1643 Royalist assault on Wem was infamous and was immortalised in the rhyme ‘The women of Wem, and a few musketeers / Beat the lord Capel, and all his cavaliers’. See Samuel Garbet, The History of Wem (Wem: G. Franklin, 1818), p. 220.
142 For studies that explore the various roles that women played during the Civil Wars see Alison Plowden, Women All on Fire: The Women of the English Civil Wars (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998); Ann Hughes, Gender and the English Revolution (London: Routledge, 2012). For a discussion of Civil War intelligence networks, albeit with very little reference to the role that women played in espionage, see John Ellis, ‘To Walk in the Dark’: Military Intelligence During the English Civil War, 1642-1646 (Stroud: The History Press, 2011).
Comonwealth besides the distrubuteing of a great p[ar]tie of her personal estate to the comfort and relieffe of diverse well affected persons, whoe at that tyme was miserably imprisoned in a very sad condition most of them being prisoners at warr in the said Cittie, In soe much that yo[u]r pet[itioner] being discovered to have given Intelligence to a party of our Army, that there was a party of the enemies to march out of the Cittie and to fall upon them in there quarters (as in truth shee did) whereby our p[ar]tie was in readiness and totally defeated the enemy; but yo[u]r pet[itioner] was forced to fly for her life, and leave her house and all her goods and stocke w[h]ich was at that tyme considerable to the pray of the enemy, whose totally plundered and spoyled them to the utter ruine of y[ou]r pet[itioner] and family.143

Clearly Sarah was a woman of rather more elevated status than Margaret and had given significant financial assistance to the Parliamentarian cause. She was similar, however, in that she chose to lavish attention on her own war story, relegating her husband’s death to a single sentence. In his study of the Civil War memoirs of Lucy Hutchinson, Derek Hirst has suggested that Hutchinson ‘gained some personal gratification from the active role amid great events’ her writing allowed her to claim.144 Such feelings were not the preserve of elite, educated memoirists. Petitions gave women the opportunity to narrate their own experiences, and both Margaret and Sarah seized the chance to put themselves at centre stage and recount stories that dwelt on their wartime agency.

Conclusion

For some individuals the experience of war defies narration. In modern accounts of war, we are accustomed to meditations on the challenges of relating the seemingly unrelatable.145 Reflecting on one of the battles of the American Civil War, the author Herman Melville warned his readers that

None can narrate that strife in the pines,
A seal is on it—Sabaean lore!
Obscure as the wood, the entangled rhyme
But hints at the maze of war—146

Some contemporaries of Britain’s domestic conflicts perhaps felt the same way. At the beginning of his own epic Civil War poem, The British Appeals, George Wither bemoaned the difficulties of writing about war: ‘alas! now I am ready/ To write, I find my shaking hand

143 TNA SP 18/202 f. 126.
unsteady'. Though evidence of what we may now understand as combat fatigue or post-traumatic stress disorder is rare, there are hints that some people were so affected by their experiences that they never regained their former composure. There was the serving maid, wounded in the storming of Hopton Castle and forced to watch as her fellow servants were put to death, who remained ‘ever after distracted with the fright’, or the soldier, Thomas Hoyle, who fought for the Parliament until he fell into a ‘deepe lunacy and distraccon’. Nevertheless, many survivors who were less acutely affected did not choose – or did not have the luxury of choosing – silence. To be eligible for a pension, injured soldiers had to recall their past, and do so in a way that would serve their interests in the present. In this respect, the war stories of poor, wounded Parliamentarian soldiers were not as distant from the accounts of elite memoirists like Sir Hugh Cholmley and Sir Richard Grenville as they may at first appear. Both memoirists and petitioners carefully curated their war stories in order to reconcile the events of the past with their present identity – be that loyal Royalist or disabled Parliamentarian – and, in so doing, what they left out of their account might be quite as significant as what they left in.

However, while petitioners’ memories were clearly guided by legislative requirements, this was not the only factor that shaped the types of stories that veterans and widows told, and many also chose to incorporate details that had no strict legal relevance. Descriptions of recruitment, non-disabling wounds and hardships, and civilian suffering loomed large, and the inclusion of such extraneous details suggests that these experiences were of sufficient personal import to form an integral part of a claimant’s story. Tales of service were often organised by engagement, a narrative structure that highlights the importance of both place and wounds as mnemonic devices.

Individual accounts were also coloured by public scripts. Both Sir Hugh and Sir Richard’s memoirs were, at least in part, attempts to rebut the accusations of disloyalty that had been levelled at them in print and to preserve for posterity a more favourable version of events.

---


Women who learnt that their husband had died in dubious circumstances borrowed the language of the Parliamentarian press and used words such as ‘cruelty’ and ‘murder’. Soldiers and widows alike characterised the third Civil War, in line with Commonwealth propaganda, not as an ongoing struggle against Charles II and the Royalists, but as a national war against the Scots. Though historians often make a conceptual distinction between public and private memory, the boundary between the two was highly porous – and it did not necessarily run only one way. When Sir Richard published the *Vindication*, his personal war story became one intervention in a larger public debate. Similarly, while wounded soldiers and bereaved women drew on public narratives to make sense of difficult experiences they also added to them, incorporating their own specific memories and telling stories that, in turn, shaped what it meant to be a survivor of war.
Conclusion

The primary aim of this thesis has been to explore the ways in which the British Civil Wars were remembered by successive governments, their opponents, and the wider populace between the execution of Charles I in 1649 and the restoration of the monarchy in 1660. Over the last decade, the mental afterlife of Britain’s major domestic conflicts has become an area of significant scholarly interest. Existing studies, however, have tended to focus on the period after 1660, when memories of the entire revolutionary period can be considered as a whole. This thesis has sought to redress this imbalance. By wresting memories of the wars during the Commonwealths and Protectorates from posterity’s passion for the revolution during the later seventeenth century, it has provided a detailed study of the memorial culture of England’s republican interval. This conclusion will summarise the thesis’ main findings and reflect on their implications for our understanding of the memory of Britain’s domestic conflicts, early modern memory, and the experience of post-civil war states more generally.

Empirically, perhaps the most significant finding that has emerged from this research is the sheer multiplicity of ways the events of 1642 to 1651 were remembered during the republics. Memories of the British Civil Wars were alive in the minds and discourses of English citizens throughout the 1650s and were deployed by a wide range of individuals for a variety of reasons. Previous accounts of the mental afterlife of Britain’s internecine conflict – when they have not overlooked England’s republican interval entirely – have been more inclined to suggest the absence of Civil War memories in 1650s England than establish their presence.¹ By contrast, this thesis has expanded the field of study to include a far wider range of commemorative acts, from the literary to the non-textual, the momentous to the quotidian, and, in so doing, has revealed the rich memorial culture of republican England. When viewed in light of the findings presented in this thesis, Charles Carlton’s claim that after the fighting

had ceased most participants ‘developed almost a form of amnesia’, both of their own wartime deeds and those of others, appears somewhat hasty.2

On a national level, this thesis has shown that successive governments made concerted, if sometimes inconsistent, attempts to control the public memory of the bloody recent past. In particular, the culpability of the King for the wars, the providential nature of Parliamentarian victories – especially during the third Civil War – and the cruel and untrustworthy actions of the Scots were themes that recurred in numerous texts and other forms of state-sponsored memory work. Further, it has argued that when republican commemorative practices did exhibit inconsistency or ambivalence this was less the product of institutional incompetence or fears of their unpopularity, as some scholars have suggested, and more the result of an inherent tension that lay at the heart of the republics’ approach to public memory.3 Torn between the competing impulses of remembrance and reconciliation, the Commonwealth and Protectorate governments attempted to steer a tricky course between the necessity of recollection and the desire to achieve a peaceful settlement. That, ultimately, the memorialising impulse generally won out was the result of a theological imperative to remember providential victories, coupled with the prioritisation of short-term political expediency over longer-term visions of conciliation.

Nor were the republican regimes and their supporters the only ones who sought to control the public memory of the internecine conflict. In contrast to the period after 1660, when the Restoration regime effectively suppressed rival interpretations of the wars in printed material, this thesis has shown that the republics’ opponents often succeeded in propagating their own versions of past events. For many of the Parliament’s former allies, such as the Levellers, this task did not require the construction of an entirely new narrative framework so much as the co-option and subversion of accounts favoured by the government. Royalists, meanwhile, contested republican scripts both directly and more obliquely. While some texts explicitly attacked the Commonwealth’s attempts to assign responsibility for the war, translations of foreign histories and allegorical works offered more subtle counter-narratives. A careful reading of these texts has revealed some of the fissures that existed within Royalism, both ideologically and temporally. The memory wars of the 1650s were not simply a battle

---

2 Carlton, *Going to the Wars*, p. 344.
between the republics and Royalists, but a war fought on many fronts between competing visions of the past, present, and future.

Through extensive analysis of archival material, primarily legal records, this thesis has also illuminated the ways in which the wider English populace – those people who were not politicians, poets, or pamphleteers – recalled the conflicts of 1642 to 1651 in the course of their own lives. It has shown that Civil War events were the subjects of ongoing discussions and debates, revealing some of the contests over memory that operated in 1650s England.

Memories of an individual’s wartime service, meanwhile, were deployed for a wide range of reasons: to buttress the case against an unpopular neighbour or official; in verbal and physical disputes; or as a demonstration of a person’s fidelity to the state. Though the very nature of the post-war settlement, in which an individual’s former service retained some legal and administrative relevance, undoubtedly helped to foster such recollections, this thesis has emphasised that the propensity to remember wartime service was not simply a side effect of government regulations. Many individuals and communities were fiercely critical of attempts to reintegrate former Royalists, just as the King’s supporters often proved equally unwilling to forget either their own actions or those of their erstwhile enemies. By dwelling on notable cases of post-war reconciliation, historians like Charles Carlton and Barbara Donagan have obscured the extent to which Civil War allegiance remained of ongoing significance for much of the English populace, as sources of identity and of hostility.4

Recollections of the recent past spanned the length and breadth of the country, and it has been possible to identify some geographic variations in cultures of memory. Memories of the actions of the Scots had a particularly strong presence in the northern counties, an area which had borne the brunt of several years of Scottish occupation and repeated incursions. The inhabitants of Staffordshire, meanwhile, were more likely to recall the passage of the ‘Queen’s army’ through that county. The municipal authorities in several towns and cities created their own commemorations to mark local wartime experiences, and in the London ward of Portsoken inhabitants chose to recall a military engagement that, though geographically distant, had involved many local veterans. Such evidence supports Andy

---

Wood’s contention that the local was an important locus of early modern memory. However, though an area’s localised wartime experience could influence both the events that people chose to recall and the way they were remembered, people’s memories were not confined to local incidents. Citizens from across the country also discussed events of national import, from the Irish rebellion to the execution of the King. Localised communities of memory, then, did not subsume national scripts, or vice versa; rather, national and vernacular memories existed side by side.

The physical damage caused by the conflict ensured that wartime events were inscribed on the English landscape. Even in the absence of visible scars, some theatres of war continued to possess considerable mnemonic power. Battlefields and sites of execution, though unmarked by memorials, were delineated by observers as spaces where the events of the past continued to echo in the present. Veterans used the locations of engagements to structure their own war stories, and they were deployed by civilians as alternative temporal benchmarks. This latter point is of particular significance. It shows that not all memories of the wars were the product of contestation or conflict over their meaning, and that the events of the internecine conflicts also became embedded in the everyday descriptive discourses of the people.

From a more theoretical perspective, one of the recurring themes of this thesis has been the multifaceted, dynamic nature of early modern memory. Debates over the memory and meaning of the bloody recent past permeated all strata of society – it was discussed by ministers on the highways, veterans in the alehouse, and servants in the parlour. Nor were these disputes the preserve of men. From the Somerset woman Mary Wadden, who fell into a debate with her neighbour over the fate of the King, to the widow Sarah Norris’s narration of her own exploits in espionage, there is ample evidence that the women of republican England were just as capable of crafting and contesting memories as their male counterparts.

Such engagement shows a striking degree of agency among English citizens. It also highlights the complexity of the relationship between public scripts and personal memory. For, while some individuals were influenced by the narratives circulating in public discourses, people might also choose to subvert or reject these scripts, or deploy them for their own ends. The early modern public were not passive receptors of public narratives. Instead, the people of early modern England evinced a nuanced grasp not only on the events

---

of the Civil Wars, but on the cultural and social significance of these events, and on the processes through which they were narrated in public and political life. What we have here, then, is not a top down imposition of memorial culture but an ever-shifting network of overlapping memorial practices.

Many previous studies of Civil War memory have overlooked the agency which individual citizens could possess. For example, in his study of the public memory of the wars in the post-1660 period, Matthew Neufeld has stated that the ‘reading public’ would ‘learn the lessons […government sanctioned] writings offered and embrace the principles they exemplified’. Similarly, Erin Peters commenced her study of commemoration and oblivion in Royalist print culture with the assertion that ‘the majority is usually content to remember in the manner prescribed by the dominant frame of reference’. By contrast, this thesis has shown that people’s responses to public scripts could be significantly more diverse. In this respect, it supports Andy Wood’s claim that the people of early modern England were able to resist public narratives and cultivate their own counter-memory of catastrophic events – but it also qualifies it, showing that not all forms of popular memory were necessarily resistive. The use of Civil War events in descriptive discourses, for example, does not conform to a binary distinction between public memory and counter-memory. Nor does the tendency among petitioners to incorporate into their war stories aspects of their experience that, while legislatively irrelevant, were of significant personal import. By emphasising that people’s memories cannot always be collapsed into either acquiescence or resistance, this thesis presents a more complex picture of the memory of catastrophic events in early modernity than has hitherto been articulated, showcasing the sheer diversity of ways the past was perpetuated in the present.

In part, this thesis owes the discovery of these less instrumental manifestations of memory to its adoption of the dynamic of memory approach, which, while by no means denying the importance of power relations in the construction of memory, is reluctant to reduce all its manifestations to the political. However, it is also the product of its varied and innovative source base. This has included court records, petitions, diaries, civic records, and material
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culture, as well as a wide range of printed texts. By expanding the field of early modern memory beyond its traditional focus on printed histories and elite memoirs, this thesis has shown that the use of a more diverse range of sources can enrich our understanding of early modern memory. It has also enabled it to cast light on several hitherto unexplored aspects of 1650s culture, such as localised veteran commemorations and almanac annotations. As a result, this thesis has methodological implications for historians of early modern memory, demonstrating the benefits of self-consciously adopting the dynamics of memory approach and of engaging with a wider selection of memorial materials.

Finally, by situating 1650s England in relation to studies of recollection in other post-conflict societies, this thesis has been able to draw some parallels between memorial practices in early modern England and those of modern post-civil war states. In a recent study of early modern memory across Europe, Judith Pollmann has argued that though modern historians have been inclined to emphasise the ‘modernity’ of many features of memorial culture after 1800, there are in fact many commonalities between early modern and modern memory.9 This thesis supports this contention, and has identified several similarities between the experience of early modern England and post-civil war states in modernity.10

Perhaps most obviously, the dilemma that the republics faced between the duty and utility of remembrance and the desire to facilitate effective reconciliation is one that continues to trouble states in the modern day. As Priscilla Hayner has put it, ‘some argue that the best way forward is to bury the past […] Yet can a society build a democratic future on a foundation of blind, denied or forgotten history? In recent years, virtually every country emerging from a dark history has confronted this question’.11 It is possible to observe this quandary in the solutions favoured by many post-war governments, which often exhibit similar tensions between the competing impulses of memory and oblivion.12

10 See pp. 96-98, 116, 199-200, 233, in particular.
12 For example, in post-civil war El Salvador, the removal of senior members of the armed forces who had been involved in the wars from their posts and the establishment of a ‘Commission on the Truth’, which sought to uncover serious acts of violence, was accompanied by a sweeping amnesty law which ensured that there were no legal repercussions for past actions and that former combatants were reintegrated into the state. Ibid., pp. 49-52.
Clearly, there are differences between these cases that derive from their specific historical contexts. As Ziya Meral has noted, in the modern world the case for the ‘duty to remember’ often turns on the twin beliefs that victims of violence should be recognised and that the commemoration of past brutalities is necessary to prevent future atrocities – the classic adage that ‘those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it’. In the republics, by contrast, the duty to remember was less a moral imperative, based on the cautionary value of memory, than a theological duty, derived from the providential nature of the wars’ successes. Nevertheless, that these duties to remember have posed states with a similar dilemma suggests that the challenges that confront governments in the aftermath of civil war are not necessarily as temporally or geographically specific as we might expect. The same is true of some of the responses. Though the term ‘oblivion act’ is specific to early modernity, many amnesty laws seek to achieve similar ends, granting a pardon for individuals’ wartime activities, and, in so doing, depriving the memory of past actions of its legal force. The process of ‘othering’, meanwhile, whereby groups attempt to buttress their own identity and dilute responsibility for communal violence by projecting blame onto a demonised ‘other’ has been identified as a central plank of nation-building since the eighteenth century. A similar technique was deployed by the republican governments during the 1650s. By emphasising the cruelty and treachery of the Scots, the English state created a foreign enemy who could be blamed, along with the King, for both the outbreak of the wars and the hardships of 1642 to 1649, essentially absolving the republics and the majority of English citizens of responsibility. Nation-building was not solely the preserve of the period after 1800, and the republican government made concerted use of ‘othering’ – particularly during the third Civil War – to try and establish the notion of a cohesive, divinely favoured English state.

To identify the full extent of the similarities between the experience of early modern and modern post-civil war states would require a comprehensive comparative study across time and space. Nonetheless, the parallels peppered throughout this thesis are suggestive; they point to the possible value of such an endeavour and represent one of the first scholarly efforts to initiate a conversation between scholars of civil war memory before and after 1800.

---

14 Countries where amnesty laws have been implemented in the aftermath of civil conflict include cases as widespread as the American, Finnish, and Lebanese Civil Wars.
Other potentially fruitful areas for future research include the ways the wars were remembered by the citizens of Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, subjects which lie outside the geographic scope of this thesis but which are deserving of dedicated study in their own right. Indeed, relatively little work has been conducted on the memories of the wars north of the border either before or after 1660. An exploration of recollection and commemoration in Scotland offers scholars the opportunity to take a more integrated approach to the study of the memory of Britain’s civil conflict, which has tended to bifurcate into pre- and post-Restoration scholarship. In future research, I intend to explore the ways in which the Bishops’ Wars and British Civil Wars have been remembered, commemorated, and forgotten north of the English border.

There are also several sources that have been deployed in this thesis that are ripe for further investigation. Petitions, for example, have offered a rare glimpse of the ways in which women and other civilians recalled both their own wartime experiences and those of their families, and there is ample scope for a more comprehensive study of the war stories narrated in these documents both geographically and temporally. Almanac annotations have been remarkably understudied by early modern historians, and this thesis has hinted at the potential of these notes as a window into the ways in which people recorded, recalled, and responded to political upheaval.

In a future research project, I intend to conduct a detailed study of the extensive notes and annotations that the men and women of Britain and North America made in their almanacs during the early modern period. This will trace how annotation practices developed over time, the extent to which notes interacted with printed text (both within and outside the almanac), and the ways in which these notes varied by period, place, social status, and gender. In so doing, the study will enhance our understanding of subjects as diverse as the experience of time, the representation of political events both past and present, intertextuality, and will consider how a mass readership emerged and transformed during what might plausibly be termed the first information revolution.

It seems fitting, however, to give the last word to the people of seventeenth-century England. In April 1660, on the brink of the Restoration, the inhabitants of Wooton Bassett were discussing the candidature of their would-be burgess, Sir Walter St John. At the mention of his name, the local butcher, John White, expressed his dismay, concluding that ‘I cannot be for him neither will I for I must be for a Cavilier, for Sir Walter is an Annabaptist, and did
deliver five bullets ag[ain]st the King at Woster fight’. It is a testament to the enduring power of the divisions of the domestic conflicts that the memory of Sir Walter’s wartime activities remained of acute significance more than a decade after arms had been laid aside.
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Mercurius Politicus, no. 4, 27 June-4 July 1650 (London, 1650; Thomason / 93:E.607[4])

Mercurius Politicus, no. 14, 5-12 September 1650 (London, 1650; Thomason / 94:E.612[14])

Mercurius Politicus, no. 16, 19-26 September 1650 (London, 1650; Thomason / 94:E.613[8])

Mercurius Politicus, no. 20, 17-24 October 1650 (London, 1650; Thomason / 94:E.615[6])

Mercurius Politicus, no. 48, 1-8 May 1651 (London, 1651; Thomason / 96:E.628[9])

Mercurius Politicus, no. 51, 22-29 May 1651 (London, 1651; Thomason / 97:E.629[10])

Mercurius Politicus, no. 66, 4-11 September 1651 (London, 1651; Thomason / 98:E.641[12])

Mercurius Politicus, no. 68, 18-25 September 1651 (London, 1651; Thomason / 98:E.641[23])
Mercurius Politicus, no. 72, 16-23 October 1651 (London, 1651; Thomason / 99:E.643[24])

Mercurius Politicus, no. 93, 11-18 March 1652 (London, 1652; Thomason / 101:E.656[20])


Mercurius Pragmaticus, no. 45, 13-20 February 1649 (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / 84:E.544[9])

Mercurius Pragmaticus, no. 20, 28 August-4 September 1649 (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / 88:E.572[18])

Mercurius Pragmaticus, no. 45, 5-12 March 1650 (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / 91:E.594[24])

Mercurius Pragmaticus, no. 50, 16-23 April 1650 (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / 92:E.598[15])

Perfect occurrences of every dayes journall in Parliament, and other moderate intelligence, no. 59, 4-11 February 1648 (London, 1648; Thomason / 81:E.520[38])

The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer sent abroad to prevent misinformation, no. 14, 28 March-4 April 1643 (Unknown, 1643; Thomason / 17:E.95[2])

The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer sent abroad to prevent misinformation, no. 59, 11-18 June 1644 (London, 1644; Thomason / 9:E.51[10])

The Man in the Moon, no. 17, 8-15 August 1649 (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / 87:E.569[14])

The Man in the Moon, no. 40, 23-31 January 1650 (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / 90:E.590[12])

The Man in the Moon, no. 41, 30 January-6 February 1650 (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / 91:E.592[4])
The Man in the Moon, no. 42, 6-14 February 1650 (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / 91:E.593[8])

The Man in the Moon, no. 51, 10-26 April 1650 (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / 92:E.601[5])

The Man in the Moon, no. 57, 29 May-5 June 1650 (Unknown, 1650; Thomason / 92:E.602[24])

The Scotish dove, sent out and returning Bringing intelligence from their army, no. 71, 21-28 February 1645 (Unknown, 1645; Thomason / 45:E.270[33])

The weekly intelligencer of the Commonwealth faithfully communicating all affairs both martial and civil, no. 400, 10-17 April 1655 (London, 1655; Thomason / 126:E.832[6])

Pamphlets and Books

Anon., A book without a title (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.559[12])

— A brief narration of the plotting, beginning & carrying on of that execrable rebellion and butcherie in Ireland (London, 1650; Thomason / E.596[2])

— A briefe and witty discourse or dialogue, between a York-shire man, and a Scottish-man; concerning the forces landed in Scotland, and the English-Army (London, 1650; Thomason / E.600[2])

— A briefe description of the two revolted nations Holland and England. Against their true and lawfull Kings, lawes, and statutes, to the dishonour of God, and the losse of their owne soules for ever (London, 1650; Thomason / E.597[6])

— A call to the officers of the army, and all good hearts, to stand upon their watch; and in all meeknesse and sobriety to plead for the interest of the people of God, and for the just liberties of these nations (London, 1659; Thomason / E.968[8])

268
— *A Catalogue of the lords, knights, and gentlemen (of the Catholick religion) that were slain in the late warr, in defence of their king and countrey as also, of those whose estates were sold by the Rump for that cause* (Unknown, [1652]; Wing / C1383)

— *A declaration of His Highnes, by the advice of his council, shewing the reasons of their proceedings for securing the peace of the Commonwealth, upon occasion of the late insurrection and rebellion. Wednesday, October, 31. 1655* (London, 1655; Thomason / E.857[3])

— *A declaration of the army of England, upon their march into Scotland* (London, 1650; Thomason / E.607[20])

— *A declaration of the Commons of England assembled in Parliament, of their true intentions concerning the ancient and fundamental government of the kingdom, the government of the church, the present peace; securing the people against all arbitrary government, and maintaining a right understanding between the two kingdoms of England and Scotland, according to the covenant and treaties* (London, 1646; Thomason / E.333[19])

— *A declaration of the officers of the army, inviting the members of the long Parliament, who continued sitting till the 20th of April, 1653. to return to the exercise and discharge of their trust. Friday 6 May, 1659* (London, 1659; Thomason / E.980[20])

— *A Declaration of the Parliament of England, expressing the grounds of their late proceedings, and of settling the present government in a way of a free state* (London, 1649; Thomason / E.548[12])

— *A Declaration or Representation of the actions, intentions, and resolutions of divers of the inhabitants of the county of Hartford, which alwaies have, and still intend to stand to their first declared Parliamentary principles, in order to common right and freedom* (London, 1649; Thomason / E.592[2])

— *A Discovery made by his Highnesse the Lord Protector, to the Lord Mayor, aldermen, and common-counsell of the City of London, on Friday, March the 12. 1657. Concerning*
the new attempts and designs of Charles Stewart and his party, both at home and abroad, to imbroile this nation againe in a new war, and to imbrow it in blood (London, 1658; Thomason / E.1644[2])

— A faithful subjects sigh, on the universally-lamented death, and tragical end, of that virtuous and pious prince, our most gracious soveraigne, Charles I (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.560[4])

— A great wonder in heaven: shewing the late apparitions and prodigious noyses of war and battels, seen on Edge-Hill neere Keinton in Northampton-shire (London, 1643; Thomason / E.85[41])

— A history or brief chronicle of the chief matters of the Irish warres. With a perfect table or list of all the victories obtained by the Lord Generall Cromwell Governour Generall of Ireland and the Parliaments forces under his command there (London, 1650; Thomason / E.608[15])

— A list of the princes, dukes, earls, lords, knights, generals, major generalls, &c. and colonells, of the Scots Kings party slaine and taken prisoners (London, 1652; Thomason / 669.f.16[29])

— A new and true declaration of the false treachery of the Scots against England from time to time (London, 1651; Thomason / E.632[17])

— A new tricke to take townes: or, The just and perfect relation of the sudden surprisall of Hereford; taken December 18. 1645 (London, 1645; Thomason / E.314[12])

— A perfect description of the people and country of Scotland (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.560[7])

— A perfect list of all the victories obtained by the Lord General Cromwel from the time that his excellency was made Captain General and Commander in Cheif of the Parliament forces in England, Ireland, and Scotland (against Charles Stuart King of the Scots,
and his forces in the three nations) to this present time (London, 1651; Thomason / 669.f.16[27])

— A perfect list of all the victories obtained by the Lord General Cromwel from the time that his excellency was made Cap. Gen. and Commander in Chief of the Parliament forces in England, Ireland, and Scotland (against Charles Stuart King of the Scots, and his forces in the three nations) to this present time; with other eminent actions (London, 1652; Thomason / 669.f.16[38])

— A perfect table of one hundred forty and five victories obtained by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and the Parliaments forces under his command, since his excellency was made governor generall by the Parliament of England from Wednesday August i. 1649. to March the last, 1650 (London, 1650; Thomason / 669.f.15[26])

— A proclamation commanding all papists and all other persons, who have been of the late Kings party or his sons, to depart out of the cities of London and Westminster, and late lines of communication, on or before Munday the 8. of March, one thousand six hundred fifty seven (London, 1658; Thomason / 669.f.20[72])

— A proclamation commanding all papists, and all other persons who have been of the late Kings party or his sons, to depart out of the cities of London and Westminster, and late lines of communication, within three days (London, 1659; Thomason / 669.f.21[22])

— A proclamation commanding all persons, who have been of the late Kings party, or his sons, to depart out of the cities of London and Westminster, and late lines of communication on or before Thursday the twelfth day of July instant (London, 1655; Thomason / 669.f.20[3])

— A proclamation for the discovery and apprehending of Charls Stuart, and other traytors his adherents and abettors (London, 1651; Thomason / 669.f.16[25])

— A proclamation prohibiting delinquents to bear office, or to have any voice or vote in election of any publique officer (London, 1655; Thomason / 669.f.20[15])
— A second edition of the new almanack for the year 1656. Or, the nocturnall revised (London, 1656; Thomason / E.490[3])

— A second narrative of the late Parliament (so called.) Wherein, after a brief reciting some remarkable passages in the former narrative, is given an account of their second meeting, and things transacted by them (Unknown, 1659; Thomason / E.977[3])

— A True account of the late bloody and inhumane conspiracy against His Highness the Lord Protector, and this Commonwealth; for the subversion of the present government thereof, and an involving this nation in blood (London, 1654; Thomason / E.813[22])

— A True account of the late bloody and inhumane conspiracy against His Highness the Lord Protector, and this Commonwealth (London, 1654; Thomason / E.813[22])

— A True Declaration of Kingstons Entertainment of the Cavaliers the on 13 of November when they entred the towne, with ringing of bels for joy (London, 1642; Thomason / E.127[39])

— A true relation of the late great mutiny which was in the city and county of Norwich, April 24. 1648 (London, 1648; Thomason / E.438[6])

— A True state of the case of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging; in reference to the late established government by a Lord Protector, and a Parlament (London, 1654; Thomason / E.728[5])

— A word to Mr. Wil. Prynn Esq; and two for the Parliament and Army. Reproving the one, and justifying the other in their late proceedings. Presented to the consideration of the readers of Mr. William Prynns last books (London, 1649; Thomason / E.537[16])

— An act for setting apart Thursday the thirtieth day of January 1650 for a day of publique thanksgiving; together with a declaration of the grounds and reasons thereof (London, 1651; Thomason, E.1061[33])
— An agreement of the people for a firme and present peace, upon grounds of common-right and freedome; as it was proposed by the agents of the five regiments of horse; and since by the generall approbation of the Army, offered to the joyn concurrence of all the free commons of England (Unknown, 1647; Thomason / E.412[21])

— An apologetick for the sequestred clergie of the Church of England. Disclaiming and detesting the late unnatural, presumptuous, unparallel’d and antichristian proceedings, against the honor and life of the best of Kings, our most dear and dread sovereign Lord and King. St Charls the martyr (Unknown, [1649]; Thomason / E.554[7])

— An Elegie on the meekest of men, the most glorious of princes, the most constant of martyrs, Charles the I. &c (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.553[1])

— An elegy upon the most incomparable K. Charles the I. persecuted by two implacable factions, imprisoned by the one, and murthered by the other, January 30th 1648 (Unknown, [1649]; Wing / K499)

— An exact relation of the bloody and barbarous massacre at Bolton in the Moors in Lancs, May, By Prince Rupert (London, 1644; Thomason / E.7[1])

— An inquisition after blood. To the Parliament in statu quo nunc, and to the Army regnant; or any other whether Royallist, Presbyterian, Independent or Leveller, whom it may concern (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.531[23])

— An Order by the Protector appointing 3 Sept as a Day of Public Thanksgiving for the victories at Dunbar and Worcester (London, 1657; Thomason / 669.f.20[65])

— An outcry of the youngmen and apprentices of London: or, An inquisition after the lost fundamentall lawes and liberties of England (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.572[13])
— Anglia liberata, or, The rights of the people of England maintained against the pretences of the Scotish king as they are set forth in an Answer to the Lords Ambassadors propositions of England (London, 1651; Wing / A3178)

— Another victory in Lancashire obtained against the Scots by Major General Harrison, and Collonel Lilburn (London, 1651; Thomason / E.641[14])

— Arguments inviting all faithfull marriners to ingage cheerfully in Englands honourable and just cause, against the Irish rebells and their adherents, now robbing at sea, and about to invade this nation (London, 1649; Thomason / 669.f.14[19])

— At the general quarter-session of the publick peace of the county of Hertford, holden at Hertford, for the county aforesaid, on Monday next after the feast of the translation of St. Thomas the Martyr: that is to say, the fourteenth and sixteenth dayes of July, in the yeer of our Lord one thousand six hundred fifty and six (Unknown, 1656; Wing / H1602B)

— Cabala, mysteries of state, in letters of the great ministers of K. James and K. Charles. Wherein much of the publique manage of affaires is related (London, 1654; Thomason / E.221[3])

— Eikon aklastos: The image unbroaken: a perspective of the impudence, falshood, vanitie, and prophannes, published in a libell entitled Eikonoklastee (Unknown, 1651; Wing / J451)

— Englands apology, for its late change: or, A sober perswasive, of all disaffected or dissenting persons, to a seasonable engagement, for the settlement of this common-wealth. Drawne from the workings of providence (London, 1651; Thomason / E.623[12])

— England's confusion: or A true and impartial relation of the late traverses of state in England; with the counsels leading thereunto. Together with a description of the present power ruling there by the name of a Parliament, under the mask of the good old cause (London, 1659; Thomason / E.985[1])
— Good newes from all quarters of the kingdome; particularly from Gloucester (London, 1643; Thomason / E.250[9])

— His Highnesse the Lord Protector’s speeches to the Parliament in the painted chamber, the one on Munday the 4th of September; the other on Tuesday the 12. of September 1654 (London, 1654; Thomason / E.812[11])

— His Majesties speech and Protestation, made in the head of his armie, between Stafford and Wellington, the 19th of September, 1642 (London, 1642; Thomason / E.200[62])

— King Charls his speech made upon the scaffold at Whitehall-Gate, immediately before his execution, on Tuesday the 30 of Jan. 1648 (London, 1649; Thomason / E.540[17])

— Loyalties tears flowing after the blood of the royal sufferer, Charles the I (Unknown, [1649]; Thomason / E.561[15])

— Majestas intemerata or, the immortality of the King (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.1347[1])

— Monumentum Regale or a tombe, erected for that incomparable and glorious monarch, Charles the First, King of Great Britane, France and Ireland, &c (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.1217[5])

— More warning yet. Being a true relation of a strange and most dreadful apparition which was seen in the air by several persons at Hull, the third day of this present Septemb. 1654 (London, 1654; Thomason / E.811[1])

— Panthalia: or The royal romance. A discourse stored with infinite variety in relation to state-government and passages of matchless affection gracefully interveined, and presented on a theatre of tragical and comical state, in a successive continuation to these times (London, 1659; Thomason / E. 1797[1])

— Paul's churchyard. Libri theologici, politici historici, nundinus Paulinis (una cum templo) extant venales (Unknown, [1652]; Thomason / E.675[12])
— Paul's Church-yard. Libri theologici, politici, historici, nundinus Paulinis (unà cum templo) prostant venales (Unknown, [1651]; Thomason / E.637[15])

— Reliquiae sacrae Carolinae. Or the works of that great monarch and glorious martyr King Charls the I (The Hague, 1651; Thomason / E.1220[1])

— Remarkable Observations of Gods Mercies Towards England (London, 1651; Thomason / E.641[26])

— Some mementos for the officers and souldiers of the Army, from some sober Christians (Unknown, [1654]; Thomason / E.813[20])

— Some reasons humbly proposed to the officers of the Army, for the speedy re-admission of the Long Parliament who setled the government in the way of a free state (London, 1659; Thomason / E.979[8])

— Stipendariae lacrymae, or, A tribute of teares (The Hague, 1654; Thomason / E.745[23])

— The answer of the Parliament of England, to a paper, entituled, a declaration by the Kings Majesty, to his subjects of the kingdoms of Scotland, England and Ireland (London, 1650; Thomason / E.613[2])

— The Armies dutie: or, Faithfull advice to the soldiiers: given in two letters written by severall honest men, unto the Lord Fleetwood Lieutenant-General of the Armie, and now published for the instruction of the whole Armie, and the good people of this Commonwealth (London, 1659; Thomason / E.980[12])

— The Army no usurpers, or The late Parliament not almighty and everlasting: shewing, that the present army in their former opposing, and late dissolving of the Parliament, have done nothing contrary to law, but according to equity (London, 1653; Thomason / E.697[13])
— The Army's martyr: or A faithful relation of the barbarous and illegall proceedings of the court-martiall at White-Hall upon Mr. Robert Lockier (London, 1649; Thomason / E.552[11])

— The Case of the armie truly stated together with the mischiefs and dangers that are imminent, and some suitable remedies, humbly proposed by the agents of five regiments of horse, to their respective regiments, and the whole army (London, 1647; Wing / W2168)

— The case of the King stated, from the very beginning of the warre to this present day (Unknown, 1647; Thomason / E.416[5])

— The cavaliers jubilee: or, long look'd for come at last: viz. the generall pardon. In a pleasant dialogue between Sir Timothy Turn-coat, and Sir Rowland Resolute, two cavaliers that met accidentally, and were lately come over from beyond sea, upon the noise of the generall pardon, and their resolution to leave the service of the young Charles Stuart, and imbrace the Parliaments protection in their gracious act of oblivion (London, 1652; Thomason / E.655[25])

— The charge against the King discharged: or, The king cleared by the people of England, from the severall accusations in the charge, delivered in against him at Westminster-Hall (Unknown, [1649]; Thomason / E.542[10])

— The charge of the Commons of England, against Charls Stuart, King of England, of high treason, and other high crimes, exhibited to the High Court of Justice, by John Cook Esquire, Solicitor General, appointed by the said Court, for, and on the behalf of the people of England (London, 1649; Thomason / E.540[5])

— The credit of Yorkshire, or The glory of the north (London, 1649; Wing / H491B)

— The devilish conspiracy, hellish treason, heathenish condemnation, and damnable murder committed and executed by the Jewes against the Anointed of the Lord, Christ their King (London, 1649; Thomason / E.550[16])
— The devils whiteboyes: or, A mixture of malicious malignants, with their much evill and manifold practises against the kingdome and parliament (London, 1644; Thomason / E.14[11])

— The Earle of Darby's speech on the scaffold, immediately before his execution at Bolton in Lancashire, on Wednesday, October 15. 1651 (London, 1651; Thomason / E.643[12])

— The Earle of Pembrokes last speech (London, 1650; Thomason / E.593[16])

— The Effects of All Letters Read in the House of Parliament from the 14. to the 23. of November from all places of the Kingdome. Viz. Surrey Shropshire Berkshire Yorke Sussex Holland Cornwall Middlesex Leicester Ireland Sea Worcester Wales (London, 1642; Thomason / E.127[48])

— The English banner of truth displayed: or, The state of this present engagement against Scotland (London, 1650; Thomason / E.608[12])

— The English Presbyterian and Independent reconciled: setting forth the smal ground of difference betwixt them both (London, 1656; Thomason / E.891[7])

— The English soldiers standard to repaire to, for wisdome and understanding, in these doleful back-sliding times. To be read by every honest officer to his souldiers; and by the souldiers, one to another (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.550[1])

— The English tyrants. Or, A brief historie of the lives and actions of the high and mighty states, the lords of Westminster, and now (by usurpation) kings of England. Containing all their rebellious and traiterous proceedings and transactions in Parliament. (London, 1649; Thomason / E.569[4])

— The fame, wit, and glory of the west, here in this song shall fully be exprest. A caveat for young men wherein they may behold, how a youngster gave away his mistris and his gold; and maids likewise may here a lesson learn, wherein good from bad they may discern (London, 164[9]; Wing / F350B)
— The famous tragedie of King Charles I basely butchered (Unknown, 1649; Wing / F384)

— The five strange wonders, in the north and west of England as they were communicated to divers honourable members of Parliament, from several countrey gentlemen and ministers (London, 1659; Wing / F1124)

— The grand conspiracy of Jewes against their King (London, 1653; Thomason / E.1524[1])

— The honest design: or, The true Commonwealths-man; offering a word in this juncture of time, in order to a settlement (London, 1659; Thomason / E.980[11])

— The honour of the English soldiery, illustrated by way of parallel, betwixt them, and those of other nations (London, 1651; Thomason / E.638[9])

— The life and reigne of King Charles or, the pseudo-martyr discovered (London, [1652]; Thomason / E.1338[2])

— The Lord General Cromwel's speech delivered in the Council-Chamber, upon the 4 of July, 1653. To the persons then assembled, and intrusted with the supreme authority of the nation. This is a true copie: published for information, and to prevent mistakes (Unknown, 1654; Thomason / E.813[13])

— The martyr of the people, or, the murdered King. Epxressed [sic] in severall considerations upon his sufferings and death. With a character of his life and vertues (London, 1649; Wing / M859)

— The monument of Charles the First, King of England Who was beheaded before Whit-Hall [sic] January 30th 1648. In the 24th yeare of his reigne (Unknown, [1649]; Thomason / 669.f.14[36])

— The New yeares wonder being a most certaine and true relation of the disturbed inhabitants of Kenton: and other neighbouring villages neere unto Edge-Hil, where the great battaile betwixt the kings army, and the Parliaments forces was fought (Unknown, 1643; Wing / N821)
— The none-such Charles his character extracted, out of divers originall transactions, dispatches and the notes of severall publick ministers, and councellours of state as wel at home as abroad. Published by authority (London, 1651; Thomason E.1345[2])

— The Perfect Politician, or, A full view of the life and action (military and civil) of O. Cromwel (London, 1660; Wing / F1334)

— The princely pellican. Royall resolves presented in sundry choice observations, extracted from His Majesties divine meditations: with satisfactory reasons to the whole kingdom, that his sacred person was the onely author of them (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.558[1])

— The rebels looking-glasse: or, The traytors doome. Wherein is discovered the judgements of God upon the rebels and traytors in all ages: collected out of several histories both sacred & profane (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.554[23])

— The Resolutions of the private soouldiery of Col. Scroops regiment of horse (now quartering at and neer unto Salisbury) concerning their present expedition for the service of Ireland. (Unknown, [1649]; Thomason / 669.f.14[28])

— The Royal martyrs, or, A List of the lords, knights, commanders, and gentlemen that were slain in the late wars, in defence of their king and country as also of those executed by high courts of justice or law-martial (London, 1660; Wing / R2134)

— The royall legacies of Charles the first of that name, of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, King and martyr; to his persecutors and murderers (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.557[1])

— The Scotch Souldiers Lamentation upon the death of the most glorious and illustrious martyr, King Charles (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.560[15])

— The several speeches of Duke Hamilton Earl of Cambridge, Henry Earl of Holland, and Arthur Lord Capel, upon the scaffold immediately before their execution, on Friday the 9. of March. Also the several exhortations, and conferences with them, upon the
scaffold, by Dr Sibbald, Mr Bolton, & Mr Hodges (London, 1649; Thomason / E.546[21])

— The souldiers demand. Shewing their present misery; and prescribing a perfect remedy (Bristol, 1649; Thomason / E.555[29])

— The subjects sorrow: or, Lamentations upon the death of Britaines Josiah, King Charles, most unjustly and cruelly put to death by His owne people, before His Royall Palace White-Hall (London, 1649; Thomason / E.546[16])

— The teares of Sion upon the death of Josiah, distilled in some country sermon notes on Febr. 4. and 11th, 1649 (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.560[18])

— The true manner of the crowning of Charles the Second King of Scotland, on the first day of January, 1650. Together with a description of his life, and throne; and a cleare view of his court and counsel (London, 1651; Thomason / 669.f.15[81])

— The True Proceedings of Both Armies; from the twelwe of November, to the twenty foure. With many remarkeable passages which has happened since the battaile at Branford (London, 1642; Thomason / E.127[49])

— The Unparalleld monarch. Or, The portraiture of a matchless prince, exprest in some shadows of his Highness my Lord Protector (London, 1656; Thomason / E.1675[1])

— To the officers and souldiers of the armies of England, Scotland and Ireland. The humble petition and advice of divers well-affected to the good old cause, inhabitants in and about the borough of Southwark (Unknown, 1659; Thomason / E.980[1])

— To the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England the humble petition of divers citizens and inhabitants in and about London (Unknown, [1654]; Thomason / 669.f.19[6])

— To the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland, &c. The humble petition of divers of the inhabitants of the North-riding of the county of York (London, 1657; Thomason / 669.f.20[44])
— To the Right Honourable the Ld. Fleetwood, to be communicated to the officers of the Army, the humble representation of divers well-affected persons of the city of Westminster and parts adjacent (London, 1659; Thomason / E.979[5])

— Traytors deciphered in an answearer to a shamelesse pamphlet, entituled, A declaration of the Parliament of England, expressing the grounds of their late proceedings, and of settling the present government in the way of a free state (Unknown, [1650]; Thomason / E.777[7])

— Two elegis [sic]. The one on His late Majestie. The other on Arthur Lord Capel (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.550[3])

— Vaticinium votivum or, Palaemon's prophetick prayer (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.1217[2])

— Verses on the siege of Glocester, and Col. Massey (Unknown, 1644; Thomason / E.257[9])

— We have fish'd faire and caught a frog. Or, The history of severall new fisher-men: who are in a short time, growne great proficients in that art (Unknown, 1649; Thomason / E.558[17])

— XXV Queries: modestly and humbly, and yet sadly and seriously propounded, to the people of England, and their representatives (London, 1659; Thomason / E.968[5])

Allen, William, A faithful memorial of that remarkable meeting of many officers of the Army in England, at Windsor Castle, in the year 1648 (London, 1659; Thomason / E.979[3])
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