2005

National Confusion over the Issues of the English Restoration

Joanna T. Neilson

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

NATIONAL CONFUSION OVER THE ISSUES OF THE ENGLISH RESTORATION

JOANNA T. NEILSON

A Dissertation submitted to the
Department of History
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded:
Spring Semester, 2005

The members of the Committee approve the dissertation of Joanna T. Neilson defended on 25 January 2005.

_____
Peter P. Garretson
Professor Directing Dissertation

_____
Patrick O'Sullivan
Outside Committee Member

_____
C. John Sommerville
Committee Member

_____
Bawa Satinder Singh
Committee Member

_____
Paul W. Strait
Committee Member

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee members.

In memory of Richard L. Greaves

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people I would like to thank for their time, energy, and encouragement throughout this journey. I began this project under the direction of Dr. Richard L. Greaves, whose death in June 2004 left a profound mark on those who knew the man and his scholarship. I am very grateful for the years of guidance and support he gave me before his passing. Dr. C. John Sommerville stepped in during the summer and has provided the guidance necessary to complete this project. I wish to express my deep appreciation for Sommerville's direction, encouragement, and kindness. When I needed a smile and words of encouragement the co-chair of this committee Dr. Peter P. Garretson was always available. I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Patrick O'Sullivan, Dr. Bawa S. Singh, and Dr. Paul W. Strait for their time, support, and patience with my long and unusual journey. I cannot thank my committee enough for making me a better scholar and teacher.

I must thank the staffs of the various libraries that I used for this research. First, I would like to thank the Florida State Interlibrary Loan department, the Strozier Library Special Collections staff, and the librarians of the Documents and Micromaterials department. I would also like to thank the staff members of the British Library, particularly those in the Rare Books Reading Room, for their kindness and assistance. The staff of the Bodleian Library at Oxford were both helpful and patient with this American's first trip to that famed library. I would like to thank the Librarian of the Balliol College Library, Oxford, Penelope Bullock, for her interest in my project and willingness to look for materials that I had not been able to pinpoint.

My friends and colleagues at Florida State have greatly helped to make my graduate school experience a fruitful and oftentimes enjoyable one. Fellow students of Early Modern British history under Dr. Greaves, Jason Jewell, Becky Hayes, and Christine Caney, have been good friends and colleagues. Many thanks should go to Jonathan Grant, who was the first professor I worked for as a discussion leader when I arrived at Florida State; he has been a mentor and friend ever since that first Fall semester. Thanks to everyone in the department who expressed interest in this project and cheered me on as the dissertation came together over the last year and a half, especially Amy Carney, Stephanie Laffer, Pam Robbins, and Kevin Witherspoon. Stephanie has been a wonderful help in editing the manuscript.

My parents have been instrumental in this process, providing emotional and financial support for this goal that they have helped nurture for many years and for understanding why I need bifocals now. To my husband Wayne, without whom this degree would not have been possible, I give my love and my deepest heartfelt thanks.

Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS

Add.	Additional
BDBR	Greaves, Richard L. and Robert Zaller, eds. *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*. 3 vols. Brighton, UK: Harvester Press, 1982.
BL	British Library
Bodl.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
Calamy Revised	Matthews, A. G., ed. *Calamy Revised*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
Chandaman	Chandaman, C. D. *The English Public Revenue, 1660-1688*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
CJ	*Journals of the House of Commons*. Reprint. London: H.M.S.O., 1803-13.
CSPD	Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series
CSPV	Calendar of State Papers Venetian
Davies	Davies, Godfrey. *The Restoration of Charles II, 1658-1660*. San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1955.
Greaves, *DUFE*	Greaves, Richard L. *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1600-1663*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
Hutton, *Restoration*	Hutton, Ronald. *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
LJ	*Journals of the House of Lords*. London: H.M.S.O., 1803-1891.
mspr.	misprint

MSS	Manuscript
OED	*Oxford English Dictionary*
Old *DNB*	Stephen, Leslie and Sidney Lee, eds. *Dictionary of National Biography*. London: Oxford University Press, 1949-1950.
PRO	Public Record Office
Rawl.	Rawlinson
SP	State Papers
Spurr	Spurr, John. *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.
ST	Howell, Thomas Bayly. *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials*. Vol. 5. London: R. Bagshaw, 1810.
Walker Revised	Matthews, A. G., ed. *Walker Revised.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*	Woolrych, Austin. *Britain in Revolution*, *1625-1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation focuses on the development of political culture in the early Restoration. I examine authors from across the religious and political spectrum who voiced their support for, criticisms of, doubts about, and rejections of the reestablishment of the monarchy and the Church of England. Using a wide range of sources, including verse, sermons, almanacs, and political tracts, I argue that the commentary was far more rich and varied than previous scholars have suggested. While giving adequate attention to the major radical tracts of the period 1660 to 1663, this study also illuminates the previously largely ignored voices who supported the Restoration but did not agree with how officials were trying to shape England.

Arranged thematically, the four chapters address different aspects of the Restoration. Chapter One examines the attempts to define Charles II's return. Chapter Two discusses the government's efforts to replace national memory of the recent past with myth and the spectrum of authors who disagreed with this approach, instead using the past three decades as fruitful material for their publications and means of expressing critical or dissenting opinions. Chapter Three examines the expectations Charles II and England had for the Restoration and the monarch's partial success in fulfilling these expectations. Chapter Four investigates Restoration ideas of obedience to the government and the Church of England.

In the Conclusions I argue that the Restoration was significant because contemporaries thought that it was. This dissertation has demonstrated the deep involvement of the press in spreading materials that discussed the important issues of the day and the wide range of opinions available to the English people. This period of civil discourse was necessary for the beginning of an opposition that did not want the downfall of the government or a radical change in the Church of England. I believe this method provides a new approach for interpreting the Restoration.

INTRODUCTION

Charles II's return to England in 1660 was a pivotal event in English history. Eleven years before his landing at Dover, his father Charles I was tried, convicted, and executed for crimes against the English state. Between the death of Charles I and his son's restoration in 1660, England experienced a republic, a protectorate, and a chaotic period from the death of Oliver Cromwell through the decision to invite Charles II back as monarch. Although Charles II returned to a political nation mostly ready to accept monarchy, the key concern was defining the basis on which he would rule Britain. This negotiation process took most of the 1660s and in many ways did not settle anything; problems in the 1670s and 1680s had roots in this failure.[1] Over time, the financial arrangements did not provide adequately for the crown's needs. Government appointments, constitutional solutions, and the land settlement left some royalists bitter and disappointed in the king whose father they had supported. Although the religious settlement encompassed many English Protestants, the solution left some groups outside the church who eventually became dissenters, and this in turn affected politics in the 1670s and 1680s.

This dissertation seeks a new approach to examining Charles' return and the early Restoration settlement through a previously neglected source base, the vast amount of printed materials produced in England from 1660 to 1663, in an attempt to interpret part of the political culture of the period. No one has delved deeply into this extensive source base to interpret the Restoration from this angle. Ronald Hutton and Paul Seaward have been interested in examining Charles' return from a government standpoint, shedding much light on the logistics of reestablishing the monarchy and the nature of the early Restoration state. In *Restoration: England in the 1660s* Neil Keeble covers some of the same ground as Hutton and Seaward. Although he explores a few of the same issues that study discusses he does not explore the source base that this dissertation does. Anne Whiteman, Robert Bosher, and Ian Green have extensively explored the mechanics of the Restoration Church settlement. In *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II*, Tim Harris explores reactions to Charles' return from the perspective of the

[1] For example, Tim Harris argues that the settlement's failures affected party development. Tim Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715* (London and New York: Longman, 1993), 6-7, 234-35.

happenings in London.[2]

Several scholars have agreed that England did not universally welcome Charles back to England. Christopher Hill has argued that the presence of the radicals he assessed in *The World Turned Upside Down* invalidates the idea of universal acclaim. He then proceeds to ask rhetorically about the fate of radical ideas after the Restoration.[3] Richard L. Greaves' *Deliver Us from Evil* demonstrates extensive radical activity in these years that utilized earlier political theories and therefore opposed Charles II's return.[4] Harris does not argue that there was large support for the king; rather he makes the negative statement that opposition to Charles was small.[5] With this contention, Harris leaves a middle ground of disinterest and apathy between opposition and fervent support. He also posits that the major "tensions" among Anglicans, Presbyterians, and separatists were not political but religious.[6] John Miller argues that although the initial positive response to Charles' return was strong, the intensity did not last because Englishmen had "too many conflicting expectations" which Miller highlights by discussing the crown's need to reward its faithful supporters and their new allies the Presbyterians.[7]

This study seeks to explain how reactions to the Restoration were more rich and varied than previously supposed, a situation that provided Englishmen with a broad range of opinions available in print on issues about interpreting Charles' return, understanding the Civil Wars and Interregnum, interpreting the country's expectations of his rule, and offering alternative visions of the nature of Englishmen's obedience to the church and state. This analysis will supplement Tim Harris' conception of the period since he does not investigate much of the print world his

---

[2] Hutton, *Restoration*; Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989); N. H. Keeble, *Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2002); Anne Whiteman, "The Restoration of the Church of England," in Geoffrey Nuttall and Owen Chadwick, eds., *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662-1962* (London: S.P.C.K., 1962); R. S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951); I. M. Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978); 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).

[3] Christopher Hill, *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980), 8, 10-11. See also idem, *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (New York: Elizabeth Sifton Books, 1984).

[4] Greaves, *DUFE*.

[5] Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II*, 51.

[6] Ibid., 37.

[7] John Miller, *Charles II* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991), 41.

crowds inhabit.[8]

The sources for this study have been drawn from the extensive surviving output of the English presses from 1660 to 1663 as cataloged in Wing, the Thomason Tracts, and the English Short Title Catalogue.[9] I have made an effort to examine the majority of what I could find; however this study does not claim to encompass everything currently available. However I examine all the main genres, in order to represent a wide range of the market from broadside ballads to religious pamphlets. The main genres are ballads and longer verse pieces, short dialogues, sermons, almanacs, prodigies, political tracts and a few plays written around the early Restoration.[10] I have utilized manuscript materials to identify those themes that found expression in both manuscript and printed materials and to demonstrate other points of view that could not have been published in this period.

Through an examination of the print genres popular during the seventeenth century, a better understanding of English responses to the Restoration can be charted. From all this information an interesting range of reactions emerges, bounded on one extreme by Venner's rebellion against the state and by sycophantic panegyric poetry praising Charles II and general George Monck on the other. Between these extremes existed a variety of people wanting to shape the Restoration settlement. To interpret this range of opinions I propose laying out a spectrum of responses that the materials themselves suggested as an analytical approach. The royalists, who supported the Stuart Restoration, compose one end of this scale and can be generally separated into zealous royalists and moderate critics. The opposite end of the scale, the radicals, did not support reinstituting the monarchy without significant changes or did not want the monarchy's return in any form. Radicals can be divided into dissident critics, subversive

---

[8] Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II*.

[9] Donald Wing, ed., *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700,* 3 vols., 2nd ed. (New York: Index Committee of the Modern Language Association of America, 1972-88); *The Thomason Tracts, 1640-1661: An Index to the Microfilm Edition of the Thomason Collection of the British Library*, 2 vols. (Ann Arbor, MI.: University Microfilms International, 1981); Early English Books Online [database online] (Ann Arbor, MI: Proquest Information and Learning). This database is a growing collection of the tracts from the Short Title Catalog and Thomason Tracts turned into PDF files. These materials are also readily available on mircofilm.

[10] Several authors have discussed the reading public, their access to materials, and the growing print market in Early Modern England, including David Cressy, Margaret Spufford, Tessa Watt, and Adrian Johns. David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980); Margaret Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1981); Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640*, reprint ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

radicals and rebellious radicals.

Zealous royalists trumpeted the Restoration and argued that there was nothing fundamentally wrong with the monarchy or the Church of England. More extreme zealous royalists advocated a return to a church government and a style of rule not possible in post-Civil War England. Their publications were often panegyrical and used grand analogies for the Restoration and Charles himself. Intentionally or not, zealous royalists tried to shape a Restoration mythology for England that viewed England as Israel led by a modern David and Charles I as the perfect martyr-king.

Moderate critics did not agree with this myth-making and preferred to produce a more realistic picture. In their support for the government they offered mild criticism that they felt would guide it in its reestablishment of the monarchy and the Church of England in the reestablishment of episcopacy. Unlike dissident critics, moderate critics did not want substantive changes in church and state.

Dissident critics were the mildest of the radicals. Their support for the monarchy was contingent upon the application of significant structural changes. The main adherents to this position were dissenters arguing for a reduced episcopacy, Presbyterians loyal to the Solemn League and Covenant, which called for the abolition of episcopacy and the establishment of a presbytery system, and ejected ministers who published farewell sermons.

Subversive radicals did not support the monarchy but stopped short of advocating rebellion or assassination of the king. However, they defended the regicides for having done God's work, praised the parliamentarian victory in the Civil Wars, loudly lamented the evils the Restoration brought upon England, and attacked Charles II publically by questioning his motives and suggesting that he would not rule England in the best interests of the people.

Rebellious radicals recommended the assassination of the monarch or rebellion against the state. For them, the Restoration had no redeeming qualities, and the only way to deal with its evils was to remove the government that had instituted them. Authors expressing rebellious radical beliefs used two strategies for conveying their messages. Plotters sometimes published manifestoes declaring their beliefs in an attempt to gain more adherents. More secretive authors used the power of suggestion, leading readers to their position. Not surprisingly, very few examples of this position existed.

Unlike specific studies of poetry or theater, this investigation will cross genre boundaries to look for larger patterns in these print media. The poets, playwrights, and ministers belonged to the same mental world that survived the Civil Wars, Interregnum, and the return of Charles II.[11]

In the historiography there is ample room for this kind of study. Although there exists a strong tradition of this kind of historical analysis for the Civil Wars and Interregnum, there are

---

[11] Harold Love and Joad Raymond support this idea. Harold Love, "State Affairs on the Restoration Stage, 1660-1675," *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theater Research* 14 (May 1975): 1-9; Joad Raymond, "The Daily Muse: or, Seventeenth-Century Poets Read the News," *Seventeenth Century* 10 (1995): 189-218.

fewer authors who have dealt with aspects of political culture in the early Restoration.[12] Although Harris utilizes an extensive collection of manuscript poetry, his use of printed poems is limited to pieces from the eighteenth-century *Collection of Loyall Songs Written Against the Rump Parliament Written between the Years 1639 and 1661.* Harris does not discuss many pro-Charles pieces and therefore only demonstrates one kind of verse material. In *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship Under Charles II,* Harold Weber examines various aspects of the Restoration political culture but he barely examines Charles' return or the early settlement as contested political issues.[13]

In *Ideas of the Restoration in English Literature, 1660-1671*, Nicholas Jose focuses on the idea of the Restoration in poetry, plays, and descriptions of public pageants such as the coronation and Lord Mayor's Day shows. His examination of the restoration panegyric is extensive and useful for discussing some of the standard themes and allusions that Restoration poets employed and why their verse was so similar in the early years of the reign. Jose's investigation has led him to conclude that massive support for the Restoration materialized after Monck's readmission of the excluded members in February 1660.[14] His source analysis seems to undermine his argument because he does not use a large number of the poems produced at this time and his other sources can be considered too closely linked to the state to be regarded as independent assessments.

In "Re-writing a Revolution," Jonathan Sawday investigates the reaction to the Restoration in the early 1660s primarily through written materials, some of which were published later.[15] He limits himself to examining a literary "crisis of representation," through broadsides against the regicides, diaries, poetry, and government legislation in which he highlights concerns

---

[12] Thomas N. Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Jason Peacy, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004); Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Elizabeth Skerpan, *The Rhetoric of Politics in the English Revolution, 1642-1660* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1992); Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1994); Robert Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism, 1628-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

[13] Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II*; Harold Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship Under Charles II* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996).

[14] Nicholas Jose, *Ideas of the Restoration in English Literature, 1660-1671* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 13.

[15] Jonathan Sawday, "Re-Writing a Revolution: History, Symbol, and Text in the Restoration," *Seventeenth Century* 7 (Autumn 1992): 171-99.

for legitimacy and skepticism about the new regime.[16]

In perhaps the best examination of the political culture of the Restoration, Nancy Klein Maguire discusses the relationship between Charles II and the theatrical world he helped to reestablish.[17] She considers the Restoration to be a "rehabilitation" process for the monarch, the playwrights, and the professional theater in which these "politician/playwrights" defended monarchy, and repented of their support for the Interregnum governments. Specifically, they gave audiences a way to cope with Charles I's regicide and Charles II's restoration through plays that demonstrate the problems with non-monarchical forms of government. However, these subjects also signal concerns and insecurity about the new regime: "Betraying an obsession with figures of monarchy, with usurpation and regicide, and with recuperation of royal power, the playwrights manifest anxiety about the regicide and fear of unforseen complications about restoration."[18] Unfortunately, Maguire does not closely connect her material to the history; like Jose, she focuses on the idea of Restoration more than the struggle to define the Restoration settlement.

The work of Annabel Patterson is useful in defining the interpretive framework of my study. In *Censorship and Interpretation*, she outlines techniques for accessing literary materials that require the reader to consider the period and text of the pieces.[19] For modern readers, determining the context is a primary analytical tool that sets a foundation for interpreting puzzling references. Patterson demonstrates how authors used several tactics including disclaimers, ambiguous references, and apparently scattered attacks to present alternative meanings. She argues that government and church scrutiny forced the literary community to develop a "system of oblique communication" that signaled readers to draw a variety of conclusions. This system has the gift of plausible deniability and puts the responsibility of uncovering the author's real meanings on the reader, hoping that the censor will not make the same intellectual connections that the author wants the reader to understand. Through this network, Patterson surmises, writers and government officials maintained an "equivocal and fragile relationship" that allowed the literary community to comment on political affairs without pushing the government to take restrictive action.[20] In the Restoration, poets, pamphleteers, almanac authors, and ministers could comment on the current political situation as long as they

---

[16] Ibid., 180.

[17] Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-1671* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). Maguire's work amply covers the tragicomedy in this period. Treading the same ground in this study would not be profitable; therefore this dissertation has examined drama only occasionally.

[18] Ibid., 5.

[19] Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: the Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984).

[20] Ibid., 7, 10-11, 45, 47-48, 57-58, 63.

kept their messages concealed. However, the government prosecuted those who flagrantly attacked the state, such as William Drake who argued that the Long Parliament was still in session and the Presbyterian minister Zachary Crofton who promoted the Solemn League and Covenant and the end of the bishops.[21]

Chapters are arranged thematically to explore the different contentious issues that found expression in the print culture of the period. Chapter One focuses on specific reactions and interpretations of the reconstitution of the monarchy. Chapter Two discusses the government's attempt to define how Englishmen should interpret Charles' return and remember the past. Chapters Three and Four address more practical problems for the citizens and monarch alike, such as Charles' commitment to and partial success at fulfilling his promises, and the people's expectations for his rule. Chapter Four investigates the issue of obedience.

Chapter One investigates England's reaction to the return of monarchy and attempts to define Charles II's place in England. Supporters of the monarchy demonstrated their commitment through showing how the Restoration was good for England. Opposition voices such as John Milton and William Drake, author of *The Long Parliament Revived*, attempted to show how the monarchy was not lawful and how the Restoration had brought woe to England, in the form of pamphlet lamentations for the country.

Interpreting the Restoration led writers to consider the agency of Charles's return. The second section of Chapter One discusses how many Englishmen understood the persons involved with the return of monarchy. Although many authors credited God and Monck, they also understood the value of including local and national political leaders and the English people in this process. Ministers used the dedications of their sermons to help heal the country and re-establish traditional bonds by reminding their patrons of their relationship and obligations to the monarch and to the people.

Authors trying to define Charles's place in England faced two challenges: opposition use of the same imagery and Charles' unconventional preparation for the throne. The two major concepts loyal writers used for their king, the phoenix and the sun, were also adopted by antagonistic writers to undermine the monarchy. Loyal poets used the phoenix analogy to represent the return of the monarchy and connect Charles II to his father; anti-monarchial tract authors employed the phoenix as a representation of the Solemn League and Covenant. Sun imagery provided poets and ministers with a good way to suggest Charles' central importance in English political life. Loyal authors handled Charles' past by arguing that its unconventionality was actually good for Charles and was necessary for Charles to be a great ruler. Through this argument, these writers insisted that the past could not be forgotten and was an important part of defining the Restoration.

Chapter Two explores the variety of reactions to the attempts of government officials to alter the ways Englishmen remembered and discussed the recent past. Despite the government's desires to heal the country through the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion and planned commemoration of Charles I's regicide, many Englishmen of all political and religious beliefs were unwilling to accept the government's effort to dissolve the English historical consciousness into panegyric myth and solemn ritual about Charles I. After an examination of the Act of

---

[21] For Drake, see Chapter One. For Crofton, see Chapter Four.

Indemnity and Oblivion, the following three subsections discuss issues that elicited alternate visions of the past from royalists and radicals, both of whom challenged the government's attempted manipulation of English national memory.

In their desire to celebrate the downfall of the Stuart monarchy and champion the correctness of the regicide, radicals published multiple versions of the regicides' last speeches and prayers before their executions. Despite the Parliament's definition of who the citizens should hold accountable for the past in the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, many authors proposed other targets; royalists chose including non-Church of England religious groups and the country as a whole, in an effort to bring England together for repentance and healing. Radicals, on the other hand, argued that Charles I was responsible for his own death.

The third subsection examines the changes in the national calendar that Charles' return wrought. Although government officials intended the national day of mourning on 30 January as a cornerstone of their attempt to create myth and ritual for the country, they could not control the ministers that preached the sermons for that day. Some ministers chose to use this new opportunity to suggest that Charles I had not been the perfect monarch that the holiday makers had envisioned. Almanac authors responded to the political changes by altering their monthly calendars to either glorify Charles II and negate the past or to mourn the restoration of the Stuarts.

Englishmen had many expectations of their returning sovereign, several of which Charles himself had fostered in his letters and declaration from his court at Breda. Chapter Three details Charles' promises, the prospects his subjects forced on him, and how the young king was not able to satisfy everyone. Charles' inability to fulfill his promise of "liberty for tender consciences" in the church settlement helped split his people and established nonconformity in England. The chapter discusses several issues that have been overshadowed by the church settlement in recent historiography: the future of the soldiers, Charles' personal behavior, and major economic concerns including taxes and the fate of sequestered and purchased church lands and private estates.

Whereas some Englishmen tried to obligate their sovereign to fulfill their wishes, many authors reminded their readers of the obedience due to king and church. Chapter Four focuses on both the attempts to convince Englishmen to show obedience to the crown and submission to the Church of England and the negative reactions to these directives. If healing England meant reestablishing traditional relationships and bonds, then Englishmen needed to obey their sovereign and conform to the Church of England. Through their exhortations for obedience, some writers expressed reservations about the Restoration, arguing for loyalty to the state but not to Charles II as king specifically.

Perhaps one of the most serious challenges to the theoretical stability of the Restoration state came from strict Presbyterians calling for the implementation of the Solemn League and Covenant, a move that disputed the Church of England's episcopal structure and the monarch's active role in politics.

Although England witnessed a voracious debate over the church, much of the negotiation ended with the passage of the Act of Uniformity in 1662. After the resulting Bartholomew Day ejections in August many ministers and poets began to voice strong opposition to the government's restricted conception of the church, using the press as a weapon of defiance against

the crown and a means of communication among the nonconformists. An examination of the glut of farewell sermons and prodigy reports can demonstrate how Neil Keeble's theory of the dissenter community's transformation from a congregational-based society to one maintained by literature should be revised and started earlier than Keeble imagines.[22]

The Conclusion will address the significance of the Restoration in the larger context of Charles' reign by arguing that the Restoration is still a relevant category for historical discussion, entering the current historiographical debate over the maturation of public political opinion and the development of political parties

Dates are Old Style with the year beginning on January first. I have preserved the original spellings (including possessives) but made the traditional corrections for seventeenth-century conventions such as *j* for *i* (where necessary) and *s* for *f*. For materials printed in the seventeenth century, printer and bookseller information has been eliminated unless the information is significant for the discussion, and shortened titles have been used for space considerations. For almanacs I have followed a modified version of Bernard Capp's citation method.

---

[22] N. H. Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Avon, UK: Leicester University Press, 1987).

CHAPTER ONE
REACTIONS TO THE MONARCHY'S RETURN

Although several scholars have examined aspects of the responses to the Restoration, no one has attempted a full-scale analysis ranging from the exuberant zealous royalist welcome to radical attempts to discredit monarchy and the episcopalian state church. This investigation will center on two main issues: responses to Charles' return and the agency of Charles' restoration. Charles' return elicited an impressive range of responses from royalists who portrayed Charles as the sun and the biblical King David to radicals who bewailed and derided the reimposition of monarchy.

Zealous royalists made effective use of analogies from nature and the Bible that demonstrated how the Restoration was good for England and highlighted the central place in English politics that Charles deserved. Sometimes these metaphors could be interpreted in more than one way. Authors using the revolution theme to explain Charles' homecoming could imply they wanted England to return to a style of church and state from the 1630s, which was not a viable option in post-Civil War England. A few royalist authors also employed the phoenix as somewhat effective imagery for Charles himself, a motif radicals turned upside down and used to signify the return of the Solemn League and Covenant.

Radicals attempted to question what the Restoration meant for England. Authors at this end of the spectrum took one of two approaches to decrying Charles' return. Examining the situation from a political and legal standpoint, the first group tried to convince readers that reinstituting the monarchy was not the best solution for England, that Charles I, General George Monck, and Charles II were not trustworthy, or that the Restoration as it had been enacted was illegal. The second group took a religious approach, asking readers to question how the Restoration would impact their salvation.

Once the initial excitement over the Restoration had faded somewhat, authors began to assess who had returned Charles to England, and the issue became a political one. Charles defined a zealous royalist position that credited God and his birthright only. Monck received the most attention from authors for his role in the Restoration. Zealous royalists tried to account for his past by claiming he had been a secret royalist plotting for Charles' return. Moderate critics preferred a more realistic picture of Monck; some in this group ignored his past and praised him for his actions in the present. Other moderate critics discussed his involvement in Interregnum governments but did not try to whitewash this fact, acknowledging that the general had not been the loyal subject the zealous royalists depicted. Many ministers sought to include the political nation in the Restoration by making selective dedications to royal officials and parliamentarians.

Although they praised these men, the ministers also reminded their dedicatees of their political duties to the king and to the people. By asserting the people's involvement in the Restoration, typically through their MPs, these moderate critics intended to bind the people closer to the monarchy. Presbyterians desiring a voice in the upcoming settlement of the Church of England asserted their role in the Restoration; however, several of these authors used this political capital to push for adherence to the Solemn League and Covenant.

This chapter will explore the general thesis of this dissertation by examining some of the ideological differences inherent in the king's return and demonstrating that the national confusion over the Restoration began before Charles set foot in England and continued well into the early settlement. Englishmen consuming the prodigious output of the English presses in this period found a diverse set of interpretations for the recent political events, ranging from sycophantic praise poems to prose attacks on Charles and the Stuarts. However, these readers could also find more nuanced and sophisticated materials in their local bookstalls that commented in some fashion on the political transformation such as subtle critique of the prince and carefully reasoned explanations of why Charles and the monarchy should not be restored. Drawn from a diverse source base published primarily throughout 1660 and 1661, the royalist materials discussed here did not have the same issues in mind besides praising the monarch in some fashion. Although they sometimes shared common metaphors and opinions, there is no evidence to suggest that they were responding to each other in any meaningful fashion.

Monarchy Returning

Zealous royalists provided their readers with models for interpreting the Restoration, using analogies that demonstrated how Charles' return was beneficial for England. Royalist writers wanted to signify the monarch's central role in English life, and chose comparisons and analogies that emphasized to readers how important Charles was to them individually and to England as a country. Many radical authors preferred to ask readers to question what the Restoration meant for England by casting doubt upon the sagacity of bringing in the king, the integrity and motives of the men involved, and the legality of the Restoration.

Royalist Definitions of Charles' Return and the King Himself

In celebration of the reestablishment of monarchy and the return of Charles Stuart, many supporters expressed their joy through metaphor, hoping to make more vivid for readers the significance of these political changes. Two ways authors accomplished their task will be examined: interpretations of Charles's return and explanations of Charles himself. Zealous royalist writers expostulating the return labeled the event a miracle or employed one of two major analogies, renewal and revolution, that emphasized the significance of the monarchy's reestablishment and its benefits for England. Authors discussing Charles reinforced the model of English government that held the king as a central element. These analogies and imagery could function on two levels: a vague one that did not convey much about politics and a more detailed

sense whereby authors made specific references to political figures in pre-Civil War England, and indicated a desire for England to return to styles of church and state not possible after the Civil Wars.

Some contemporaries marveled at the turn of events in the spring of 1660. The rector of Wintringham, Lincolnshire, Edward Boteler, who had suffered for his royalism during the first English Civil War, likened England's surprise and inability to believe Charles' return to the disciples' reaction to the resurrection of Christ. The Edinburgh minister Robert Lawrie posited two explanations for why the people had lacked any hope for Charles' return. Few people were for the king; many subjects experienced a "great alienation of heart, found in many of the Nations, from the King and his Family." Lawrie saw the army's opposition as the second reason the king's subjects could not hope for his return. Over time God decided to make the army loyal to the monarchy and used it to support Charles Stuart.[23]

Poets and ministers alike represented Charles' return as a miracle.[24] In his sermon reinforcing Englishmen's obedience to their sovereign, Matthew Fowler, an Anglican minister in Hammersmith, likened England before the Restoration to Abraham's son Isaac lying on the altar as a sacrifice; Charles' return thus was depicted as God's having saved Isaac: "but, blessed be the Lord, who, when three Kingdomes and the Church of God in them, were like *Isaac* upon the Altar, ready to be made a sacrifice to the fury and phrensie of misguided zealots, suddenly stept in between the Knife and the Sacrifice, and rescued us out of the very Jawes of Destruction."[25] The poet Thomas Mayhew praised the recent events as a miracle in his panegyric on the king's return. In a sermon comparing David's return to his kingdom and Charles Stuart's arrival in England, Simon Ford, minister at All Saints, Northampton, and future royal chaplain, tried to characterize the Restoration as a miracle without calling it such, saying that Charles' return was "at last, by a providence, but *one degree* removed from a *miracle* (if at least, it may be thought to be distant from it at all)."[26] Defining the Restoration as a miracle gave the event the sense that humans had little to do with these developments; however, using hesitant language to step back from employing the term allowed Ford fully to indicate that Charles' restoration had not been entirely unexpected.

Zealous royalist authors used two major secular themes for Charles' return: renewal and

---

[23] Edward Boteler, *Gods Goodnesse in Crowning the King* (London, 1662), 1-2; Old *DNB*, *s.v.* Edward Boteler; Robert Lawrie, *God Save the King* (Edinburgh, 1660), sig. B1v.

[24] For further discussion of this theme, see Keeble. Keeble, *The Restoration*.

[25] Matthew Fowler, *Totum Hominis* (London, 1662), 26; *Walker Revised*, 304.

[26] Thomas Mayhew, *Upon the Joyfull and Welcome Return of His Sacred Majestie, Charls the Second, of England, Scotland, France and Ireland King, Defender of the Faith, &c.* (London, 1660), 11; Simon Ford, *Parallela* (London, 1660), 34.

revolution.[27] Both motifs attempted to erase the Civil Wars and Interregnum from the country's memory by returning England to its earlier history; renewal reversed the effects of time, making England young again, whereas revolution reestablished England at a time before the recent upheavals. They did not utilize the modern definition of revolution as embodied in the American, French, and Russian revolutions. Authors employing revolution as a theme used the term in the sense of the original Latin root of *revolvere*, or to "roll back," rather than major forward moving political change. The two metaphors differed in what they provided writers. Renewal, suggesting a return to health, was a more general literary device that did not imply much about politics. Revolution, on the other hand, signified a return to the point of origin and therefore implied more strongly a return to the politics of pre-Civil War England.

For literary authors, Charles' return was best explained by allegories to the natural world. Symbolically, the Restoration brought both physical regeneration in the natural world and revival in the human realm. The poet Samuel Austin, son of the religious poet Samuel Austin and graduate of Oxford during the Interregnum, argued that Charles' return could reinvigorate time itself: "By His Return the Antient face of Time / Looks young again, and our World's at its prime."[28] For the author of *Epicinia Carolinia*, Charles gave "*a new* and *perpetual spring*" to the realm.[29] This renewal extended to the king's subjects, for Thomas Higgons suggested that Charles' arrival had been a "day, which makes the aged young agen."[30] Taking this theme one step further, Rachel Jevon argued that Charles' return brought England back from the dead; when Charles I had died, so had England.[31]

The revolution theme had more immediate implications for the authors' perceptions of how Charles II and the kingdoms should establish themselves. Writers supporting revolution as simply a return to monarchy were the mildest of the zealous royalists. For example, the poet Samuel Pordage's golden age analogy was the most vague on what had been restored and the best suited to poetry. Pordage told his sovereign that "for now's return'd the golden age again, / Which all Behold in your most happy Raign."[32] Pordage demonstrated that England had returned

---

[27] See Keeble for a discussion of "restoration" versus "revolution." Keeble, *Restoration*, 46-53.

[28] Old *DNB, s.v.* Samuel Austin; Samuel Austin, *A Panegyrick on His Sacred Majesties Royal Person, Charles the IId, by the Grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c. and Corronation* (London, 1661), 8.

[29] S. W., *Epinicia Carolina, or an Essay upon the Return of His Sacred Majesty, Charles the Second* (London,1660), 7.

[30] Thomas Higgons, *A Panegyrick to the King* (London, 1660), 1.

[31] Rachel Jevon, *Exultationis Carmen to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty upon His Most Desired Return* (London, 1660), 5.

[32] Samuel Pordage, *Heroick Stanzas on His Maiesties Coronation* (London, 1661), 12.

to a previous state without explaining what had made the latter a golden age. In his panegyric on the coronation, Henry Bold, a prolific poet who had been sequestered from New College, Oxford, in 1648, proclaimed "*Revolution! Revolution!* / Our *King Proclam'd! Restor'd!* and *Crown'd!* A Year / Like *Plato's*, sets us *Even* as we *Were*."[33] Bold's overblown statement suggested that England had come full circle in reestablishing the Stuart monarchy. George Morley, bishop of Worcester, disagreed with Bold's understanding of England and the monarchy at the coronation; he did not believe that the revolution had been completed. In his sermon preached at the coronation, the prelate told the assembled congregation, "thanks be to *God* and the *King* for it, our Old Government is already *Restored* in *both* the *parts* of it; and yet it cannot properly be said to be *restored*, until it be *setled*, as it was before; and *setled as it was before*, I am afraid, it is *not yet*, I hope it *will be*."[34] Morley did not have to elaborate on what areas he thought remained unfinished; his listeners and readers undoubtedly knew he was referring to the church settlement. Taking the extraordinary opportunity a coronation sermon provided, Morley explained to his audience, which included the most important political figures in England, that they had not finished what they had set out to do. Morley's comment was a critique of the settlement, not Charles' return, and should not be considered directed toward the king as well. His admonition, however, encouraged listeners and readers to think about the past and how the current monarchy could be modeled after the previous one.

Whereas Morley's sermon reminded readers of the past, Carew Reynell's *The Fortunate Change*, penned in celebration of the coronation, drew attention to specific people and demonstrated the zealous royalist beliefs of the author. Reynell wanted England to return to the social and political conditions as they had existed in the 1630s and praised strong political and church officials such as the earl of Strafford and Archbishop William Laud :

> But *God* be praised, now our wishes are,
> To be just as we were before this War.
> And had we *Laud* and *Strafford* once again
> Wee'd kisse their foot-steps, and adore their train.

In a side note, Reynell told his readers that Laud and Strafford had been "extreme[ly] able Men for politick abilities, and really meant well for the publique."[35] He argued for a return to conditions as they had been before the war and a style of monarchy that was not possible in post-Civil War England, which he did not seem to realize. This rehabilitation of Archbishop Laud, the widely deplored prelate who had attempted to bring the Church of England to a more ceremonial style of worship that many feared was a step toward Roman Catholicism, and the

---

[33] Henry Bold, *St. Georges Day Sacred to the Coronation of His Most Excellent Majesty Charles the II* (London, 1661), 1; Old *DNB*, s.v. Henry Bold.

[34] George Morley, *A Sermon Preached at the Magnificent Coronation of the Most High and Mighty King Charles the IId* (London, 1661), 59.

[35] Carew Reynell, *The Fortunate Change* (London, 1661), sig. B1r.

earl of Strafford, the highly disliked authoritarian lord lieutenant of Ireland in the 1630s, both of whom had been executed by the Parliament, was unusual in early Restoration literature. Many authors avoided specifics of Charles I's reign, particularly details such as praising previously hated political figures that symbolized authoritarian government in church and state and that might anger readers, causing them to reject the view of the Restoration being propounded, or more significantly, the sermon and the minister. For older readers his employment of Laud and Strafford as emblems of good government implied Reynell's desire for a more authoritarian state and ceremonial church and also indicated that he approved of Charles I's personal rule.

Various authors employed imagery and analogies for their king that signified his central place in English history, the government, and everyone's life. Phoenix imagery demonstrated Charles II's connection to his father and could be interpreted as a zealous royalist or dissident critic image. Poets and ministers also equated Charles II with the sun, one of the defining necessities for life. However, the most profound analogy for Charles was King David, whom authors pointed out had suffered a similar fate to the English monarch.

Connecting Charles II to his father as "the Living Image of our Martyr'd King" was an important part of defining the mythology of the Restoration, bridging the gap between Charles I's death and his son's return to England and attempting to nullify the purported legitimacy of the Interregnum by emphasizing the royal succession. Nicholas Jose argues that poets used phoenix imagery to hide their problems in interpreting the Restoration and Charles II, but he has missed the central feature of the phoenix and the powerful message it conveyed.[36] Equating Charles II with the phoenix, a mythical bird that rose from its own ashes, was the most effective means of conveying this association between father and son and the revival of the Stuart monarchy. Mayhew called Charles a "rare and Phoenix King."[37] For the anonymous author of *Three Royal Poems*, Charles was "this Phenix springing from his Fathers tombe."[38] John Ogilby, designer of the coronation pageant, picked up this phoenix analogy and had one of his actors tell the king, "*We'l blame that Fire no more, that scorch'd our Nest / of Spicey Trade, since we see You, the Best / Of* Kings, *Rise from the Ashes of that Flame, / That burnt our First Right* Phoenix *of Your Name*."[39]

Supporters of the Solemn League and Covenant also utilised phoenix imagery to critique the government by suggesting that Charles' restoration meant the rebirth of the Covenant and its reimposition in church and state. *A Phenix*, a collection of reprinted Covenant materials from the 1640s and early 1650s, helped invigorate the debate between Covenanters, who argued that the Covenant gave them the right to bind Charles II and England to Presbyterianism and their views

---

[36] Jevon, 2; Jose, 38.

[37] Mayhew, 10.

[38] *Three Royal Poems* (London, 1660), 2.

[39] John Ogilby, *The Relation of His Majestie's Entertainment Passing through the City of London, to His Coronation* (London, 1661), 10.

on government, and those who reasoned that the Covenant was null and void.[40]

Sun imagery provided zealous royalist authors with two ways to signify Charles' central place in the political world. Invoking the sun as a symbol for the king implied his dominant position in the physical and political worlds and demonstrated how his presence was essential for the lives of his subjects. Dr. Thomas Philpot, a graduate of Cambridge and Oxford and rector of Akeley, Buckinghamshire, used the zodiac to illustrate Charles' exile and his importance in current events. As the sun, Charles traveled through the zodiac and met the challenges of each new sign. Philpot associated different zodiac signs with events and people who had opposed the Stuarts; for example, Sagittarius and his bow represented men who had fired verbal shots at the king and Aries stood for the battle of Worcester. With his restoration, Charles entered the final house of Leo where he was at his prime.[41] Philpot's choice of astrological imagery was useful for reaching a population used to reading astrological information in their almanacs.[42]

Post-restoration poets began to use sun imagery differently than their pre-civil war counterparts; after the Restoration the sun's light and heat-giving properties became more important than in the older interpretation, which had prized the sun's central place in the "cosmic and hieratic order."[43] However, some zealous royalist authors employed the sun's physical properties to reinforce the political significance of the monarch. In the prologue to *The Adventures in Five Hours*, the courtier and playwright Sir Samuel Tuke utilized the sun imagery to praise the monarch, who had suggested he write the play, saying, "*my Eyes were dazled with Excess of Light; / Even so the Sun, who all things else displays, / Is hid from us i' th'Glory of his Rays*."[44] Thomas Pestell reported that Charles shone so brightly that the sun deferred to him: "*CHARLES* in his Glory, with his sparkling Train, / Outfac'd the Sun, who went to bed again."[45] Because Charles provided more light than the sun, he became England's source of light and was deemed central to basic survival. As the sun, Charles brought to the people light and heat that

---

[40] *A Phenix, or the Solemn League and Covenant* (Edinburgh, 1660). See Chapter Four for a fuller discussion of the Covenant controversy.

[41] John Venn and J. A. Venn, eds., *Alumni Cantabrigienses* 10 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), 357; Thomas Philpot, *The Creples Complaint* (London, 1662), 18-19.

[42] See Chapter Two for more discussion of almanacs.

[43] Ruth Nevo, *The Dial of Virtue: A Study of Poems on Affairs of State in the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), 149.

[44] Samuel Tuke, *The Adventures in Five Hours* (London, 1663), sig. a1v.

[45] William Pestell, *A Congratulation to His Sacred Majesty, upon His Safe Arrival and Happy Restauration to His Three Kingdoms, May 29th, Being His Birth-day, and Our Year of Jubile,1660* (London, 1661), 3 (mspr. 5).

"make[s] us live."[46] Henry Bold employed one of the more interesting analogies of England without Charles: "So comes the *Sun* after a half-years *night*, / to the be-numb'd, and frozen *Muscovite*."[47] The conformist minister Henry Hibbert, who graduated with a B.A. from Brasenose College, Oxford in 1622, was ejected from his cure as vicar of Holy Trinity, Kingston-Upon-Hill, Yorkshire in 1660, but conformed before the coronation, shared Bold's sentiment; in his sermon celebrating Charles' birthday and return to the kingdom that focused on the reinstitution of monarchy, he portrayed England before Charles' arrival as blanketed in darkness. The Restoration brought light and heat to the earth's flora and fauna.[48] Some authors caught up in the panegyric took this imagery too far and created ridiculous images. For example, the poet of *Epinicia Carolina* declared that "you are alone a *Sun*, Your very Name / Gives a new life and birth to every thing, / Gives a *new* and *perpetual spring*."[49] Authors using the sun analogy accorded their king powers over the natural world, and by extension the political world, and directly connected Charles with God, the ultimate power.

The Scottish minister Robert Lawrie took this analogy between the natural and political worlds further and illustrated his point with an extended metaphor based on Psalms 101 and 104 that demonstrated the political implications of night and day and emphasized the pivotal role of the monarch as the sun. Lawrie explained that

> the night is a time when the savage beasts range abroad, Wolves, Lions and Serpents creep out from their dens and holes: But when the day appears, these beasts retire to their caves, and man goeth forth to his labour. So it is in times of confusion, when Government is cast cruel as Tygers, deceitfull as Crocodiles, they come abroad boldly to satisfie their lusts: But in time of lawfill Authority, when a King is on the throne, these vermine are chased to their holes and dens, as is declared at large, *Psal.* 101. and honest men come forth, appear and lift up their heads.[50]

Lawrie did not need specific details to conjure an image of the past; he asked his readers to imagine nighttime when wild animals controlled the earth and humans were confined to their homes. With daylight, people did not have to be afraid anymore as the wild animals retreated

---

[46] *Gloria Britanica* (London, 1661), 6 (mspr. 8).

[47] Henry Bold, "To his Sacred Majesty Charles the Second, at His Happy Return," in H. Beeston, *A Poem to His Most Excellent Majesty Charles the Second* (London, 1660), 7 (mspr. 9).

[48] Old *DNB, s.v.* Henry Hibbert; Henry Hibbert, *Regina Diervm, or, the Joyful Day* (London, 1661), 14.

[49] *Epinicia Carolina*, 7.

[50] Robert Lawrie, *God Save the King*, 5-6 (mspr. 7-8).

and left dominion to the humans. The transition to the political analogy followed easily; as the sun, Charles the monarch banished the "vermine" and made England safe for his subjects.

The most successful and popular zealous royalist analogy for Charles II was the biblical King David. Of the imagery and analogies available for clerical authors, David was the most useful and capable of demonstrating shades of difference among zealous royalist authors. Some ministers chose to make the parallel between the two kings and delve into biblical history, leaving out recent events or an extended explanation as to why Charles and David were so similar. Other ministers, however, took the opportunity to lay out in minute detail the similarities between the two rulers. The most fanatic zealous royalist, the Anglican divine Peter Heylyn, who suffered for his royalism during the Interregnum, used the comparison to argue that Charles's situation was more impressive and important than the biblical situation.[51]

Simon Ford used David's return as the basis of his sermon commemorating Charles' restoration. He thought that the parallel was extremely close, saying that

> it is a matter of greatest wonder to me, to observe how exactly the *two Histories* run *parallel*. Insomuch that it were no hard matter for an *ingenious phancy*, by altering the names of *David, Absalom, Joab, Abishai, Zadock, Abiathar, Shimei, Ziba, Mephibosheth, Jordan*, &c. into others proper to our late affairs, to insert *verbatim* the *greatest part of the Chapter* into a *Chronicle* of *these Times*.[52]

Ford suggested to his readers that his discussion of David and Absalom was an allegory of recent events in England.

Other authors used the David analogy to highlight Charles' recent history by drawing an extensive parallel between the two kings. Wanting to analyze David and Charles' experiences systematically and demonstrate how similar they were, Robert Feltwell, the vicar of East Walton, Norfolk, created fifteen categories to compare the two kings. He dramatically equated Saul's persecution of David and the Republic's pursuit of Charles through hunting metaphors:

> *David* was persecuted by *Saul* and as he expresses himself, 1 *Sam*. 26.20. Was by that Tyrant sought for as a Flea, hunted as a Partridge in the mountaines. And was not our Gratious Soveraign in that sad condition, that all places were searcht to apprehend him, all Ports guarded to prevent his escape; so that in his three Kingdomes the *Foxes* had holes, and the *Fowls* of the Ayre nests, but our Soveraigne had not where in safety to lay his head?[53]

---

[51] Old *DNB, s.v.* Peter Heylyn.

[52] Ford, *Parallela*, 1-2.

[53] R[obert] Feltwell, *Davids Recognition, with a Parallel Betwixt His and Our Present Soveraigns Sufferings and Deliverances* (London, 1660), 14.

In his discussion of how the two kings had escaped he made a connection between the wilderness of Ziph and the cave David used in 1 Samuel 24:3 and the woods near Wolverhampton and the oak tree in which Charles II hid after his failed attempt to reclaim his kingdoms at the battle of Worcester in 1651.[54] Feltwell intended to create the impression that David and Charles had experienced similar hardships, thereby giving his readers some insight into Charles' situation through studying David's plight.

Peter Heylyn took an opposite approach to magnifying Charles' recent history with the David parallel and displayed extreme zealous royalist views. By the time he preached his sermon on 29 May 1661, the comparison of Charles II and David had been covered several times in print by other ministers. Heylyn needed a fresh approach. After acknowledging that this comparison was an obvious and fitting argument, he proceeded to demonstrate how the two cases were different. The primary theme running through his comparison was how much worse Charles II's experiences had been and how much better his restoration was. Heylyn argued that Charles had an expectation of inheriting the crown, whereas David did not. Charles II and his supporters suffered worse during his exile than had David. Heylyn employed hyperbolic language to express Charles' suffering:

> And as the dangers which accompanyed our English *David*, were more transcendent in respect of his Sacred Person; so, were they far more grievous to him in respect of his party: whose *tears* he put into his *bottles*, whose *stripes* he bare on his own *body*, and whose calamities did more afflict his *righteous Soul*, then his own misfortunes.[55]

Heylyn had crossed into panegyric territory. He felt that God's rewards were greater for Charles than David. God's presence was more obvious in England than in Israel because the circumstances in 1660 were more extreme than in biblical times. Unlike David, who secured his own safety and used others to run his military campaigns, Charles put himself in danger and led his troops at the battle of Worcester. Heylyn also argued that God's presence in England was signified by the larger number of royal supporters in England for Charles than David had found in Israel.[56]

The analogies discussed here allowed zealous royalists to present readers with models for understanding the Restoration that attempted to negate the effects of the Civil Wars and Interregnum and compare England to Israel through the parallel between Charles and David. During the early Restoration, however, royalists ceased to monopolize nature analogies as dissident critics published reports of miracles and prodigies as propaganda against the

---

[54] Ibid., 13-18.

[55] Old *DNB, s.v*. Peter Heylyn; Peter Heylyn, *A Sermon Preached in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter in Westminster, on Wednesday May 29th, 1661* (London, 1661), 25-30.

[56] Heylyn, 28-30.

government's religious policies.[57]

Radical Reactions to Charles' Return

Some radical elements in England did not want Charles to return, as Hill, Greaves, and Keeble have demonstrated. Radicals reacted in one of three dramatic ways: some spoke against the king; others plotted Charles' assassination; and a few wrote impassioned tracts against the return of the Stuart monarchy. The state papers report rumors of threats to the king's life, such as a deposition given by John Heath on 29 June claiming that a Captain Southwold wanted to dispose of Charles by "cutt[ing] him as smale as herbes to ye pott."[58] During the summer of 1660 government officials investigated Cuthbert Studholme of Carlisle in Cumberland as a serious threat to the king's life because he had made inflammatory statements promising to kill the king, proudly proclaiming that his sword would "run Charles Stuart through the heart blood."[59] Other radicals more willing to risk their lives to reverse the Restoration plotted Charles' deposition, as Greaves has shown in his *Deliver Us from Evil*. Some radicals chose to express their discontent through the press, hoping to convince England that restoring Charles was a mistake. Unlike some of the alleged verbal utterances, published tracts against the Restoration did not advocate the assassination of the king; instead they argued against reinstituting monarchy or implied Charles and the crown should be removed from office without explicit bloody overtones.

To further this assertion that radical writers made a serious contribution to anti-restoration sentiment in 1660 and to flesh out the literary part of the spectrum of radical reaction to the Restoration, two themes will be examined. Tracts that argued against the Restoration along political and legal lines composed the first group and included *Plain English*, *The Valley of Achor*, and William Drake's *The Long Parliament Revived*. The second motif was religious; reactions varied from the dissenter Richard Baxter's tepid acceptance of the Restoration to the Quaker Daniel Baker's harangue against England for allowing the Restoration in *Yet One Warning More*.[28] Although Richard Greaves has addressed the radical press in *Deliver Us from Evil*, his foci were to provide a solid overview of the period and to examine the crown's attempts at censorship, thereby leaving room for a detailed investigation of these tracts from 1660 that

---

[57] See Chapter Four for further discussion of this topic.

[58] PRO, SP 29/5/42.

[59] PRO, SP 29/3/40; *CSPD, 1660-61*, 39.

[28] *Plain English to His Excellencie the Lord General Monck, and the Officers of His Army* (London, 1660); *The Valley of Achor* (London, 1660); [William Drake,] Thomas Philips, pseud, *The Long Parliament Revived* (London, 1660); Daniel Baker, *One Warning More* (London, 1660); Greaves, *DUFE*, 210-11.

specifically argued against the Restoration.[30] With the exception of *Plain English*, these authors did not protest against monarchy directly, preferring instead to cast doubts upon the desirability of monarchy, the credibility of the major figures involved, or the legitimacy of the Convention Parliament.[31]

Political and Legal Reactions. Published in January or February 1660, *Plain English* was one of the foremost anti-restoration arguments presented before Charles' arrival and became a benchmark for other radical publications through its strong tone.[32] Dedicated to General Monck, the tract urged the general to maintain everything England had fought for by not restoring the Stuart monarchy. Throughout the preface the writer appealed to Monck's conscience, his sense of duty, and what the author presumed Monck felt about the past. The author pleaded:

> We cannot yet be perswaded, though our fears and jealousies are strong, and the grounds of them many, that you can so lull asleep your Consciences, or forget the publick Interest, and your own, as to be returning back with the multitude to *Egypt*, or that you should with them be hankering after *Leeks and Onyons* of our old bondage. Though it were possible you should forget, yet certainly God will not, all the injuries and oppressions done by that Family to his Church and people in these and other Nations: Though the Inscription (*Exit Tyrannus,*) which was fixed over the place where the Statue of the late King formerly stood at the *Exchange*, hath been blotted out by the Rabble, yet it is written with the Pen of a Diamond in the hearts of many thousands, and will be so hereafter in the adamantine Rolls of Fame and History.[33]

For the author, the Stuarts were responsible for oppressing the people (particularly dissenters) and causing the Civil Wars. Charles II would be a replica of his father, supporting the same policies and treating the English dissenting community the same way. He also raised the traditional Roman Catholic specter by suggesting that during Charles' time abroad, he became

---

[30] Greaves, *DUFE*.

[31] The dispute between John Milton and the royalist minister Matthew Griffith has been left out because it has been thoroughly discussed by Masson and Woolrych. David Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, new and rev. ed. (New York: Smith, 1946), 5:667-69, 675-77; Austin Woolyrch, "Historical Introduction," in *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, rev. ed. (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1980), 7:201-4.

[32] Greaves, *DUFE*, 208.

[33] *Plain English*, 1.

contaminated with "popish" ideas and wanted to implement them in England.[34] The implication of the preface suggested that if Monck did help restore Charles, he would betray the three kingdoms by reinstating the Stuart tyranny and thereby working against what God had commanded when Charles I was executed. This emotional and political extortion was among the strongest of the period.

To support his assertion that England should not restore the Stuarts, the author included a reprint of the Parliament's Vote of No Address to Charles I in 1647, a parliamentary reaction to Charles I's attempted escape from his confinement on the Isle of Wight. Some parliamentarians had been so outraged that they urged the Parliament to impeach Charles and exclude him from any further attempts to "settle" England. Perhaps as a compromise maneuver the Commons passed the measure, declaring that it would not attempt to negotiate with Charles any longer and would consider any attempts without its permission to be treason.[35] He reminded readers why the political leaders had decided to stop communicating with Charles; reproducing the Parliament's original text was more authoritative than a summary of the document and allowed the past to speak directly to the present. Monck and the other readers could see for themselves what the parliamentary authors intended and feel the emotion evinced in the language. The piece had further implications; the author wanted the readers to believe that the Parliament had the power to cut the monarch out of the government and to imprison the king's person. Since it had incarcerated Charles II's father, it did not need to fear the son.

In *The Valley of Achor,* an attack on multiple royalist targets, the anonymous author attempted to create doubt about the Stuart monarchy and Monck. He posed a series of questions intended to underscore many of the sensitive issues Charles' government did not want the people to consider. In the first third of the tract the questions focused on Charles I, his deposition, and the right of the Parliament to enact justice upon the king. The second third examined Charles II and attempted to tar him with anything that might reflect negatively on the sovereign. The author finished the tract by excoriating Monck, attempting to discredit the general by rehearsing some of his more dishonorable deeds in the service of the Protectorate.

Forming the basis of the *Valley of Achor* was the assumption that Charles I had been responsible for the Civil Wars and therefore guilty of the blood lost. The English people, symbolized by the Parliament, had engaged in the wars to defend their liberties against a tyrannous king; Charles I's behavior absolved them from any responsibilities toward their monarch: "Whether if the Government be divided betwixt King and Parliament, if the King by Arms violates his part, the Parliament be not bound by all bonds, Sacred and Civil, to maintain their right by War?" The tract also assumed that parliamentary victory on the battlefield gave them the right to end the English monarchy: "Whether if the success be given to the people, they may not depose the King?"[36] The author did not state outright that England did not need a monarchy, but he suggested that the country had earned the right to remove the king, implying

---

[34] Ibid., 2, 6.

[35] Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, 401.

[36] *The Valley of Achor*, 1.

the monarchy should remain abolished.

The author's discussion of Charles II was among the most specific and condemnatory in the very early Restoration. Through a set of well-defined questions, he suggested that Charles intended to rule England arbitrarily. He made three charges against the monarch, only one of which he could prove. First, he reprimanded Charles for not fulfilling the Solemn League and Covenant, which the prince had taken as a condition of his coronation in Scotland in 1651. Second, he argued that Charles had "too much owned the Rebellion of Ireland, contracting the guilt of that Blood also upon himself" because he had been too lenient with the rebels and denied the soldiers their promised land. Third, the author presumed that Charles was interested in suppressing Protestantism in favor of Roman Catholicism. Using the Irish experience as a model, he asked "whether his Majesties now keeping in with the *Irish*, intends not thereby to awe the *Scots*, and the *English*, as his Father did by the Army raised by *Strafford*, and those sent over to *Montrose* in *Scotland*, which was like to ruine that Kingdom?" Neglecting Cromwell's treatment of Ireland, the author blamed Strafford and Charles I for its problems.[37]

The Valley of Achor was highly successful in defaming the Stuarts and hence their return to England. Attacking multiple targets was a good approach because it allowed the author to present in greater detail how reinstalling Charles II was a bad idea. In one short tract the author demonstrated how Charles I had been guilty of the Civil Wars and had deserved the punishment the Parliament meted out to him, how Charles II would be a bad king for England, and how General George Monck was not the honorable man many royalists portrayed.

Written by the London merchant William Drake under the pseudonym Thomas Philips, *The Long Parliament Revived* presented a more dangerous challenge to the government than did most of the other tracts printed after the Restoration in May 1660 because it challenged the legal basis of the Restoration. Fundamentally it asserted that the Restoration was illegal. Drake's argument caused an outcry in the Parliament and the press. Both houses of Parliament began proceedings against him for his assertion that the Convention Parliament did not sit legally. At least three different authors took issue with Drake's interpretation of English government: his explanation of the king's prerogative, his definition of the three estates, and his use of co-ordination theory. Little is known about Drake himself; documents referred to him as a London merchant. However, he may have been the same William Drake who petitioned the crown at the Restoration for a place as a tax farmer or a commissioner of the customs. There is no indication that he received the position he wanted.[38]

Drake argued that the Convention Parliament did not sit legally and its actions were void because the Long Parliament was still in session. He warned England that "whilest their Authority is not legally founded, the Nation can promise themselves no assurance of the lasting enjoyment of those benefits and securities they have given it, being, 'tis to be feared, and too justly, they fall void of themselves by vertue of the said Parliaments illegal Policy and

---

[37] Ibid., 3-4. See Chapter Four for the Solemn League and Covenant.

[38] PRO, SP 29/9/12.

Constitution."[39] His proof rested in the parliamentary act that denied the king the ability to dissolve the Parliament against its wishes and his rebuttal of William Prynne's assertions about why the Long Parliament had been dissolved. Parliamentary leaders had taken advantage of the tensions surrounding the earl of Strafford's attainder to present Charles I with a bill that altered English parliamentary tradition. Before this bill, the king had possessed the prerogative to dissolve the Parliament whenever he felt it expedient. The new bill, which Charles signed, transferred this right from monarch to the Parliament; the Parliament thus remained in session until it chose to pass an act declaring the session finished.[40]

The implications of Drake's assertions were staggering; if the Convention was illegal then so was the Restoration. Charles sat on the English throne without the appropriate legal authority, regardless of his dynastic rights.

Drake's tract caused an uproar in both houses of Parliament, which took preliminary steps toward convicting him of treason against the state. On 17 November, the Commons called him to the bar, where he admitted his authorship of the "dangerous Book," as secretary Morris described it. Drake tried to convince the members that he had composed this tract out of concern for the king, not to attack the government, and that he had suffered for the king during the Interregnum. They questioned him closely on how he had written the book and whether anyone else was involved; Drake answered that he was the sole author and had used Sir Edward Coke's *Institutes* as his guide. Afraid that no one would believe a merchant capable of this level of reasoning, Drake did not sign his own name to the piece and used the alias Thomas Philips instead. Outraged at Drake's boldness in the tract, Sir Heneage Finch declared that he "could not think any thing more dangerous than the writing of this Book at such a time; that it blew up this Parliament totally, and damned the Act of Oblivion: and the author had shewed himself the greatest incendiary that could be, and all his former merits could not countervail this action." The Commons ordered Drake taken into custody and the committee of privileges to examine the tract and report its findings.[41]

Offended at what the committee understood from Drake's text, the House of Commons decided to impeach Drake and sent the case to the House of Lords. The impeachment articles focused on the issue of the Convention's legality and the offence to parliamentarians' power. The passages they cited as problematic concerned the illegality of the current Parliament and Drake's desire for the return of the Long Parliament so that it could dissolve itself appropriately.[42] Parliamentarians did not use the elaborate argumentation that anonymous critics of Drake employed to attack his argument to prove that Drake's work was seditious.

Once the House of Lords had received word of the Commons' intent to prosecute Drake on 4 December, the Lords began preparations to hear the case. On Thursday, 6 December, they

---

[39] Drake, 16-17.

[40] Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, 182.

[41] *CJ*, 8:186; *ST*, 1364-65. See Chapter Two for the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion.

[42] *LJ,* 11:201; *ST*, 1366-67.

ordered Drake arrested to answer charges against him. During his appearance on 12 December, after hearing the House of Common's impeachment read in the House, Drake again admitted his authorship but defended his intentions in writing the tract, apologizing for composing and publishing the piece. After Drake's appearance, the House of Lords postponed discussion of the case several times and on 20 December ordered the attorney general to start judicial proceedings against Drake if the Lords did not have time to complete its deliberations before their dissolution.[43]

Unfortunately for Drake, he published his tract at a very inopportune time. He missed the general pardon offered by the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion during the summer. The major regicide trials and executions took place in October and the Parliament passed an Act of Attainder against all regicides not executed or in jail in November. Parliamentarians were not in the mood to be magnanimous to a man who told them they did not possess any legal rights.[44]

Although the parliamentary objections to Drake's tract centered on his denial of the Convention Parliament's legitimacy and power, other critics attacked his understanding of English government. All three authors asserted the necessary role of the king in English politics against Drake's assertion that the king could be removed from the Parliament. The earliest response, *The Long Parliament Is Not Revived,* dated 28 November, sought to prove Drake wrong by establishing a new understanding of the three estates of the kingdom. The most zealous response, *Another Word to Purpose against the Long Parliament Revived*, a tract published on or before 7 December, asserted the king's prerogative against the designs of the Long Parliament and attempted to prove that the act Drake held dear was void in its inception. The more moderate royalist author of *The Long Parliament Twice Defunct*, a "Zealous yet moderate oppunger of the Enemies of his Prince and Country," demonstrated how Drake's application of the act was contrary to the act itself, attempted to alter the foundation of English government, and supported the co-ordination theory.[45]

The author of *The Long Parliament Is Not Revived* countered Drake's promotion of the act granting the power to dissolve itself by arguing that Drake's explanation of the Parliament was incorrect. He attacked Drake's understanding of the estates of the realm by offering an alternate explanation that attempted to reconcile two older definitions of the political domain. Arguing that there were no estates of the realm, the anonymous author stated that the English political realm was composed of the two houses of Parliament with the king superior to both and responsible for calling and dissolving the two houses when he saw fit:

> A Parliament is a Politique Body, compounded (not of three States,

---

[43] *LJ*, 11:200, 207-8, 211, 212, 217.

[44] Hutton, *The Restoration*, 132-34.

[45] C. C., *Another Word to Purpose against the Long Parliament Revived* (London, 1660) (henceforth *Another Word*); R. C., *The Long Parliament Is Not Revived* (London, 1660) (henceforth *Not Revived*); *The Long Parliament Twice Defunct* (London, 1660) (henceforth *Twice Defunct*).

> as our Author would, of King, Lords and Commons, but) of heterogenial or dissimular parts, *viz*. the King, the *Principium*, *Caput* & *Finis* of it, and of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, one distinct House, and of the House of Commons, another distinct house; both which houses are convened and created by the Kings Writ.[46]

This account was an attempt to synthesize two contradictory definitions of the Parliament. The older explanation, supported by royalists before the civil war, argued that the Parliament consisted of the Lords spiritual, the Lords temporal, and the Commons. The king was omnipresent in these three and superior to them. However, Charles I's *Answer to the Nineteen Propositions* posited a new definition of the Parliament, one that altered the balance of power. In this new interpretation, the Lords spiritual folded into the Lords temporal, forming one part of the three, and the king became one of the three elements, leaving the three estates as king, Lords, and Commons.[47] The author collapsed the Lords spiritual and temporal into one entity and left the king in the omnipresent place he held under the older royalist definition.

Another Word to Purpose against the Long Parliament Revived was perhaps the most zealous royalist response to Drake. The tract focused on the parliamentary act that Drake claimed gave the Parliament the ability to dissolve itself. However, the author parlayed his defense of the king's ordinary prerogative into a vindication of his extraordinary prerogative. Fundamental to the tract's argument was the assertion that the king could not give away powers that were part of his prerogative, such as calling and dissolving parliaments. Since Charles could not alienate this power, the act that Drake trumpeted was void, and the Long Parliament had no

---

[46] *Not Revived*, 4.

[47] Corrine Weston and Janelle Greenberg, *Subjects and Sovereigns: The Grand Controversy over Legal Sovereignty in Stuart England* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 36; Michael Mendle, *Dangerous Positions: Mixed Government, the Estates of the Realm, and the Making of the Answer to the XIX Propositions* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1985), 134-35. Weston, Greenberg, Smith, and Mendle disagree on how this definition was developed. Weston and Greenberg present the more likely scenario; they argue that it was an accident. The royalist authors of the Answer did not read what they were writing carefully enough and produced this new interpretation. Smith argues that the authors intentionally posited these changes in defining a constitutional royalist position. David L. Smith, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640-1649* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 3. Mendle argues that Hyde thought that Viscount Falkland and Sir John Culpepper's definition of the three estates was incorrect but did not point out this mistake to the king because he feared his friends would lose favor with the monarch. Charles did not read the Answer before it was published. Mendle, 6-7.

right to resume sitting.[48]

Another Word became a zealous royalist tract when the author moved from maintaining the king's ordinary prerogative into a defense of his extraordinary prerogative and praised the deceased earl of Strafford. Admitting that Charles I's demand for ship money had not been popular, he asserted his right to require this extraordinary tax without the consent of the Parliament for the defense of the realm. He also defended "incomparable" Strafford as a important favorite of the king.[49] Examining the king's extraordinary prerogative, expecially its use in the ship money case, was not a move designed to convince Englishmen who were sympathetic to Drake's argument.

The most moderate of the three responses was *The Long Parliament Twice Defunct*, published on or before 3 December. This rebuttal attacked Drake's implementation of the act's reasoning, his definition of the Parliament, and his use of the co-ordination theory of government. Although he demonstrated how the framers had been facetious in their explanation of why the Parliament needed to be able to dissolve itself, namely, so it could pay off its debts in the event of the king's desire to dissolve them or his untimely death, which would normally end the session, the author used this preamble to demonstrate how the Long Parliament could not be "perpetual." He argued that the parliamentarians had not intended to set themselves up for as long as they liked; they had wanted to suspend the king's prerogative long enough to fix a problem. Once the problem was solved, the king's prerogative would return and the Long Parliament would be dissolved by his death.[50]

He disagreed with *Another Word* about the king's ability to alienate his prerogative. However, the sovereign did not have this right:

> Yet I will not deny but that the Kings Majesty might binde up his own hands, and suspend his ordinary power from an actual dissolution of the Parliament; morally by his promise, or legally, by an Act made for that Purpose. . . . I doubt whether the Kings Majesty, or his two houses, or altogether, could legally change the substance of the Parliament, and defend it against the natural causes of its Dissolution.[51]

This discussion followed his earlier idea about the Parliament wanting to suspend the king's prerogative temporarily. He argued that parliamentarians could take measures that temporarily altered the English government but no one could change the fundamental nature of how

---

[48] *Another Word*, 2-3 (mspr. 4-5), 10 (mspr. 11). The poet Carew Reynell also praised Strafford. See above.

[49] Ibid.

[50] *Twice Defunct*, 10.

[51] Ibid., 19-20.

government operated.

Perhaps the most important aspect of *Twice Defunct* was the author's discussion of Drake's implicit use of the co-ordination principle. Neither *Another Word* nor *Not Revived* touched upon this aspect of Drake's thought. Deriving from the *Answer to the Nineteen Propositions*, co-ordination was the idea that the Parliament consisted of king, Lords, and Commons and that these three elements shared law-making responsibility equally. However, this theory also asserted that the king did not have to be present all of the time. The Presbyterian minister Charles Herle combined the three-estates definition from the *Answer to the Nineteen Propositions* with the medieval theory of the king's two bodies and drew the conclusion, abhorrent to royalists, that because the king's political capacity was always vested in Parliament, his personal capacity was not required; therefore the two houses could govern without the king.[52] The author of *Twice Defunct* agreed that the three estates were king, Lords, and Commons, but did not concur that they shared law-making power, "for, hence some would infer a Coordination of power in the Parliament, which cannot, I conceive, be made good by Reason or the Laws of this Nation; For the King hath undoubted power to call and dissolve Parliaments, which are properties inconsistent with a coordinate power."[53] If the Parliament were truly co-ordinate, the only way to dissolve it would be an act passed by the two houses and signed by the king, which was the process that Drake had proposed.

On the basis of this understanding of the Parliament, Drake defended the continuance of the Long Parliament, and it was part of his rebuttal to William Prynne's *The Case of the Old Secured, Secluded, and Now Excluded Members* in which Prynne had argued that Charles I's death had dissolved the Long Parliament. To Prynne's assertion that since the king was a part of the Parliament, his death would dissolve it because it could not operate while missing one portion, Drake answered with the king's two-bodies theory as explicated in the doctrine of co-ordination: "the King is rather a part of the Parliament in his Politick than his personal capacity, which is alwayes subject to death, but his Politick never."[54] To counter this part of Drake's argument, the author of *Twice Defunct* needed to discount the two-bodies theory, which he did by arguing that the theory was out of date and illogical: "This is an out-worn and threadbare Distinction, which the common story of the Knights being perjured in his politick, and going to Hell in his natural Capacity sufficiently confutes." He also suggested that it is impossible to separate the two capacities; the political must exist in the physical.[55]

Despite Drake's protests that he was the sole author and used only Coke's *Institutes* for his tract, the material itself suggests that either Drake had collaborators or used Civil War literature and ideas to construct the *Long Parliament Revived*. Unsure of Drake, the Lords

---

[52] Weston and Greenberg, 3-7, 33-40, 52-62. See Chapter Four for more reaction to the co-ordination theory.

[53] *Twice Defunct*, 19-20, 28.

[54] Drake, 12.

[55] *Twice Defunct*, 27.

ordered a fuller investigation, appointing several members to question him further about authorship of the piece and who had commissioned him to compose it.[56]

For royalists, *Plain English* and *The Valley of Achor* could be dismissed as subversive radical propaganda. Drake, a dissident critic, however, presented a real threat to the fledgling government attempting to reconstruct the monarchy because he professed to be a loyal Englishman trying to help the government by proving that the Restoration was illegal. The outcry that ensued should not be surprising.

Religious Reactions. Religious authors presented the mildest and the most radical reactions to the Restoration. Before Charles' arrival Ralph Farmer, vicar of St. Nicholas, Bristol, preached a controversial sermon that told listeners and readers that the restoration would be insignificant if Englishmen did not live religiously. Taking a similar approach, Richard Baxter was more restrained in his acceptance of the monarchy's return than the zealous royalist and tried to stress that Englishmen should worry about their souls more than their sovereign. The most extreme religious reaction was from the Quaker Daniel Baker, who railed against the Restoration by demonstrating how England had declined rapidly since Charles' return.[57]

In his sermon for the day of fasting and humiliation on 6 April, Farmer strove to convince his listeners and readers that worrying about their souls was more relevant than contemporary politics and that King Jesus should be more important to them than King Charles. He began this argument by explaining that having a monarch did not absolve England from behaving morally:

> And we expect a *King*: But if ye *still do wickedly, ye shall be destroyed both you and your King*. That which the hearts of the people were *set* upon, was a *King*, nothing would *please* them but a *King*; yea you shall have a *King*; But yet *do not go away from God, and follow after vain things*, for if you do, *you shall be consumed* and destroyed, *both you and your King* together.

Farmer offered the ultimate proof that King Jesus was more important than Charles, saying "King *Charles* cannot save your soules; but if King *Jesus* rule in your *hearts*, he can and will save you."[58]

Farmer published his sermon to defend himself against allegations that he had preached against the Restoration, devoting several pages to an extensive analysis of the sermon in an attempt to prove that he had not spoken against Charles' return.

> My Sermon, say some, drove all at *this, The bringing in of the King*

---

[56] *LJ,* 11:218.

[57] [Ralph Farmer,] *A Plain-dealing, and Plain-meaning Sermon* (London, 1660); *Calamy Revised, s.v.* Ralph Farmer; Richard Baxter, *Right Rejoycing* (London, 1660); Daniel Baker, *One Warning More* (London, 1660).

[58] Farmer, 11, 13.

> *would bring in all prophanesse*; But did I any where say so? Truly I needed not, Prophanesse is in *already* in the Nation, nor did I *thinke* the King would bring it *in*, and I hope he *never* will.[59]

Farmer did not preach against the Restoration *per se*; he simply argued that Charles' return was not the solution to England's spiritual problems.

Invited by the Lord Mayor Thomas Alleyn to preach to many of the city's important political and economic leaders and to publish the resulting sermon, Baxter took a restrained approach and explained to his listeners and readers how they should celebrate Charles' restoration. Using Luke 10:20, "nothwithstanding in this rejoyce not, that the spirits are subject to you, but rather rejoyce because your names are written in heaven," Baxter put the Restoration into perspective by reminding readers that salvation was more important that the political situation in England. He defended his approach to his sermon by arguing that he was not discouraging celebration, but trying to mold it:

> By this time you see, that I am not unseasonably suppressing your warrantable joy; but 1. preventing that which is unwarrantable, and 2. Shewing you the higher joys, which must animate these, or they will be but dead corrupted things; It is only the *regulation* and the *Exaltation* of your joyes that I am endeavouring.[60]

However, the underlying message told readers that if they rejoiced too much for the Restoration they would be endangering their souls; without explaining what was too much Baxter led readers to question even their modest expressions.

Unlike many royalist ministers commemorating the Restoration, Baxter did not propound the political events much at all; he expounded on salvation for most of the sermon, and provided a slight discussion of Charles' return. He did not argue that England needed Charles; in fact his language suggested that he was skeptical of the reinstitution of the monarchy:

> It is some matter of Thankfullness to me, that whereas to our perpetuall shame, we could not in so many years compose the disagreements in Church affairs among us, we are not altogether without hope, that agreement may be now more effectually procured; not only because that carnall advantages, that hindred it with some, are taken from them, and suffering will dispose some more to peace; but because we are *perswased* the *disposition*, and we are *sure* the *interest* of his Majesty standeth, for our

---

[59] Ibid., 21.

[60] Baxter, *Right Rejoycing*, 18.

reconciliation and unity.[61]

For Baxter, secular government was not important in itself but as a means to reconcile the disparate factions of the church. He did not argue that England knew Charles would be the solution to the church's problems, just that Englishmen had convinced themselves Charles wanted the same religious settlement as they, or perhaps more precisely, that Baxter did. After giving praise to God for the bloodless events, Baxter returned to his overwhelming spiritual focus.[62] Compared to the panegyric royalist sermons, his welcome for Charles was tepid.

The Quaker Daniel Baker wanted to scare England by convincing his readers that it was subject to God's wrath for having allowed the Restoration. In *One Warning More*, he castigated his readers for not heeding the numerous warning signs available to England. His tone was fiery and admonishing, showing little regard for anyone's feelings. For example, he berated London as an "*Impudent Harlot*, thou *whorish Blood-thirsty Mistress* of abomination," because he felt the city was a center of filth and vice. He also targeted Monck as the major author of the Restoration, for "this Great and mighty One hath erred concerning this matter, and how wickedly, wilfully and desperately he mistook the good Land or Haven of Rest, to his own destruction."[63] However, what made Baker's tract dangerous and a rebellious radical piece, was the implication that the solution to England' problems was the deposition of the monarch. He did not state this outright, but rebellion was the logical conclusion to his charges against the Stuart monarchy.

The radical spectrum of reaction to the Restoration contained three distinct types of responses. Dissident critics Ralph Farmer, Richard Baxter, and William Drake accepted the Restoration but attempted to detract from its importance. Farmer and Baxter urged everyone to consider his or her salvation more important than the change in government. Drake, verging on being subversive, argued for the reconstruction of the monarchy but reasoned that the current government did not have the legitimacy it needed to be a real government. Subversive critical pieces such as *Plain English* and *The Valley of Achor* tried to convince readers that installing Charles on the throne would not be good for England because he would rule the country arbitrarily. Neither tract advocated Charles' removal if he did regain his throne. For all his verbal thrashing, Baker presented a subtly rebellious radical tract because his arguments drew readers to the inevitable conclusion that the only way to preserve England and restore its moral compass was the removal of the monarch. This investigation has proven that the radical reaction to the Restoration was more complex than previously thought.

---

[61] Ibid., 46.

[62] Ibid., 47-51.

[63] Baker, 5, 20 (mspr. 28). Baker's tract was part of a developing radical tradition in the Restoration to rail against the government and Church of England by warning the people about their impending doom, often citing numerous examples of prodigies and strange deaths to prove their case. Many of these pieces had a religious slant and warned people against mistreating dissenters. These prodigy tracts, such as the *Mirabilis Annus* series, will be discussed in Chapter Four.

Conclusion

The spectrum of English reaction to Charles' return was large and varied. Zealous royalist supporters used analogies that reinforced Charles' central place in English politics, manipulating nature analogies to demonstrate how the monarchy's return was fundamental to the country's survival and growth. Most of the radical authors examined argued that the Restoration had or would bring harmful things to England; the men who had ended the English monarchy had believed that the country was in better shape without the Stuarts. The Restoration ignored this advice.

Consensus among supporters of the monarchy disintegrated quickly after the initial joyous shouts praising Charles' return. Defining who brought Charles back became a political issue; claiming connection with the Restoration provided political clout, something General Monck had, English political leaders desired, and the Presbyterians needed to press their claims for a voice in the Restoration settlement.

The Agency of Charles' Return

While explaining who was responsible for the Restoration, zealous royalist, moderate critic, and dissident critic authors demonstrated a keen political sense about what elements were important beyond king and the Parliament. These writers sought to connect different groups to the Restoration, thereby giving them political legitimacy. Claiming association with the Restoration could garner political and social clout. Before his arrival, Charles II defined his return as God's will and his own right, but he also comprehended the value of making his subjects part of the process. His subjects, however, understood the political realities better and saw Monck and the people as integral parts of the Restoration. God deserved praise and thanks for these events, but human elements played crucial roles.[64] Many zealous royalist and moderate critic authors saw God as the impetus and Monck as his tool. Nonetheless, connecting the people to the political process, bringing them and their sovereign together in the reestablishment of the state, was very important for healing the country. Some ministers accomplished this task by dedicating their sermons to various peers and political figures. The Presbyterians had the smallest voice; they wanted a place in the Restoration settlement and avowing responsibility for Charles' return would help them establish this claim. Baxter asserted the Presbyterian role to demonstrate how much more loyal the Presbyterians had been than the Cavaliers. The Presbyterians Giles Firmin, the rector of Shalford in Essex, John Gailhard, and Zachary Crofton, the curate of St. Botolph's, Aldgate all published on this issue.[65]

---

[64] For discussion of God's role in the Restoration, see Keeble. Keeble, *The Restoration*, 32-33.

[65] *Calamy Revised, s.v.v.* Giles Firmin and Zachary Crofton.

Dieu et Mon Droit: Charles' Explanation for His Return

Before the Restoration, Charles II was convinced that he was the king of England, Scotland, Ireland, and France but would not enjoy his rightful position until God returned him to his thrones. His understanding became a zealous royalist position on his arrival. He understood that the kingdoms had suffered throughout the Interregnum but he had no reason to assume that these problems were the cause of his homecoming; for Charles, despite his subjects' needs, he was not recalled by them. In his letter from Breda to the House of Lords, Charles asserted that "Our Own Just Power and Authority will with Gods Blessing be restored to Us."[66] When speaking to the commissioners sent to negotiate his restoration, Charles recognized the Lords as part of God's plan for the Restoration: "And that by you (the Instruments imployed in behalf of Our Kingdoms[)], there may be wrought such a perfect Union and conjunction, between Our Self and Our People."[67] In his letter from Breda to the people of England, he reinforced his definition of his return by saying, "We can never give over the hope in good time to obtain the Possession of that Right which God and Nature hath made Our Due, so we do make it Our daily suit to the Divine Providence, that he will in compassion to Us and Our Subjects, after so long misery and sufferings, remit, and put Us into a quiet and peaceable Possession of that Our right."[68] In Charles' mind, Monck had no independent motivation to restore the monarchy; he needed inspiration from God before he could carry out his duty to his sovereign.[69] For his subjects he reinforced the zealous royalist explanation he wanted England to accept for his resumption of the throne. Using God's providence as the explanation helped bolster the image of his return as a miracle, an event the English people received but had not enacted. Publicly acknowledging his subjects' role in his restoration could diminish his majesty and suggest that the people have power over him.

Interpreting Monck's Role in the Restoration

Although many authors praised God for Charles's arrival, many also understood the political realities of the Restoration: without Monck Charles would not have regained this throne. At the end of his poem praising Monck, D. Leicester triumphantly declared, "Put this thinge /

---

[66] Charles II, "His Maiestie's Gracious Letter to the House of Peers, from Breda, April 4 / 14 1660," in *A Collection of His Majestie's Gracious Letters, Speeches, Messages, and Declarations Since April 4 / 14, 1660* (London: Printed by John Bill, 1660), 1.

[67] *King Charles His Speech to the Six Eminent Persons* (Antwerp, 1660).

[68] "His Maiestie's Declaration from Breda to All His Loving Subjects, April 4 / 14 1660," in *A Collection of His Majestie's Gracious Letters*, 6.

[69] "His Maiestie's Letter to General Monck Now Duke of Albemarle, &c from Breda, April 4 / 14 1660," in *A Collection of His Majestie's Gracious Letters,* 24.

Uppn Record, George Monk restor'd the Kinge."[70] One poet reminded everyone of this indelible fact. In his broadside panegyric to the general, Richard Farrar told Monck that "The *King* is so oblig'd, Himself doth owne / 'Tis by Thy Conduct, Hee Ascends the Throne."[71] Monck's past presented an obstacle for royalist authors; he had served under the Protectorate, the Rump, and the Council of State. Royalists differed in how they used Monck's past. Although they acknowledged his history, zealous royalists claimed the general had been plotting the king's return while working for the opposition. Moderate critics did not share this conviction that Monck had always been a royalist at heart, preferring a more realistic interpretation of events than zealous royalists. One author, the physician Martin Lluelyn, combined crediting Monck with the argument that England's necessity had brought Charles home, not his own rights, and produced one of the most unusual pro-Restoration and moderate critic arguments in the period.

Throughout the late Interregnum and early Restoration, some authors portrayed Monck as the man to solve the country's problems; before Charles' arrival he was the defender of parliamentary government, not the harbinger of kingship. In hindsight, after the Restoration Monck became the herald of the returning monarchy for the zealous royalists, the man who always knew that he stood for the restoration of the Stuarts and carried out a definite plan which included deceiving everyone about his real intentions. Moderate critics saw Monck as a military leader who made the decision to support Charles Stuart.

Perhaps the earliest rendition of Monck as the defender of the Parliament occurred unusually early in November 1659 in a broadside attacking John Bradshaw, the head of the high court of justice that had condemned Charles I. The poem's speaker wanted formal charges drawn up against Bradshaw, but felt that the current government, the committee of safety, lacked the legitimacy to carry on these legal proceedings. The poet thought that Monck would march to London and resolve these problems:

> The charge they wisely frame
> (on with it, on with it)
> In that yet unknown name
> of supreme power
>
> Which six weeks hence by vote
> Shall be, or it shall not,
> When Monk's to London got
> In a good hour.[72]

---

[70] "On Colonell George Moncke's Restoringe of the Kinge, Anno Domini 1660," BL, Add. MSS 4457, fol. 75r.

[71] Richard Farrar, *A Panegyrick to His Excellency, the Lord General Monck* (London, 1660).

[72] *The Arraignment of the Divel, for Stealing Away President Bradshaw* (London?, 1659).

The broadside *Noble English Worthies* echoed this sense of Monck as the desired restorer of the Rump Parliament and savior of the army because he paid his troops:

> The honest Souldiers, (though some be
> sadly mis-led) resolve to see
> The *Parliament* restor'd again,
> And run away to *Monck* amain;
> Who pay's them well, as well they may
> Expect; for *Lambert* has no pay;
> And thus the Newes is every day.[73]

By the time of the handwritten date on the broadside, 7 November, Monck had stated his support for Parliament against the army in England and had purged the army in Scotland to enhance his position. On 20 October Monck had written to Charles Fleetwood, John Lambert, and William Lenthal, forcefully stating his opinion on recent political events and the rightful purpose of an army in the English government.[74] Monck established himself as the defender of parliamentary liberties.

After Monk's march to London in January 1660, he changed from being the subject of speculation to the restorer of English liberties.[75] With the return of Charles II, he became the focus of various authors' commendation and celebration for the reestablishment of their sovereign. One broadside hand-dated 22 February 1659 commemorating the return of the secluded members praised God and Monck for having ended the reign of the Rump Parliament: "Then lets pray to Great Jove, that made *Monck* so kind, / To our desperate Estate, to put him in mind."[76] Zealous royalist poets chose figures from English mythology and history, such as St. George and the earl of Warwick, the "Kingmaker," to express his importance to England. Published and unpublished authors explained his past behavior as part of his secret plot to restore the monarchy. However, loyalist critics also dealt with Monck's past, especially his service to the Interregnum governments. For some ministers, the biblical general Amasa, who deserted Absalom and supported David, provided an apt example that Monck had not been the perfect royalist. One poem published early in the Restoration took this understanding further and did not try to argue that Monck's past actions had been part of a royalist design, expressing a more realistic royalist position.

---

[73] *The Noble English Worthies* (London, 1659). Although all parts of the army were owed arrears, the army in Scotland was paid better than the others. Lambert's army lacked pay as Monck's army marched south. Davies, 225; Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, 759. See Chapter Three for more on the soldiers.

[74] Davies, 162-64.

[75] For a discussion of the speculation, see below.

[76] *The Parliament-Complement* (London, 1660).

In the poetic analogies to St. George, England's patron saint, Monck represented a magnified version of the traditional St. George, having done a greater service for his country than this symbolic namesake by slaying the multi-headed Hydra (the Rump Parliament). Before the Restoration, the anonymous broadside *Saint George, and the Dragon* bearing the handwritten date of 28 February 1659 portrayed Monck as the force that had brought the Rump to an end. Although the author did not employ the St. George analogy in the text, his use of it in the title suggested the parallel between Monck and St. George and the Rump Parliament and the dragon. John Rowland, poet and rector of Foot's Cray in Kent, declared, "Saint *George* for *England*, as men us'd to sing, / Was but a Type; that *George* one Dragon slew, / This kill'd a H Y D R A, and brings in the K I N G." For his comparison, Rowland employed typology, a form of literary analysis, often used to interpret the Bible, which argued that certain people, events, and ideas in the past foreshadowed and were imperfect versions of the present.[77] Rowland as a minister and his seventeenth-century readers would have been familar with typology and understood the message he wanted to convey. He suggested that St. George was significant for England because he foreshadowed Monck, thereby praising Monck even more.[78] Thomas Higgons shared his sentiment; after a brief description of the mythic figure, he asserted that the contemporary George had accomplished more.[79]

Authors of various persuasions also represented Monck as a modern Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, the "Kingmaker." The poet Arthur Brett praised Monck by showing how he, like Warwick, had yielded to his rightful sovereign instead of taking the crown for himself: "So of Great Warwick's mind is he, / Rather to make a King than be."[80] However, this analogy was not always a positive one. The anonymous author of *The Valley of Achor* used the Kingmaker analogy to suggest that Monck would become proud and abuse his position; the author asked "whether *Duke Monk* may not prove as boasting a *King maker* as *Nevil*, Earle of *Warwick*, who created and destroyed at his pleasure upon the least discontent?"[81] Unlike royalist applications of the Kingmaker analogy, this radical interpretation went beyond the surface and used the reality of Henry Neville to puncture the positive image the royalists portrayed.

Monck's involvement with the Rump troubled all royalists trying to show the general in

---

[77] Paul J. Korshin, *Typologies in England, 1650-1820* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), 76; Joseph A. Galdon, *Typology and Seventeenth-Century Literature* (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 21-24.

[78] John Rowland, "In Honor of the Lord General Monck, and Thomas Allen Lord Major of London, for Their Great Valour, Loyalty, and Prudence," in *His Sacred Majesty Charles the II* (London, 1660); Old *DNB*, *s.v.* John Rowland; Richard L. Greaves, *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002), 179.

[79] *Saint George, and the Dragon* (London?, 1660); Higgons, 3.

[80] Arthur Brett, *The Restauration* (London, 1660), 22.

[81] *The Valley of Achor*, 5.

the best light. At least two unpublished poets shared this interpretation of Monck. Leicester was blunt about Monck's actions before the Restoration, saying that "he did ally with the Enemy." The anonymous author of "Well! Say what you will, our noble king Charles" suggested that Charles had made a deal with "Suttle & Secrett" Monck for his restoration. To implement his plans for Charles' return, Monck had to work with the current governments: "This wily Monck, to cover his close designe / Tendred compliance & service to the Rump."[82]

Zealous royalist authors' descriptions of Monck's methods implied his original intention had been to restore the monarchy and portrayed a cunning and self-assured political figure. Before the Restoration, authors did not know what to make of Monck's actions and intentions but implied that he had secret plans. The diarist John Evelyn observed:

> *Generall Monke* came now to *Lond*: out of *Scotland*, but no man knew what he would do, or declare, yet was he mett on all his way by the Gent: of all the Counties which he pass'd, with petitions that he would recall the old long interrupted Parliament, & settle the Nation in some order, being at this time in a most prodigious Confusion, & under no government, every body expecting what would be next, & what he would do.[83]

Another keen political observer, Francesco Giavarina, the Venetian ambassador to England, was suspicious of Monck; he felt that the general manipulated everyone to his own advantage.[84] Zealous royalist authors had more faith in Monck, seeing his actions as good for England and the royalist cause. The author of *St. George and the Dragon* commented that "a little time shall shew you which way my design tends, / And that, besides the good of the Church and State, I have no other ends." After the Restoration authors such as the Anglican divine Thomas Fuller, who graduated B.A. in 1625 and M.A. in 1628 from Queens' College, Cambridge and was able to preach and publish during the Interregnum, portrayed Monck as a riddle that only he and God understood, and continued this secrecy theme but argued that this deviousness was a good and necessary part of Monck's plans.[85] The anonymous author of *Muses Congratulatory* employed a successful paradox to describe Monck's actions, saying, "how innocently subtle hast thou

---

[82] Leicester, BL, Add. MSS 4457, fol. 75r; Bodl., Rawl. Poetry MSS 66, fols. 9r, 10r.

[83] John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E. S. de Beer (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 3:241.

[84] *CSPV*, *1659-60*, 117.

[85] *Saint George, and the Dragon* (London?, 1659 [1660]); Old *DNB, s.v.* Thomas Fuller; Thomas Fuller, *A Panegyrick to His Majesty, on His Happy Return* (London, 1660), 3.

wrought / Thy just atcheivments."[86] In his sermon commemorating Charles' return, Francis Walsall, royal chaplain and prebendary of St. Peter's, Westminster, focused on Monck's efforts at persuading the people to support Charles Stuart. Instead of violence, Monck enticed the people with "balmy words, with soft and gentle stroking."[87] Walsall's description sounds more like a seduction than a political campaign. Farrar's contrasting interpretation turned Monck into a thief, stealthy and always in control: "and yet Thou did'st not either Fight or Treat. / All this so calmly, with such Silence too, / And so much Speed."[88]

Moderate critics did not feel Monck's past actions were part of a clever plot to restore the king. Perhaps the most striking analogy for Monck was Amasa, one of Absalom's generals who had switched sides to support David. In this metaphor, Amasa served as an instrument for God to affect David's return, and by extension, Monck became God's tool for Charles' restoration. Dr. William Creed, archdeacon of Wiltshire and canon resident of Salisbury, argued that God was the principal agent, Amasa the instrument for carrying out this return, and David the trigger that prompted Amasa to begin the process.[89] This Amasa analogy acknowledged that Monck was not the guardian angel described by some other authors nor did he have a plan from the beginning to restore Charles Stuart. Instead, the Amasa analogy suggested that Monck supported the various Interregnum governments until his conscience dictated otherwise.

Using Amasa was not the only way to intimate Monck had not been consistently loyal; one broadside poet used the dialogue format to have an Englishman and a Scotsman discuss Monck's recent actions and complain about Monck's lack of loyalty to the king before the Restoration:

> Our Noble *Georg* near did intend
> To abandon his loyalty (chang with each wind)
> Though he did awhile it suspend:
> Yet as I may freely confesse unto thee,
> He was not so great in my books,
> When our Posts and Chains cut down I did see,
> And our Gates remov'd from their Hooks.[90]

---

[86] T. B., *The Muses Congratulatory Address to His Excellency the Lord General Monck* (London?, 1660).

[87] Francis Walsall, *The Bowing Heart of the Subjects to Their Sovereign* (London, 1660), 13; Francis Walsall, *Cordifragium* (London, 1660).

[88] Farrar.

[89] Walsall, *The Bowing Heart*, 6; Old *DNB, s.v.* William Creed; William Creed, *Judah's Return to Their Allegiance* (London, 1660), 5-6.

[90] *A Pair of Prodigals Returned* (London?, 1660).

The anonymous poet has painted a more realistic picture of Monck, acknowledging his service to the committee of safety and expressing the City's discontent with his demobilization of its fortifications on 9 February and the total destruction, against his wishes, of some gates on 10 February.[91]

Unlike most of his contemporaries, Martin Lluelyn emphasized England's desire for Charles in these events and portrayed Monck as the agent of the people instead of God. Arguing that Charles had been restored because England needed him, Lluelyn considered the prince to be the best solution to the country's problems. He bluntly stated that all other attempts to return Charles to this throne had been unsuccessful and that only the English need for him had brought him back: "what Birth, nor Brains, Treasure, nor Force could do, / Our Kind Necessity hath rais'd Thee to." For Lluelyn, Englishmen had the right to select their king but chose Charles because they wanted him: "We still request a King, and that King, Thee." Lluelyn also implied that before arriving in England, Charles had not been the king: "woed to a Crown, and Courted to a Throne, / There You are Prince; there you are King alone."[92] These implications are surprising given Lluelyn's past. After graduating from Oxford with an M.A. in 1643, he entered the royalist army and was sequestered from Oxford in 1648. Between 1648 and 1660, he studied medicine, earned his degree from Oxford, and received his certification to practice. Apparently he had good connections at court because soon after Charles II's return, he was appointed a physician to the king.[93] His background suggests a strong royalist leaning and a desire to place an emphasis on Charles' rights to the crown rather than the people's selection. Instead, he told his sovereign and patient that he was obligated to the English people for his position, not God, Monck, or his own ancestry.

For Lluelyn, Monck did not play a defining role in Charles' return; the general was the means but not the reason. Lluelyn contrasted Monck's role with the potential for outside help for reestablishing Charles. Spanish or French aid would have been bad for England:

> Had You by Forreign Strengths regain'd Your Right,
> You might at once Restore us, and Affright.
> For Spanish Aides, had scarce the credit won,
> Of Spanish Succours, but Invasion.
> Your wisht Approach it self might so, amate,
> And Your Return had seem'd *Our* Eighty Eight.
> Our hopes Restorer *France* did fear to be,
> And *Spain* though Hospitable, was not He.

---

[91] Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, 762-63.

[92] Martin Lluelyn, *To the Kings Most Excellent Majesty* (London?, 1660), 3-4 (mspr. 5-6), 10 (mspr. 8).

[93] Old *DNB, s.v.* Martin Lluelyn.

Renowned *Monck* alone to Us, and You.[94]

In the first two lines above, Lluelyn suggested that if Charles had obtained outside help, he would have become England's conqueror and could have ruled England however he pleased. He invoked the memory of the Spanish Armada to demonstrate the fear a Spanish-aided restoration would have brought. Instead, Monck was the agent of Charles' return.

In his defense of Monck against charges of disloyalty to the council of state, James Warwell, the rector of Boxford in Suffolk, plotted three dangerous arguments that dissenters could and did use against the crown. Monck's success justified his earlier actions; Monck did what was right because he "hath done no more then what the conscience of a true, upright Christian and of a sincere honest man strictly bound him to [do]."[95] This argument from success could be used to justify the Civil Wars, regicide, and the Protectorate. For example, in a set of *Speeches and Prayers* of several regicides published as skillful propaganda glorifying the regicides, the regicide Thomas Harrison reaffirmed his belief in the Parliament's execution of Charles I, saying that God and the Parliament supported by God justified the act.[96] Royalist authors were quick to refute this logic. For example, William Creed argued that success did not make something good; God suffered wrongdoers to succeed but did not give his blessing, sometimes allowing the enemies to win to scare the world and the rightful rulers.[97] Warwell knew that restoring Charles was right; but Cromwell had believed that executing Charles I had been correct too.

Warwell's second justification argued that Monck was not bound to defend the government after his military commission expired.[98] According to Warwell, Monck was not obligated to his government on general principles, for his military charge was his only tie to the leaders. Once his employment ended, he was free to follow his conscience. The author of *Cromwell's Conspiracy*, a dialogue about the Interregnum, used the same logic for his interpretation of Monck. In a conversation between the lord mayor and Monck, the general told the mayor:

In the meantime you know that I am now

---

[94] Lluelyn, 7-8 (mspr. 5-6).

[95] James Warwell, *Votiva Tabula* (London, 1660), 75.

[96] *The Speeches and Prayers of Major General Harison, Octob. 13. Mr. John Carew, Octob. 15. Mr. Justice Cooke, Mr. Hugh Peters, Octob.16. Mr. Tho. Scott, Mr. Gregory Clement, Col. Adrian Scroop, Col. John Jones, Octob. 17. Col. Daniel Axtell, & Col. Fran. Hacker, Oct. 19 the Times of Their Death* ([London], 1660), 2. See Chapter Two for a discussion of the regicide tracts.

[97] William Creed, *Judah's Purging in the Melting Pot* (London, [1660]), 16-17, 24.

[98] Warwell, 75.

> A servant to the Parliament, and must
> Act by Commission; but when that is out,
> My hands will be at liberty to do
> What God and my own Conscience shall suggest.[99]

Dissenters under Charles could use this reasoning, particularly the conscience argument, for not defending and actively working against the English crown. Without specific employment, these discontented people did not have to be loyal to the government. This logic worked against everything administrations wanted their citizens to believe, namely that they owe their governments loyalty regardless of the situation. Convincing the English people to be loyal to the crown was one of the major themes of political discourse in the early Restoration.

Warwell's third reason posited that Monck was not bound to execute bad commands, and the government's transgressions had released him from his obligation to obey his leaders.[100] With this argument Warwell provided dissenters with solid reasoning for disobeying future government regulations on religion. This logic was not new; in her almanac for 1659 Sarah Jinner had observed that "people are not bound to obey well, when Governors do not govern well." Many dissenting ministers would stress that Christians are not obligated to obey unjust commands; by defending Monck with this logic, Warwell added legitimacy to the argument.[101]

Lauded by royalists, Monck was a significant part of the developing Restoration mythology. Zealous authors tried to construct a royalist past for Monck, explaining that he had a plan to restore Charles all along. On the other hand, moderate critics presented a more realistic interpretation of the general, one that did not claim Monck had been a secret royalist but a man who made the decision to support and effect Charles Stuart's return. The dominant picture that the myth maintained was the zealous royalist one of a valiant general longing for the return of his king while he served other masters, waiting for the right time to transform England back into a monarchy. Both interpretations of Monck are still current.[102]

---

[99] *Cromwell's Conspiracy* (London, 1660), sig. F1r.

[100] Warwell, 75.

[101] Balliol College Library, MS 670 a.6[9], Sarah Jinner, *An Almanack and Prognostication for the Year of Our Lord 1659* (London, [1659]), sig. C3r. This topic will be covered more fully in Chapter Four.

[102] Monck's biographers, Maurice Ashley and Ted R. Jamison, Jr., support the zealous royalist view of Monck, arguing that the general had a plan for Charles' return before he marched to London in January 1660. Godfrey Davies and Ronald Hutton affirm the moderate critic position. Davies posits that Monck decided to restore Charles between 9 and 21 February. Once Monck stood for the readmission of the secluded members, the general "crossed the Rubicon." Hutton takes a more cautious approach, saying "by the beginning of March at the latest, it must have been obvious to George Monck that the policy he had initiated was making a royal restoration likely." Maurice Ashley, *General Monck* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1977),

Connecting the People to the Restoration

Making Englishmen feel they were part of the Restoration and the ensuing political process was intended to tie them closer to the state and their sovereign; they were also less likely to forget why Charles's return was important for the three kingdoms. Moderate royalists addressed this task through selective dedications to important people. Targeting peers, parliamentarians, municipal and county leaders, and prominent citizens, these authors strove to gain potential patrons by glorifying the chosen individual with his connections to the restored monarchy, but they also reminded these people that because they had a role in the Restoration, they also bore some responsibility for the success of the government.[103]

The relationship between minister and patron obligated both sides; patrons ordered ministers to preach on certain days and then asked them to print the resulting sermons. Ministers assumed that these patrons supported the messages of the sermons. In his dedication to Sir Edward Dymocke, the king's champion and high sheriff of Lincoln, Obadiah Howe, the vicar of Boston, Lincolnshire, and a man who had supported the Parliament during the Civil Wars and endorsed the monarchy at the Restoration, enunciated this relationship:

> Your Command bound me for the Pulpit, and to the Auditory, by the way of Discourse; and your Candor brings me to the Press, and to your Self, by way of Dedication. What was presented to your Ears, is here represented to your Eyes: not as commanding your pains in the review, but craving your Patronage. Your Command did first give life to these Conceptions; they are therefore Yours. I humbly expect that right, that you will own them.[104]

Howe's repetition of *command* and *commanding* demonstrated his understanding of Dymocke's

---

163-65; Ted R. Jamison, Jr., *George Monck and the Restoration: Victor without Bloodshed* (Ft. Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1975), xii; Davies, 310; Hutton, *Restoration*, 106.

[103] Patronage has been an important area of research in the last forty years. Ian Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Dustin Griffin, *Literary Patronage in England, 1650-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Linda Levy Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London: Routledge, 1993); Cedric C. Brown, ed., *Patronage, Politics, and Literary Traditions in England, 1558-1658* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1991); Alistair Fox, *Politics and Literature in the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989); Paul J. Korshin, "Types of Eighteenth-Century Literary Patronage," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 7 (Summer 1974): 453-73.

[104] *Walker Revised*, 92; Old *DNB, s.v.* Obadiah Howe; Obadiah Howe, *Eloheem, or God and the Magistrate* (London, 1663), sig. A2v. The original was all italics.

role in this relationship and relieved him of individual responsibility for printing the sermon. For his part, Dymocke was responsible for endorsing Howe's message.[105]

Some ministers chose high government officials as potential patrons, in part to remind them of their responsibilities in the reconstruction of the monarchy. John White, a minister at Wadhurst in Sussex, told Lord Culpepper, the master of the Rolls, that he hoped "that your Lordships known and approved faithfulnesse and wisedom may long prosper in the Service of his Sacred Majestie." After reminding the earl of Lauderdale of his suffering during the Interregnum, Simon Ford praised him by assuring the noble that he would be a good councillor for Charles II.[106]

At the June 1661 assizes in York, Josiah Hunter, a local minister in York, dedicated his sermon to Sir Thomas Slingsby, high sheriff of York and the patron who had appointed him to the pulpit for that day. Hunter connected Slingsby to his monarch by reminding him of the honors and responsibilities Charles had given him, saying, "*his* Majesty *hath so much honoured you in preferring you to such a place of* Trust & Credit *in your* Country*, and you have so farre honoured your* Selfe *in the discharge of it.*"[107] Hunter established a chain of command from the king to Slingsby to himself and reminded Slingsby of his place in this order.[108]

Dedications to parliamentary representatives were also popular and connected the voters and political leaders to the government. Before the Restoration, Benjamin Bruning, a town preacher in Ipswich before and after the Restoration, told Sir Henry Felton and Henry North, MPs for Suffolk, that the county expected them to guide the country well:

> *Think often on us your poor Country men, who are full of expectations, waiting to see what God [good?] the Lord will do for us, by means of your wisdome, faithfulness, and courage; let me take the boldness to put you in remembrance, that ye are now the Stewards of God for us; and that it concerns ye, as ye love your own Souls, so to mannage all your Parliamentary actions, as if ye*

---

[105] In a study of eighteenth-century literary patronage Dustin Griffin enunciates a similar understanding of the patron-client relationship. He argues that the patron lent the client's pieces legitimacy and that the client gave ownership of the piece to his patron. Griffin, 29-31.

[106] John White, *The Parallel between David, Christ, and K. Charls, in Their Humiliation and Exaltation* (London, 1660), sig. a3r; Simon Ford, *Parallela Duaogzallela* (London, 1661), sigs. A2r-A3r.

[107] Josiah Hunter, *Judah's Restitution* (York, 1661), sig. A2r-v.

[108] Hunter and his contemporaries that sought to connect the people, their parliamentary representatives, and the monarch may have been thinking of themselves as part of the Great Chain of Being that linked all ranks of people in a "hierarchical" chain from the lowest creature through all ranks of men up to God. Arthur Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936), 59.

> *were assured at the instant of the Parliaments dissolution to be summoned by* the most High, to give an account of your Stewardship.[109]

Using the idea of stewardship in Luke 16:1-4, Bruniung instructed his parliamentary representatives in their political responsibilities. The biblical story focused on a steward who had misused his employers' wealth and was in danger of losing his position: "Give an account of the stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward."[110] The political implications were clear; parliamentarians were responsible to the people and God, who would judge them on how well they had taken care of their earthly responsibilities to the people. Bruning did not connect Felton and North to their king; the MPs themselves were God's stewards. Nor did the dedication instruct the political leaders to help restore the king. According to the title page, Bruning intended to preach the sermon on 9 April, the day of parliamentary elections, but actually delivered it on 10 April. There is no indication when this sermon went to press. The publication of this sermon may have been a statement of the supremacy of the Parliament or a subtle plea against restoring Charles.

Royalist authors made effective use of dedications to parliamentarians, reminding their dedicatees of their responsibilities to the king and the people. In the sermon, *Parallela, or the Loyal Subjects Exultation for the Royall Exiles Restauration* paralleling David and Charles II, Simon Ford dedicated the tract to Sir Henry Yelverton and John Crew, MPs for Northampton. Ford told the political leaders that the county looked to them for good, loyal government: "*Your present* Interest *in that* Parliament, *which hath given us the* occasion *of that* Joy, *which begat the* Meditations *here expressed*; and your known Loyalty *to our* gracious Sovereign, *in so many* eminent services *(of late especially) manifested, to your greatest hazard of lives and estates*."[111] Ford's choice of Crew demonstrated a desire to incorporate a wider range of people in the Restoration; Crew had been a secluded member of the Long Parliament who did not support the execution of Charles I. Although he had been a parliamentary negotiator at several of the important treaty discussions, he had not approved charging and trying his sovereign and he was secluded in 1648. Crew was among the English party that received Charles II at the Hague before his final voyage to England.[112] Preaching on the same subject, Francis Gregory, a schoolmaster in Woodstock, also chose the parliamentary representatives for Oxfordshire, Sir Thomas Spencer and Edward Atkins, as his dedicatees. Gregory included them in the Restoration by asserting that they were integral to Charles' return: "*And to* whom *can I then*

---

[109] *Calamy Revised, s.v.* Benjamin Bruning; Benjamin Bruning, *Vlastema ex Hypsous, or The Best Wisdom* (London, 1660), sigs. A2r (mspr. A1r), A4v-B1r .

[110] Luke 16:2.

[111] Ford, *Parallela,* sigs. A2v-A3r.

[112] Old *DNB, s.v.* John Crew; Mary Frear Keeler, *The Long Parliament, 1640-1641* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1954), 147.

present *it, but to* You, *who have been Instruments, of* our Choyce, *but in* Gods hand, *to bring back* our David, King *of* England, *to his* Jerusalem *too*."[113] In this statement, Gregory connected the citizens of Woodstock, through the parliamentary representatives, with the execution of God's wishes. His formulation praised not only Spencer and Atkins but also the people most likely to buy copies of his sermon.

The Presbyterians

Very few authors discussed the role of the Presbyterians in Charles' return. Doing so indicated a critique of the developing Restoration mythology of the royalist triumph and contradicted Charles' own published ideas on the subject. This idea was not radical; exponents of the Presbyterian role in Charles' return wanted the king on the throne. Acknowledging the Presbyterian contributions to the Restoration gave them a voice in the political arena and legitimized their claim to a stake in the church settlement.[114]

Presbyterian participation in the Restoration was most evident in the actions of the Presbyterian Knot, an organization of like-minded political leaders who had wanted to keep the crown in 1648, and suffered Pride's Purge and the termination of the House of Lords for their beliefs. Despite this support for monarchy, these political leaders wanted a narrow definition of monarchy, allowing them to set the terms upon which the reigning monarch would rule. They felt the best solution to the chaos after the fall of the Protectorate in 1659 was the return of the Stuarts, but on their terms. As the Convention Parliament began to gather, leaders of the Presbyterian Knot attempted to influence parliamentary proceedings to ensure that Charles would return upon their conditions. However, Monck's careful management of the new young members ensured that the Presbyterians did not remain the majority and quashed their dream of a limited monarchy.[115]

Several dissenters understood this connection between their role in the Restoration and right to a place in the discussions about the Church of England. They strove for legitimacy for their beliefs through vigorous assertions of the fundamental Presbyterian role in Charles' return. Baxter discussed the Presbyterians' part in the Restoration as an attack on the men who had claimed to be the king's supporters. On the other hand, staunch Presbyterians and dissident critics Giles Firmin, Zachary Crofton, and John Gailhard defended the Solemn League and

---

[113] Francis Gregory, *David's Returne from His Banishment* (Oxford, 1660), sig. A2v (mspr. A3v).

[114] Godfrey Davies and Anne Whiteman have expressed similar views, suggesting that the Presbyterians expected special treatment at the Restoration. Davies, 309; Whiteman, "The Restoration of the Church of England," in *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662-1962*, 51.

[115] Hutton, *Restoration*, 105, 117-18; Davies, 308, 339.

Covenant as valuable and significant in the king's return.[116]

Baxter lent his voice to the Presbyterian claim to a significant role in the Restoration. In the sermon *Right Rejoicing*, he implied that the Presbyterians, not the Cavaliers, were the main human motivation for the recent turn of events. The Cavaliers were too busy carousing to do any of the work; he argued "that while profane opposers of Religion, did boast and vapour, and swear, and curse, and drink healths for his Majesties restitution, it is *those whom they reproached*, that have *silently* and *effectually* accomplisht it, and that with speed, as soon as they had power."[117] This image of the carousing Cavalier became a stereotype authors on all parts of the religious spectrum used; therefore it was a valid one for communicating with readers.[118]

The Presbyterian minister Giles Firmin brought wide experience to his ministry. He studied medicine at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, before moving to New England, where he lived for about twenty-five years. Upon his return to England Firmin obtained the vicarage of Shalford, Essex, where he served until his ejection in 1662. The old *Dictionary of National Biography* portrays Firmin as a moderate Presbyterian who agreed with Baxter on a church government of reduced episcopacy.[119] However, his defense of the Solemn League and Covenant questions this interpretation.

Firmin took a two-step approach to asserting the Presbyterian role in the Restoration. First, he defended the Presbyterian community from charges that they did not support the king during the Interregnum by arguing that a public profession of loyalty had not been possible:

> *But Who* heard *these Prayers? Where were they made? Say you: I tell you,* God *heard them, and men heard them: they were made in our Studies, between God & our own souls, they were made in our families: they were made in our daies of private Fasting, and Prayer, which you call* Conventicles)[.] *Would you have heard them in our Publick Congregations? It may be you would; but would you then have judged us* prudent?

Firmin argued that praying for Charles in public lead to his arrest and imprisonment, which

---

[116] G[iles] F[irmin], *Presbyterial Ordination Vindicated* (London, 1660); J [ohn] Gailhard, *The Controversie Between Episcopacy and Presbytery* (London?, 1660); Zachary Crofton, *Analepsis Anelephthe* (London, 1660).

[117] Baxter, *Right Rejoicing*, 46.

[118] See Stephen Greenberg's dissertation for a discussion of the development of the Cavalier stereotype in literature. Stephen Joel Greenberg, "Cavalier: Propaganda Stereotypes in Seventeenth-century England" (Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1983).

[119] Old *DNB, s.v.* Giles Firmin; *Calamy Revised, s.v.* Giles Firmin.

underscored his loyalty to the Stuarts.[120]

Second, Firmin asserted that the Solemn League and Covenant kept the Presbyterians loyal to Charles and ensured his Restoration:

> *Such* Subjects *had his* Majesty *among the now despised* Presbyterians, *who, had they not been* faithfull *and loyal to his Majesty,* (*as they were bound to be by the* Solemn Covenant) *but would have closed with the Army, doubtless they could have carried such a Party with them, that I believe as yet our* King *had not set upon his* English *Throne, nor had the voice of Thanksgiving for his restoring been heard in our Iland* [Island or Land?].[121]

Firmin wanted to convince his readers that without the Presbyterians' support Charles would not have resumed his English crown. Furthermore, the Solemn League and Covenant was the glue that bound the Presbyterians to the king. Therefore the Covenant was a fundamental part of the Restoration, an argument few Presbyterians were willing to defend on paper and many conformists decried.[122]

Unfortunately, little is known about John Gailhard, a Presbyterian who felt his co-religionists had played significant roles at several points along the road to the Restoration. Gailhard was adamant about the Presbyterian role in the Restoration:

> And, shall I refute this slander cast upon Presbyterians by their practice, let me but look upon the late Deliverance, and consider them as actors in it: Alas, what could Episcopal and Royalist do; they could lift up the hand no where, but at the bar, they were as low as they could be, let them vant now as hight ast they will. How great profers and Encouragements did Monck receive from the Scots who paid his Army? Did not the Lord Fairfax appear to back him? Was not the City, where are more Presbyterians then Episcopal, very instrumental in the work? And did not the secluded members after their re-admission testifie, that it was for want of time and not of affections that his Majestie was not yet by them desired to come in, by causing the Covenant to be set up in the House, and in all publick places; In a word, the *Presbyterians* cannot be deprived of the honor of having brought in the king.[123]

---

[120] Firmin, sig. A2r.

[121] Ibid., sig. A2v.

[122] See Chapter Four for the Solemn League and Covenant.

[123] Gailhard, 10-11.

Gailhard echoed Firmin in his assertion that Presbyterian support was fundamental to the Restoration. However, he did not stress the importance of the Covenant as much as Firmin did; Gailhard preferred to see several avenues of Presbyterian success.

Zachary Crofton, the best known Presbyterian controversialist in the Restoration, engaged John Gauden and several others in a print war over the applicability of the Covenant. Originally from Ireland, Crofton moved to England in 1644 and began preaching a year later. He held various positions throughout the Interregnum, finally settling at St. Botolph, Aldgate, in London. He was ejected from this post for his vocal support of the Covenant.[124]

Crofton did not follow the same reasoning as Firmin and Gailhard; he did not directly argue that the Covenant itself was responsible for the Restoration. Instead, he used Presbyterian participation to counter King James I's maxim "No Bishop No King." In his second submission to the controversy, *Analepsis Anelephthe*: *The Fastening of St. Peter's Fetters*, Crofton responded to several tracts published since his original salvo at Gauden. He used the Presbyterian role in the Restoration as a rebuttal to arguments posited in the *Reasons of the Present Judgement of the University of Oxford*, a reprint from 1647 written against the Covenant. Among the many reasons employed by the dons to explain why they argued they could not take the Covenant, they posited James I's dictum that monarchy and episcopacy were inseparable:

> In so much as King JAMES would often say, what his long experience had taught him, *No Bishop, no King*. Which Aphorisme, though we find in sundry Pamphlets of late years to have been exploded with much confidence and scorn; yet we must professe to have met with very little in the proceedings of the late times, to weaken our belief of it.[125]

Crofton countered by arguing that episcopacy was not mandatory for the establishment of monarchy:

> Now, Sir, as to the so often Canted Aphorisme of King *James*, *No Bishop, No King*; with which the Prelates and their Priests do so much strive to rivet their Government unto the Crown; I must be free to say, that it is more *politick than pious*; and of no more warrant or authority, than the *Spaniards one universal Emperour, and one Pope, or universal Bishop*; and when the *Scots loyal adherence to*, and advancement of His most Sacred Majesty, unto the Ruine of their Kingdom, Loss of their Lives and Estates, Exile and Imprisonment of their Nobles, and Conquest of their Land; together with the *uncessant struglings* of the Covenant interest,

---

[124] Old *DNB, s.v.* Zachary Crofton; *Calamy Revised, s.v.* Zachary Crofton. See Chapter Four for a fuller discussion of this controversy.

[125] *Reasons of the Present Judgement of the University of Oxford,* reprint ed. (London, 1660), 13.

> under Sequestration, Imprisonments, Banishments, and death of many; not ceasing till they had (by Gods blessing) effected the Happy and Honourable Restitution of King and Kingdom, be well considered, I hope these learned Masters and Scholars of *Oxford* will see some proceedings that may at least *weaken their belief* in this political Maxime.[126]

For Crofton, the Presbyterians had brought Charles back without supporting government by bishops.

Although most royalist writers ignored these dissenter claims, Arthur Bury took the challenge and, using sarcasm, spat venom back at the Presbyterians. Bury was an Oxford graduate and fellow of Exeter College when Charles I made Oxford his headquarters. In defense of the city, Bury joined the city's guards. For his royalist service he was ejected by parliamentary visitors. At the Restoration he regained his lost fellowship and became a prebendary of Exeter.[127] Toward the end of his sermon, Bury launched an attack on the Presbyterians, condemning their treatment of Charles I and their claim to active participation in the Restoration. For Bury, the Presbyterians had no scruples and acted only for their own benefit: "They will do whatever shall seem most advantagious, and no *law* nor *religion* shall withold them, for *Providence* leads them." He did not argue that the Presbyterians had executed Charles I, but they had played a pivotal role: "They put the King, though not to death, yet upon the certain expectations of death, as knowing *there are but few steps between the prisons and graves of Princes*." After his recitation of the Presbyterians' crimes, he lashed out sarcastically at their assertion of their part in Charles' return by reiterating his argument that they had helped force Charles Stuart to flee in the beginning: "If they had not driven him from his Kingdome, he could not have been restored" Bury reminded his readers, adding the scarcastic comment "but *they restored him.*[128] When Bury preached this sermon, this comment probably drew a laugh from his congregation, but they would have noted the anger behind the snide comment. Bury made fun of their claim and blamed them for the first English Civil War, the act that had caused Charles Stuart to flee his father's kingdom.

Moderate dissenters and staunch Presbyterians were unable to translate their views into national policy. Despite their claims to have helped the Restoration, this political move did not give them the legitimacy they needed. Regardless of their initial success with the Worcester House Declaration, proponents of a reduced episcopacy did not see their progress put into law; the Act of Uniformity established a much narrower Church of England with episcopacy intact. Steadfast Presbyterians could not convince England that the Solemn League and Covenant bound the country to their Presbyterian ideals.

---

[126] Crofton, *Analepsis Anelephthe*, 102.

[127] Old *DNB, s.v.* Arthur Bury; *Walker Revised, s.v.* Arthur Bury.

[128] Arthur Bury, *The Bow* (London, 1662), 40-45.

Conclusion

Nicholas Jose has complained that many poets "straddled the fence" and did not define one element alone as the reason for Charles' return, but he has neglected how contemporaries understood their world.[129] Rightly recognizing the complexity of events, seventeenth-century Englishmen did not have a problem positing more than one agent for the Restoration; the event provided an opportunity to discuss the politics of the ensuing settlement. Although Charles defined a zealous royalist view of his return, many of his subjects did not share it, preferring instead to defend Monck as an important element in the Restoration. Zealous royalists portrayed Monck as a secret royalist waiting for the appropriate time to restore Charles; moderate critics wanted a more realistic image of the general. Many ministers intended to connect their patrons to the Restoration and obligate them to maintain the monarchy through pointed dedications. Firmin, Gailhard, and Baxter, likely looking forward to the debate over the Church of England, attempted to gain some political legitimacy for the Presbyterian interest by voicing the Presbyterians' role in Charles' return.

Conclusions

This investigation has proven that the English reaction to the Restoration was rich, varied, and far more complicated than the basic tripartite breakdown of people, namely those who supported Charles Stuart, those who did not care, and Englishmen opposed to the monarchy. In defining Charles' return, zealous royalists and moderate critics had the same general goal–to celebrate the Restoration–despite their different views on how to carry out their desires. Radicals were not as close in their views; dissident critics wanted the opportunity to make serious changes in how the monarchy and Church of England would operate whereas subversive and rebellious radicals wanted to prevent the Restoration altogether.

Section one of this chapter has discussed the various reactions to Charles' return. Using renewal and revolution as themes to explain the Restoration allowed zealous royalist authors to propose different things about the Restoration. Renewal suggested that England had grown old or become ill, and Charles' return reinvigorated and brought England back to good health. Revolution, on the other hand, implied that England had come full circle since the Civil Wars with the return of the Stuart monarchy. At least one author employed the revolution motif in an extreme zealous royalist fashion; Carew Reynell suggested that England should return to the governing style of Charles I and the church ceremonial of Laud.

Defining Charles gave zealous royalists another opportunity to exalt monarchy and explain their king to their readers. Zealous royalists strove to identify the sovereign as the center of English political life, accomplishing this goal through analogies to the natural world. Comparing Charles with the biblical King David demonstrated Charles' greatness and gave authors a way to explain Charles' plight and restoration to their readers; through David's story

---

[129] Jose, 27.

Englishmen could better understand their own sovereign. However, the extreme zealous royalist Peter Heylyn took the David analogy several steps further than most of his contemporaries by arguing that Charles was greater than David and implying that his suffering had been worse than Christ's. The same imagery that zealous royalist authors used to celebrate Charles could also be used against his government. Phoenix imagery proved to be controversial, as proponents of the Solemn League and Covenant employed the phoenix to represent the revival of the Covenant and its application in church and state.

The radical reaction varied widely from dissident critics Baxter and Farmer, who tried to convince readers that worrying about their salvation was more important than bringing Charles home or celebrating his return, to the Quaker Daniel Baker's fiery condemnation of the evils the Restoration had brought and the implied call to rebellion against the monarch who had caused England to slip into this peril. The subversive radical pamphlets *Plain English* and *The Valley of Achor* strove to show readers how the reestablishment of the monarch would be bad for England. The dissident critic William Drake's *The Long Parliament Revived* caused the most excitement of the radical tracts and struck at the heart of the Restoration by claiming that the Convention Parliament did not have any legal authority to rebuild the monarchy. His argument caused an uproar in the houses of Parliament, whose offended members tried to impeach him, and a strong reaction in the press from three anonymous authors who quarreled with his interpretation of the English government.

Section two has explored who Englishmen felt was the agency for Charles' return. Claiming connection to Charles' return became an important political asset. Establishing one's role in the Restoration could garner political clout. Zealous royalist authors helped to embellish Monck's place in English politics. Moderate dissenters and Presbyterians promoted their part in the Restoration in the hope of giving themselves a stronger voice in the church settlement; however, staunch Presbyterians also tried to use their support to force the reimposition of the Solemn League and Covenant. Authors used dedications to current and potential patrons to remind their dedicatees of their political obligations to Charles and the people.

Wanting to heal the country and control how his subjects thought about the past, the Parliament attempted to redefine historical memory through the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. Chapter Two explores how royalist and radical Englishmen ignored the government's request and kept the past in the current political memory.

CHAPTER TWO
DISSOLVING HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS

With Charles' return to England, the government needed to secure the foundation of the restored monarchy and looked to provide the country with peace and unity. Administrators faced a kingdom that had been deeply divided and torn apart by two Civil Wars, had seen its monarch executed, and had experienced major political changes in the last two decades.[130] Officials realized that the Civil Wars, regicide, and Interregnum were irrevocable parts of English historical consciousness that could not be ignored or deleted. Political leaders needed to shape the country's historical consciousness by limiting the past in the current discourse. To accomplish this goal, the Parliament offered England a new way of understanding the recent history that affected the present. In this policy of dissolving historical consciousness, parliamentarians offered most of the country a pardon for their past actions, defined a small group of men whom they would hold accountable for the previous crimes, provided myth and ritual as official interpretations of recent history and Charles I, and tried to persuade Englishmen to stop talking about the past conflicts in terms other than the myth and ritual the government supplied, thereby removing them from the public consciousness.

Many of Charles II's subjects of all political and religious persuasions were unwilling to heed what Charles and parliamentarians wanted; many ignored the plea in the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion to stop discussing much of recent history and continued to look into the last three decades for material. These authors critiqued or rejected the proffered reinterpreted vision of the past. Zealous royalists used the past to castigate people who had opposed the royalists during the Civil Wars and Interregnum. Moderate critics delved into recent history to demonstrate that Charles I had not been the glorious and perfect monarch that the government's theory trumpeted. Radicals dealt with recent events to support the regicide, lament the end of the Republic, and argue that Englishmen should remove Charles II from the throne.

This chapter will continue the analysis of the ideological differences inherent in the Restoration and early settlement, thereby further demonstrating that reactions to the Restoration were many and varied. Englishmen had access to a wide variety of materials that did not pay attention to the government's mythologizing and ritualizing of the past and discussed events and

---

[130] In the British perspective, Scotland, Ireland, and England experienced their own Civil Wars.

personalities that had been significant parts of recent history.

The first section of this chapter discusses the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion passed in the summer of 1660. Despite the crown's imploring, the Parliament, burdened with other equally serious business to consider, did not pass the act quickly. Intended to affirm the king's pardon for the majority of Englishmen who had acted against the monarchy, the act separated those selected for punishment from the large number of those pardoned and asked the country to remove the past from their publications. The general pardon was wide in scope, including the pamphleteer and journalist Marchmont Nedham and the poet John Milton. One notorious author, the astrologer William Lilly, benefitted from the act despite his earlier publications and the harsh tracts published by a rival astrologer, the royalist John Gadbury. Those in custody, however, found the government generally unresponsive to petitions claiming the benefit of the general pardon.

Throughout 1660 the crown continued to support the act publically, but despite complaints to the Parliament many in England did not follow the government's lead on this issue. Authors continued to use history as material for the present. Sections two, three, and four examine different parts of the Restoration discourse in which royalist and radical authors defied the government's wishes to stop discussing past conflicts in their publications. Moderate critics shared the government's goal of healing the country but felt that political leaders did not take the right approach to this problem. Radicals, on the other hand, used the media to defend the regicides and blame Charles for his own death.

Although the regicide trials and executions were part of the government's limited acknowledgment of the past that provided some justice and satisfaction for the people, they also furnished subversive radicals with the pretext for presenting their case against Charles I. The second section examines radical and royalist attempts to use the regicide trials and executions against their opponents. Shortly after the executions in 1660 and 1662, subversive radicals published purported speeches and prayers of the regicides that glorified the men as martyrs and clearly implied that the regicide had been good in God's eyes. Royalists attempted to counter these radical tracts by republishing them with additional royalist commentary designed to convince readers that these texts actually demonstrated how evil the regicides were or presented the lives of these men before their executions to show their crimes. The royalist responses were somewhat successful in their repudiation of the radicals' assertions of martyrdom for the regicides.

Despite the Parliament's definition of the guilty, Englishmen also blamed other groups and people for the Civil Wars, regicide, and Interregnum. The third section examines how some authors saw these other targets. Although some writers aimed for dissenting Protestants, many moderate critics felt that holding the people in general accountable for the past was a good way to unite them in seeking forgiveness and celebrating the return of the monarchy. However, some authors of differing radical beliefs held Charles I responsible for the Civil Wars and subsequently his own execution. Radicals espousing this argument produced some of the most dangerous tracts of the early Restoration.

Changing the national calendar gave loyal and opposition writers a good opportunity to defy the government's wishes. The fourth section examines two ways that the Restoration affected the English calendar and the production of almanacs. Some ministers used their

sermons for the newly instituted day of national mourning on 30 January as a platform to suggest that Charles I had not been the perfect king and glorious martyr the crown and zealous royalist authors portrayed him to be. Englishmen also experienced another major change in the national calendar when almanac writers began to alter their publications to reflect the current political situation; some shifted toward the king and removed most traces of the Civil Wars and Interregnum. John Tanner, on the other hand, began to incorporate more of his republican politics into his almanacs and manipulated the physical layout of his work to confuse the censors.

The conclusion will assess the effectiveness of the government's proposal and implementation of its attempt to dissolve England's historical consciousness. Despite its success in narrowly defining whom it should hold accountable and punish and carrying out this punishment on those in custody, the Parliament could not convince many Englishmen to accept the model it proposed, to stop talking about the past, and particularly to accept its assessment of Charles I.

The Act of Indemnity and Oblivion

For establishing a harmonious relationship between sovereign and subjects, the crown needed to forgive the majority of Englishmen for their active or passive participation in the Civil Wars, the execution of Charles I, and the Interregnum. Authors of different religious and political beliefs urged Charles to show mercy toward his former opponents. One anonymous poet reassured fellow countrymen that Charles would extend the olive branch, saying, "By Which a Pardon you may find, / When to Repentance ye're enclined."[131] In an address to the monarchy's enemies, Thomas Reeve, a minister preaching in Essex and the author of several sermons concerning the Restoration, impersonated the collective will of the people and indicated that England could have mercy upon them for their past actions. The Quaker George Fox the Younger addressed his sovereign directly, telling him that it was not his place to take revenge on his enemies; God would enact retribution. Instead, Charles should forgive the people and not return the violence inflicted on his father.[132] One writer, concerned that the regicides should be brought to justice, felt that the majority of Englishmen should receive a pardon. The chaplain to Lady Elizabeth Capel, Edmund Barker, argued that mercy was the appropriate response sometimes, but not everyone deserved it:

> All spirits are not capable of mercie, all people are not proper for mercie; and to be sure, not scandalous, not notorious Offendors. Oh no; such must be made examples, and be brought to speedy

---

[131] *News from the Royall Exchange* (London, 1660).

[132] Thomas Reeve, *England's Restitution* (London, 1660), 120-21; George Fox the Younger, *A Noble Salutation, and a Faithful Greeting unto Thee Charles Stuart* (London, 1660), sigs. C2v and C3r.

tryal.

England needed mercy and justice.[133] The Act of Indemnity and Oblivion was designed to provide both.

The Act of Indemnity and Oblivion established the foundation of the bond between Charles II and his people. England needed peace and unity, and the best way to ensure this was to remove unnecessary barriers between the sovereign and the majority of his subjects; a relationship based on guilt and the potential for recriminations would not have been satisfying or secure for either side. Expressed in the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, the Parliament's policy of maintaining a limited vision of the past presented Englishmen with a new model for interpreting recent events in which they presented Charles I as a martyr, narrowed the country's responsibility for these previous crimes, offered the majority of Englishmen a pardon, and told Englishmen to stop talking about the last two decades in their publications. Defining Charles I as a martyr identified the official position on the Civil Wars, regicide, and Interregnum. Hoping to settle the country, the Parliament selected a very small number of men to represent and suffer for English guilt and offered everyone else a pardon for their previous actions. Doing so allowed the sovereign and most of his subjects to start afresh. Parliamentarians also asked Englishmen to stop talking about recent history; public discussion of the last two decades kept their memory alive and made healing and coming together more difficult for the country.[134]

Charles' quest for a general pardon began with his Declaration and letters from Breda. Throughout his early statements on amnesty he laid the groundwork for several important elements of the Parliament's approach to limiting the past and eventual act. The promise of a "free and general pardon" was one of the foremost commitments he made in this communication. He offered any subject who came forward within forty days a pardon, except the men the Parliament exempted. He wanted to assure his subjects that

> no Crime whatsoever committed against Us or Our Royal Father before the publication of this, shall ever rise in judgement, or be brought in question against any of them, to the least endamgement of them, either in their Lives, Liberties, or Estates, or (as far forth as lies in Our power) so much as to the prejudice of their reputations, by any reproach or term of distinction from the rest of

---

[133] Edmund Barker, *Votum pro Caesare* (London, 1660), 24.

[134] Keeble also discusses the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion but does not take this same approach. Keeble, *The Restoration*, 70-76. Harold Weber argues that the crown made a concerted effort to control the press which began with the Licensing Act in 1662 and that in this act the king had to share part of this control with the Parliament. However, Weber does not realize that the Parliament, not the crown, produced the Licensing Act, and any royal attempt to monitor the press would necessarily involve parliamentarians. Weber, 133, 151-53, 156-57.

Our best Subjects.[135]

Charles wanted to promise his less than loyal subjects that they would not be prosecuted under the law, thereby offering his subjects a narrow understanding of the past, one that largely omitted the actions of the majority of Englishmen, focused blame on the men the Parliament would highlight, and attempted to keep the threat of recrimination out of the relationship between the prince and his people.

Another component that became a part of the act's limitation of the past was the crown's willingness to punish people who did not abide by the act's restrictions on discussing the past and blaming individuals for their roles during the Civil Wars and Interregnum. In his letter to Monck dated 26 May Charles enunciated a willingness to prosecute anyone who did not follow his guidelines, saying "if the Licence and Distemper of the Time shall so far transport any men, as to presume upon memory of former Animosities, and of what is past, to use any Reproaches towards them, We will look upon such persons as disturbers of the Peace and Security of the Kingdom, and shall cause them to be prosecuted accordingly."[136] For Charles, anyone who attacked another's credibility for his or her actions during the Civil Wars and Interregnum was damaging the country as a whole because doing so kept the past in current historical memory. For this crime, Charles thought the government had a responsibility to prosecute the offenders. Political leaders would incorporate part of Charles' desire to protect those pardoned into the final Bill of Indemnity and Oblivion but would weaken the strength of the provision by shifting the prosecution of these cases from the government to the injured parties.

In his letter from Breda to the House of Commons, Charles enjoined the parliamentarians in his drive for a settlement, reminding them that they should decide who would be excepted from pardon and suggesting that the bill they would draft would provide indemnity and protection for those persons whom Charles wanted to forgive: "If you desire security for those who in these calamitous times, either willfully or weakly have transgressed those bounds which were prescribed, and have invaded each others Rights; We have left to you to provide for their Security and Indempnity [sic]." The prince's use of the phrase "willfully or weakly" implied that he had a wider definition of who should be considered guilty than the Parliament eventually produced. The former term referred to those who actively committed crimes against the monarchy; the latter word, however, suggested that those who acquiesced in the crimes of others were also guilty. Despite this suggestive language, Charles reaffirmed his commitment to giving parliamentarians the responsibility of deciding whom to punish and pardon. His language laid the responsibility for security squarely on the Commons, saying that they should "take care that all men be satisfied, which is the surest way to supresse, and extirpate all such uncharitablenesse and animosity as might hereafter shake, and threaten that peace which for the present, might

---

[135] "His Maiestie's Declaration from Breda to All His Loving Subjects, April 4/14, 1660," in *A Collection of His Majestie's Gracious Letters, Speeches, Messages, and Declarations Since April 4/14 1660* (London: Printed by John Bill, 1660), 7-8. John Bill was the king's printer. See Chapter Three for a discussion of Charles' promises in his Declaration from Breda.

[136] *His Majesties Letter to His Excellency the Lord General Monck* (Edinburgh, 1660).

seem established."[137] Charles' message in the above statement was clear; he told the House of Commons that the general pardon was a powerful political tool that could help maintain English peace. Not only would the pardon help cool tensions between royalists and non-royalists, but it would mollify potential threats to English public security. The pardon would reassure these elements that the government would not hold them responsible for the past and in turn they would have less reason to distrust the government.

Charles' desire for an act of pardon was a constant theme in his and Lord Chancellor Hyde's messages and speeches to the Parliament throughout the summer of 1660. Charles connected this desire for a bill of indemnity and oblivion with his need to fulfill his promises made from Breda; through his communications with parliamentarians, he pressed them to uphold his commitment to England's security. He stressed the necessity for this act as a way to provide security and reassure those subjects who had supported the Interregnum administrations that he would protect them if they agreed to accept the Restoration and monarchical government.[138]

The proposed bill of indemnity and oblivion had its first reading in the Commons on Wednesday, 9 May, its second reading on Saturday, 12 May, and its third reading on Wednesday, 27 June, when it was approved; it was taken to the Lords on Wednesday, 11 July. The reason the Commons took so long to pass the act was their heavy schedule and the need to determine who would be exempted. During this time parliamentarians had a variety of other important business, including the bill for judicial proceedings, the bill for establishing ministers in their livings, a bill for abolishing the court of wards, and discussions of extending the excise and imposing a poll tax. They also had to prepare for the king's arrival and sort out problems concerning elections for a new Parliament. Unhappy with the slow progress the Commons was making with the bill, the king in council ordered the preparation of a message on 15 June to the members urging them to speed up their deliberations. The Commons may have agreed with their sovereign, but other pressing business made his request almost impossible to fulfill; the Commons did not finalize their draft of the bill and send it to the Lords for almost a month.[139]

On the same day as the message to the Commons, the king issued a proclamation reaffirming his commitment to his promise of a pardon in his letters from Breda. This publication attempted to do three things. The king wanted to reassure his subjects that he would honor his Breda obligations and offer the majority of his subjects a pardon for their past actions relating to the Civil Wars and Interregnum. The declaration was also intended to pressure Commons into working faster on the bill. Perhaps most importantly for Charles' attempt to shape England's perceptions of the past, the king told his subjects to bury memories of previous conflicts, saying, "we desiring, and ordaining, That henceforward all Notes of Discord, Separation, and Difference in Parties, might be utterly abolished amongst all Our Subjects, whom we invited and Conjured to a perfect Union amongst themselves, under Our Protection, for the

---

[137] *A Letter from His Majesty to the Speaker of the Commons* (London, 1660), 4 (mspr. 6).

[138] *His Majesties Gracious Message to the House of Commons* (London, 1660), 3-4 (mspr. 5-6).

[139] *CJ*, 8:19-86; PRO, SP 29/4/37.

resettlement of Our just Rights, and theirs, in a free Parliament."[140] England would have unity when Englishmen ceased discussing previous conflicts and stopped striving for revenge on those who had supported the Parliament or any of the Interregnum governments. Parliamentarians carried this idea through the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion as a significant part of their limitation of the past.

Interested in a limited official retribution, the Commons created two categories of citizens deemed ineligible for the general pardon and liable to further punishment for their previous actions. The first group consisted of men considered the most responsible for the king's death, which included the significant judges that sat on the regicide court and other figures thought important in the king's death. These men lost their estates and were deemed liable for legal proceedings, including trial for their lives. The second group of twenty men were political and military figures who had been more active in the recent events and therefore considered by the Commons to have been obstructive to the royalist cause. Although they were not exposed to trial for the king's death, their estates were sequestered.[141]

The House of Lords received the bill for indemnity and oblivion and the bill for confirmation of judicial proceedings on 11 July but did not begin discussions until the 20th. Like the Commons, the House of Lords had a heavy schedule that included the judicial proceedings, a bill for continuing the excise, the matter of tonnage and poundage, and some private business. Despite their own slow progress with the bill, the Commons urged the Lords to proceed with the bill several times. During the Lords' early deliberations, the Commons sent a message urging the Lords to pass the bill for indemnity and oblivion quickly because not doing so would have negative consequences: "'Animosities of the People will be increased, whereby the Peace of the Kingdom will be disturbed.'" The Lords responded by requesting the Commons send them the evidence they had gathered so the Lords could examine it for themselves. Despite another plea from the Commons on Tuesday, 24 July, a commitment to put the country's business before private matters (which the Lords did not do) on the same day, and a harangue from the king on 27 July that asserted that this bill was "a necessary Foundation of that Security We all pray for," the Lords proceeded slowly on the bill, finally able to hold a conference with the Commons about desired alterations on 9 August. The two houses spent much of the next two weeks in conferences discussing the changes the Lords wanted to make, including adding men to the exceptions list. After much debate, the houses presented the bill along with several others, including one for the confirmation of judicial proceedings, for the king's assent on 29 August.[142]

In his speech thanking both houses for all the bills they had presented him, Charles reiterated his desire for the indemnity and oblivion bill in particular and his hopes that the act

---

[140] *By the King. A Proclamation Concerning His Majesties Gracious Pardon* (London, 1660).

[141] David A. Davis, "A New Treason: The Trials of the Regicides of Charles I" (M.A. Thesis, Florida State University, 1990), 36-51. For a full discussion of this topic, see Davis.

[142] *LJ*, 11:87-147; *His Majesties Gracious Speech to the House of Peers, the 27th of July 1660* (London, 1660), 2.

would contribute to the peace of the country: "There be few men in the Kingdom, who have longed more impatiently to have these Bills passed, than I have done to pass them; and I hope they will be the Foundation of much security and Happiness to us all."[143]

This "security and Happiness" was rooted in the main goal of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion: to define the past by limiting the responsibility for the regicide and other activities against the crown. In this act, the Parliament accomplished this end through three main ways: defining whom the country would hold accountable for Charles I's fall and the Interregnum, pardoning the vast majority of Englishmen for their past offences against the monarchy, and asking the people to stop talking about these previous conflicts.

The first method identified all of the men, alive, deceased, in custody, or absconded, whom the Parliament held answerable for the past. In a sense, the government pointed to these men and told England that these were the men they should blame and provided two levels of responsibility–the first group exempted completely from the pardon and the second group reprieved for their lives only. Presenting a limited number of men identified as responsible had major advantages. Englishmen could more easily comprehend a short list of names than a broad-based national sweep of individuals. This approach allowed the Parliament to face the past and account for it by identifying a small number of people to hold accountable and punishing the ones the government could arrest. Executing the regicides they could capture in the first group and legally disabling men in the second group discussed above provided the government with a way to suggest to the people that the issue was closed. They sought to provide the country with closure, both for emotional and for practical reasons. Emotionally, Englishmen could focus their anger somewhere and see justice enacted. The government hoped that providing this conclusion would help citizens stop discussing the past; with the guilty defined and punished, past conflicts could be buried.

However, the act contained more exemptions than just the men held responsible for the regicide and the recent Interregnum governments. Parliamentarians outlined several offences that the pardon would not cover. These crimes were not usually political in nature and included murder, piracy outside the royalist cause, buggery, rape, bigamy, and witchcraft. Theft was a different issue. The Parliament allowed the pardon to cover felony theft for crimes committed before 4 March 1659 (probably 1660) but denied the benefit for crimes committed after this date. Three men convicted of theft and sentenced to execution attempted to obtain relief using the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion but discovered that their crimes were not covered under the promised amnesty. Henry Faye, John Hobbs, and Edward Bersford petitioned Charles for a pardon. Faye had dealt in commonwealth currency, Hobbs robbed someone on the highway, and Bersford stole cloth worth 10 shillings. In their plea they thanked the king for giving them a reprieve from the death sentence and begged his pardon for their crimes, explaining that they had tried to claim the benefit of the act but "by reason of some proviso therein were denyed the benefitt thereof."[144] According to the provision in the act these men were not eligible for a pardon and appeared to be

---

[143] *By the King. A Proclamation Concerning His Majesties Gracious Pardon* (London, 1660).

[144] 12 Car. II., c. 11; PRO, SP 29/48/30.

using the government's desire to help settle the country to escape punishment for their crimes.

In the second approach, the Parliament fulfilled Charles' Breda promise of a general pardon for the majority of Englishmen. Under the act, all Englishmen who had offended by its provisions against Charles I or Charles II from 1 January 1637 to 24 June 1660 would receive a royal pardon except the stipulated few for all acts against either king. This pardon helped to isolate the men identified as the official objects of blame because the government singled them out and offered the rest of the country anonymity and oblivion. Therefore the country's gaze was focused on the men in both exemption categories more sharply.

Parliamentarians implemented Charles' earlier desire to provide those who were pardoned with some protection from prosecution and the rebukes of fellow citizens but modified the king's vision of how this help would work. Charles indicated that he felt the government should prosecute those who violated the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion; the Parliament shifted the burden of prosecution from the administration to the people complaining of their treatment, leaving the responsibility for seeking redress to the individuals through the courts. Under the act, people not exempted from the pardon were not liable to prosecution of their past actions by individuals or the state; the act imposed fines on officials who withheld property and goods from the rightful owners and allowed the dispossessed to sue for their goods. For three years the act allowed persons protected under its provisions to sue individuals who damaged their reputations: "if any person or persons within the space of three yeares next ensueing shall presume malitiously to call or alledge of, or object against any other person or persons any name or names, or other word of reproach any way tending to revive the memory of the late Differences or the occassions thereof," penalties would be imposed. Gentlemen paid £10 and their social inferiors could be fined forty shillings.[145]

The key as to why the Parliament offered those pardoned this legal avenue lay in the last part of the quotation cited above. Attacking someone for their actions during the Civil Wars and Interregnum brought up old conflicts that officials wanted to remain buried. Parliamentarians were interested in keeping the past out of current discourse. This protection the act offered put the burden of proof on the plaintiffs and implied that they would have to acknowledge their previous acts. Suing someone for slander in this situation suggested that the alleged slanderer's accusations were true, thereby defining the plaintiff as partially responsible for the past problems. To claim protection, individuals had to admit that they had been anti-royalist in some capacity, which would diminish them in the eyes of royalists and continue the rifts the Act was intended to help heal. Making individuals responsible for suing others who attacked them shifted the issue from criminal to civil court and the financial burden from the government to the people interested in the proffered protection.

Ronald Hutton has argued that the act was an "almost complete formal success" because he found only one court case where a person sued another for discussing his behavior before the Restoration.[146] However, as Hutton would probably agree, one court case did not prove that Englishmen had stopped talking about the past. It suggested, on the other hand, that very few

---

[145] 12 Car. II., c. 11.

[146] Hutton, *Restoration*, 135.

people were willing to take their claims to a court of law, and perhaps the implications of doing so kept most people silent, something the government desired.

In the last method, parliamentarians asked Englishmen to stop discussing parts of the Civil Wars and Interregnum and implied they should forget the crimes of people included in the pardon. Ignoring the past was good for the country's security and future happiness, "to bury all Seed of future Discord and remembrance of the former as well in His owne Breast as in the Breasts of His Subjects one toward another."[147] The Parliament did not ask fellow Englishmen to eradicate what had happened and pretend that the events had never occurred. Instead, the two houses wanted England to stop allowing the past to make an impact on the present by coloring how neighbors viewed each other and providing provocative material for discussion. The less Englishmen discussed the past the faster its importance would decline in the current historical memory.

The pardon in the act covered a significant number of well-known people, particularly authors whose works spoke against the monarchy during the Interregnum. However, punishing them would have acknowledged the power of the written word in the campaign against the Stuarts. Three of the best examples of Interregnum authors who had written in support of the then current regimes, railed against the Stuarts, and did not suffer serious punishment or debilitation were the propagandist Marchmont Nedham, the poet and pamphleteer John Milton, and the astrologer and almanac author William Lilly.

Before the Restoration, Nedham had used his talent for whoever would hire him. During the English Civil Wars, Nedham had been a strong advocate for the parliamentarians, editing the newsbook *Mercurius Britanicus* from 1643 to 1644. A few years later, however, he had switched sides and wrote for the royalists through *Mercurius Pragmaticus* from 1647 to early 1649. Interregnum government officials had thought Nedham's skills could be used to support the Protectorate, and Nedham became the editor of the *Mercurius Politicus* from 1650 to 1659.[148] Although Nedham could claim that he had worked for Charles I in the years before the regicide, his parliamentarian employment would not have endeared him to the restored king. His pamphlet *Interest Will Not Lie*, a republican piece published in August 1659 that tried to demonstrate that no one, except the Roman Catholics, would benefit from the return of Charles II, was not calculated to please the exiled sovereign. He evinced a strong distaste for monarchy; for example in his description of royalists, whom he said were only interested in a restoration to better themselves, he mocked them by making fun of their willingness to help Charles' cause, saying "these, to restore the single Family of a Prince, cast out by a wonderful hand [or band] of providence, seem willing to hazard the ruine of all their own Families, and to serve the ends of certain persons about him (men whose fortunes are desperate) they are ready to fool themselves into a loss of their own, as certainly they will, if *Charls* miscarry in his enterprise." Although Charles did not fail, he would not have liked Nedham's assertion that the downfall of the Stuarts had been a good thing for England, and by extension Charles I's execution beneficial for anyone.

---

[147] 12 Car. II., c. 11.

[148] Joad Raymond, *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England 1641-1660* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), 332-38.

He also asserted a mixed monarchy theory of the ancient constitution, an argument that if it had been published after the Restoration would likely have led to his arrest. During the following spring, several authors published pieces deriding Nedham or calling for his head.[149]

Despite his work for anti-royalist groups and governments and his *Interest Will Not Lie*, Nedham endured the Restoration without any penalties and continued to publish into his later years. Concerned for his safety, he fled to the continent to avoid the censure of the restored government. His biographer Joseph Frank has implied that Nedham survived because he had friends to manage his case at court and that some Restoration official thought that he would be a valuable asset for the government. Able to purchase a pardon, Nedham also enjoyed inclusion in the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion.[150] However, singling out Nedham for punishment would have recognized that his anti-royalist newsbook *Mercurius Britanicus* and the Interregnum *Mercurius Politicus* were a part of the country's past, an idea that violated the government's desire to dissolve English historical consciousness. Exempting Nedham would have drawn attention to *Interest Will Not Lie*, thus reminding Englishmen of another place they could access anti-monarchical materials. Ignoring Nedham not only followed the policy of limited acknowledgment, it also probably helped keep another radical tract out of the public eye.

Given Milton's extensive publishing record against the monarchy and employment as Latin secretary to the council of state, his survival was surprising. His first publication after the regicide and his last before the Restoration will serve to illustrate this point briefly. His *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, published a few weeks after Charles I's execution in 1649 and the first tract to justify the regicide and the establishment of the republic, argued that power came from the people who were the sole reason monarchs held their crowns:

> Since the King or Magistrate holds his authoritie of the people, both originally and naturally for their good in the first place, and not his own, then may the people as oft as they shall judge it for the best, either choose him or reject him, retaine him or depose him though no Tyrant, meerly by the liberty and right of free born men, to be goveren'd as seems best to them.[151]

In this passage, Milton argued that kings served at the behest of the people and had no other right

---

[149] Marchmont Nedham, *Interest Will Not Lie* (London, 1659), 2 (mspr. 4), 6 (mspr. 8), 31-34 (mspr. 33-36); Joseph Frank, *Cromwell's Press Agent: A Critical Biography of Marchamont Nedham, 1620-1678* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1980), 126-27, 143-45.

[150] Frank, *Cromwell's Press Agent*, 127, 143-44; Joseph Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961), 261.

[151] Masson, 6:163-64; John Milton, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, in *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. Douglas Bush et al. (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1962), 3.206.

to their crowns than the people's selection. Preempting any argument about the king's responsibility in the relationship between the sovereign and his subjects, he suggested that Englishmen could remove their rulers for whatever reason simply because it was their right. In the early months of 1660 Milton took a large chance and published two editions of *Readie & Easie Way to a Free Commonwealth* in which he explained that restoring the monarch was not the best solution for England and advocated that a "free Commonwealth without [a] single person or house of lords, is by far the best government." Monarchy, Milton reminded his readers, had been deemed "burdensom, expensive, useless and dangerous" for England and abolished by the Parliament.[152] Examining Milton's body of work should not have inclined parliamentarians or the crown to have mercy for a man who had used his pen to extol the downfall of the monarchy and to promote a government that excluded Charles II.

Milton experienced some royalist retribution at the Restoration but was not exempted from the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. Concerned for his safety, Milton left his home on 7 May 1660 and went into hiding at a friend's London house for four months, borrowing £400 in case of an emergency. The Parliament did make moves to punish him, but in the end did not include him in the exemptions from the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. On 16 June the Commons ordered the arrest of Milton and the minister John Goodwin, but the house officials did not proceed on this charge until November. Charles ordered two of Milton's books, *Ekionklastes* and *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* burned by the common hangman, saying that both books "contained sundry Treasonable Passages against Us and Our Government, and Most Impious endeavors to justifie the horrid and unmatchable Murther of Our late Dear Father, of Glorious Memory."[153] The burnings began 27 August and were repeated throughout the next two weeks. Although Milton was not exempted, the warrant for his arrest remained in force and he was taken into custody in late August and remained in jail until 15 December, when the Commons ordered his release. Despite all of these threatening moves, the government allowed Milton to sue out a pardon, which he received sometime after the Commons debated the issue on 16 December.[154]

Christopher Hill has suggested two reasons why Milton survived unpunished. First, an extensive network of friends lobbied the government in his favor, a thesis shared by two of Milton's biographers, William Parker and David Masson. Parker suggested that Edward Montagu (the future earl of Sandwich), Secretary William Morice, General George Monck, Monck's brother-in-law Sir Thomas Clarges, and possibly Arthur Annesley (the future earl of

---

[152] John Milton, *The Readie & Easie Way to a Free Commonwealth*, in John Milton, *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. Edward L. Ayers, 7:355, 364-65.

[153] Charles II, *A Proclamation for Calling in, and Suppressing of Two Books Written by John Milton* (London, 1660).

[154] Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, 782; Christopher Hill, *Milton and the English Revolution* (London: Faber and Faber, 1977), 208; Masson, 6:162-63, 185-87, 192-94; Ruth Spalding, ed., *The Diary of Bulestrode Whitelock 1605-1675* (Oxford: The British Academy, 1990), 606, 612-13.

Anglesey) were instrumental in helping Milton avoid serious punishment. Many other people were able to make good use of friends to protect themselves, including the regicides Colonel John Hutchinson and William Heveningham, the grandson-in-law of a royalist earl. Masson, however, went further, arguing that Morice, Annesley, Milton's friend and former fellow secretary Andrew Marvell, and friend and royalist author Sir William Davenant would not have been powerful enough to have secured Milton; someone more influential must have been involved. Masson speculated that Hyde had been the force that protected Milton here, despite his earlier dislike for the author.[155] If so, Hyde may not have been a positive voice for Milton; instead of advocating for his freedom Hyde may have chosen not to act against him. Hyde would have been well placed to circulate among parliamentarians Milton's inclusion in the exemption. More interested in securing the crown's limited acknowledgment of the past, Hyde may have considered punishing Milton to be giving the man and his ideas too much advertisement.

Second, Hill has mused that someone in the Restoration government saw Milton's literary talents and thought he might be persuaded to work for the crown. Hill did not suggest whom he thought valued Milton.[156] However, Milton would have had to have made a fairly radical ideological shift to come to terms with writing for the form of government he had spent much of his literary career denouncing. Restoration officials may have been able to sway Nedham, but Milton appeared to have had much stronger and deep rooted convictions. His later writings, such as *Paradise Lost*, suggest that Milton would not have been very pliable.

Perhaps the best explanation for Nedham and Milton's survival combined the help of important friends and the government's unwillingness to acknowledge the power of the press against the Stuarts over the past two decades. Nedham had the added advantage that he had plied his skills for both sides in the past, and could be convinced to write for the monarchy now. As Masson has pointed out, the crown did not order Milton's most dangerous tract, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, to be burned, choosing instead, *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* and *Eikonoklastes.* However, the officials engaged in some subterfuge by not calling the tracts by their correct and better-known names. Refusing to identify the latter Milton tract by its title, the writer referred to it instead as a response to *Ekion Basilike*, but identified this royalist tract by its subtitle. Masson suggested this had occurred because Milton's careful friends had kept the less savory parts of his past out of the political discourse.[157] Burning *The Tenure of Kings and*

---

[155] Hill, *Milton and the English Revolution*, 208; William Parker, *Milton: A Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 571; Masson, 6:185-87; Hutton, *Restoration*, 133; Old *DNB, s.v.v.* John Hutchinson and William Heveningham.

[156] Hill, *Milton and the English Revolution*, 208.

[157] Masson, 6:164, 189-92. Masson argued that parliamentarians should have created a third category of men exempt from the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion for "literary defenders of the regicide" and included Milton and John Goodwin, a fellow radical author whose *Obstructors of Justice Opposed* followed Milton's *Tenure* into print and echoed much of Milton's argument against Charles I. The Parliament later included Goodwin among the twenty men exempted for their goods. Masson, 6:175.

Magistrates would have been far more symbolic, but the display would have reminded the people of the tract's existence and kept it in the public discourse, an action not suited to the government's limited acknowledgment of the past. This attempt to control Englishmen's memories of the past explained why the proclamation authors identified the tracts in such an unusual manner; naming *Ekionoklastes* would have given readers more information for finding the pamphlet, something the crown wanted to avoid. Using the full title of the *Ekion Basilike* may have reminded readers of the title of Milton's attack.

The conflict between the rival astrologers William Lilly and John Gadbury was another good example of the extensive range of the pardon of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion and the government's unwillingness to punish opposition authors. Gadbury defamed Lilly as an astrologer and an enemy of the monarchy. Despite Lilly's past and Gadbury's strong case against him, the astrologer benefitted from the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion and continued to publish his almanacs into the 1680s. His career began to decline, but perhaps more from his bad predictions than royalist outrage against him.[158] In the almanacs published after the Act, Lilly vigorously defended himself, identifying his right to a pardon. However, his language suggested that he still harbored anti-monarchical feelings and hinted at Lilly's place as a subversive radical in the Restoration.

Gadbury attacked Lilly's astrological skills and his previous political beliefs, arguing that he was one of the worst traitors in England. Gadbury's *Spurious Prognosticator Umasked* pointed out that many of Lilly's predictions had not been fulfilled.[159] In his second attack on Lilly, Gadbury addressed the Parliament, hoping to prompt the two houses to arrest Lilly for his past actions. His foremost charge against Lilly alleged that the latter had promoted Charles I's execution through his almanacs and other writings, specifically *Observations on the Life and Death of King Charles*, in which Lilly argued that the Parliament had done the right thing in defending England against the king. Gadbury also complained that Lilly had received money from the regicides for his services. Many of the other charges involved Lilly's support for the Interregnum governments, arguing that he had needed to keep his masters in power to maintain his employment.[160] Using Lilly's own writings and admissions, Gadbury constructed a solid case against him as a dangerous anti-monarchy man with the literary skills to promote his point of view. In his summation Gadbury used hyperbole to tar Lilly with responsibility for all of the recent upheavals, saying, "he is looked upon as the only man now in *England guilty* of all our *sufferings*." Gadbury felt that in payment for his crimes against the state Lilly's estate should be sequestered because it was "the *wages* of his *arch-Villanies,*" and Lilly should be imprisoned to

---

[158] Bernard Capp, *Astrology and the Popular Press* (London: Faber and Faber, 1979), 88-89.

[159] John Gadbury, *The Spurious Prognosticator Unmasked* (London, 1660).

[160] John Gadbury, *A Declaration of the Several Treasons, Blasphemies and Misdemeanors* (London, 1660), 1. I have not been able to track down this Lilly publication.

protect England from "his infernal Actings."[161]

Perhaps the most damning evidence against Lilly came from his *Monarchy or No Monarchy* (1651) where he argued that ancient prophecies had revealed that England would not have a king after Charles I's execution: "*England* shall no more be Goverened by KINGS, or that this PARLIAMENT shall be subdued by any of the Issue or Race of the late KING."[162] This prophecy was fairly explicit, discounting the possibility of Charles Stuart returning to reclaim his father's throne and arguing that monarchy was a usurpation of the true authority vested in England.

Despite his high profile support for the various Interregnum governments, Lilly was not excepted from the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion and was allowed to sue for a pardon, which cost him about £13. Therefore he enjoyed the benefits of the act, including the ability to sue anyone for libeling him. In his first almanac written after the Restoration (1661), he was defensive, protective of his reputation, and unwilling to use panegyric to mollify the king and the people. Lilly argued that he could not have predicted Charles' return because the events leading to the Restoration were "Acts above Nature." In his explanation for the Restoration Lilly credited God's choice to abandon the "late dissolved Power" and bring Charles to England. He did not trumpet Charles' right to the throne; instead he intimated that Charles' return was punishment for the sins of the Interregnum governments. His wording suggested that he had a hard time accepting that the previous governments had done any wrong, saying, "GOD is just, and we must acknowledge so much, that those Mens downfall or Overthrow being so conspicuous an example of that great uncertainty whereto all mortall affairs are inevitably Subject."[163] Lilly's assertion that God was the arbiter of all events carried with it a menacing undertone; if God had chosen to remove the Rump from power, he might decide to topple Charles as well. His acknowledgment of the Restoration was also a warning and marked Lilly as a subversive radical.

Lilly felt compelled to defend himself and proclaim his pardon under the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion several times. In his address to the readers for his 1661 almanac, he tried to forestall criticism by reminding readers that Charles had not demanded the satisfaction his attackers did:

> let these, the worst of men accuse, if they dare, his Majesty of being mercifull, who in one word hath by his Act of Clemency, silenced all former actings, and all preceding Penns which were of contrary Judgements: Therefore syth [seeth] his Majesty hath so

---

[161] Ibid., 7.

[162] William Lilly, *Monarchy or No Monarchy* (London, 1651), 65-66.

[163] Katharine M. Briggs, ed., *The Last of the Astrologers: Mr. William Lilly's* History of His Life and Times from the Year 1602 to 1681 (London: Folklore Society, 1974), 86; *BDBR*, *s.v.* William Lilly; Lilly, 1661, sig. A2r-v. According to Lilly, he was briefly incarcerated in January 1662. Briggs, ed., *The Last of the Astrologers*, 85-86.

> willingly, and seriously by example and precept remitted all former Acts or misunderstandings either against his late Father or himself, what satisfaction can be expected to be given to these little malitioas [malicious] Pigmies, when the lofty Oake, or when Jove himself requires it not.[164]

Lilly accused his attackers of ignoring the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion and demanding a higher standard than the monarch did. He highlighted the differences between his accusers and the king with a visual image that used height to convey nobility of character. His opponents were "pygmies" compared to the sovereign as a towering tree. If the king was willing to forgive the past transgressions, so should his subjects. Lilly was unwilling to cede any ground to the monarchists; in the above passage he defended the validity of his earlier opinions by saying that he was one of the "preceding Penns which were of contrary Judgements."

During 1661 Lilly must have experienced further attacks because his almanac for 1662 contained several references to the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion and his protection under it. In responding to his unnamed attackers, he tried new tactics; he argued that his assailants were undermining the unity and peace Charles desired to bring to the people. These "ill-disposed persons" wanted to revitalize the conflicts of the Civil Wars and Interregnum despite Charles' attempt to close them. He also demonstrated how the king and the two houses of Parliament had passed the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion legally and it was therefore binding on all subjects.[165]

Gadbury's campaign to convince the Parliament to imprison and prosecute Lilly was unsuccessful. Lilly's fierce anti-monarchial writings before and suggestive subversive radical sentiments after the Restoration should have made him a good candidate for government scrutiny. However, arresting and punishing Lilly would have recognized the power of the anti-royalist press during the Interregnum and required parliamentarians to expand their limited acknowledgment of the past because authors disseminating anti-monarchical materials suggested that the ideology was far more prevalent that the Restoration government wanted to admit. The same argument can be made for Nedham and Milton's survival at the Restoration.

Although the crown's commitment to the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion was strong on paper, the execution varied with each case and may have depended on the celebrity of the person involved and how many friends he had who could work for him behind the scenes. Several prisoners petitioned the crown for relief and release under the act, often acknowledging their mistakes but pointing out that they qualified for a pardon. The crown examined each case and determined if the person in question should be kept in prison or set free. Six incarcerated petitioners will be examined: the regicide General George Fleetwood, the regicide Colonel Robert Wallop, Major Richard Creed, John King, Joseph Bampfield, and Francis Corker. The men in the first category, Fleetwood, Wallop, and Creed, partially exempted from the act but incarcerated at the time of their petitions, did not apologize for their past actions and stressed their right to their freedom. Prisoners in the second category, King, Bampfield, and Corker,

---

[164] Lilly, 1661, sig. A3r-v.

[165] Lilly, 1662, sigs. A2v, A5r.

chose to apologize for their crimes and beg the king's mercy. The men in the second group suggested that the government was capable of vindictiveness against lesser unknown players whose actions the government considered heinous, such as John King, the crier for the High Court of Justice and two royalists who had become spies for the protectorate, Joseph Bampfield and Francis Corker.

Fleetwood served the Parliament during the first English Civil War, sat in the Parliament for Buckinghamshire in 1647, and became one of the king's judges the following year. He attended the court twice, heard the death sentence pronounced, and signed the death warrant. He turned himself in at the Restoration and claimed the benefit of the king's proclamation, which saved him from execution in 1660 but kept him in prison until at least 1664.[166]

In his petition, Fleetwood argued that Charles should judge him on his intentions, not his deeds, and show him mercy. He did not apologize for his actions, but instead tried to convince the crown that Cromwell had pressured him into signing the death warrant:

> But coming to Towne the night before the Sentence passed, And goeing [going] next morning to Westminster he unfortunately mett with Cromwell, who fell violently on your Peticioner with most bitter words, because he had disobeyed his pticular [particular] summons & absented himselfe from the Court; By which Cominacons [Communications] (mingled with subtill insinuacons [insinuations]) your Peticonor (who was then young & not prepared for so Sudden and violent an Assault) was contrary to his & full intent drawne into the bloody bussinesse.[167]

Fleetwood blamed Cromwell for manipulating him through smooth language and threats to join the movement against the king. He did not have the strength to stand up to Cromwell, and allowed himself to be persuaded to sign the death warrant. However, if his intent had been to avoid the trial, returning to London the night before the reading of the sentence and attending the next day at Westminster seemed contradictory. Fleetwood probably appeared at Westminster because he felt that his absence would harm his future career; his description of Cromwell's anger would seem to confirm this assumption. Without acknowledging it, Fleetwood confessed that he had felt his current and future political position had been more important than Charles I's life, not an admission calculated to appease the son of the executed king. Apparently Charles was not impressed; despite Fleetwood's affirmation of his support for Monck before the Restoration and the need to support and maintain the honor of his family, the crown did not release Fleetwood.[168]

The regicide Robert Wallop had been a life-long member of the Parliament and had been

---

[166] Old *DNB, s.v.* George Fleetwood.

[167] PRO, SP 29/9/178.

[168] PRO, SP 29/9/178; Old *DNB, s.v.* George Fleetwood.

one of the judges on the high court of justice but participated minimally. He was present only three times, did not appear for the reading of the sentence, and did not sign the death warrant. During the Interregnum he was active in politics, sitting on the council of state several times before, during, and after the Protectorate and serving in Richard Cromwell's first Parliament. Although elected for the Convention Parliament for Whitechurch, Wallop was expelled for his position on the high court of justice and attendance during the early phase of the trial.[169]

For his presence on the high court of justice, Wallop was exempted partially from the benefits of the act, making him vulnerable to further legal proceedings by parliamentary action. In the summer of 1661, Parliamentarians decided that the regicides in custody should remain in jail and make public repentance for their crimes by participating in a gruesome annual ritual involving being dragged around the city on a hurdle and standing under the gallows with ropes around their necks for public display. From the Tower, Wallop petitioned Charles to release him from this ritual and presented several reasons why Charles should accede to his request. First, Wallop argued that the government had not been privy to all the relevant facts of his case. Instead of helping him, his former friends withheld the information that would help his case and instead took advantage of Wallop's imprisonment to take over parts of his estate. Second, Wallop appealed to the king's human side and asked him to "take pity of an Old Man, most injuriously dealt with, and ungratefully forsaken by his nearest Relations and give him the liberty of a little free Air before he dies." Third, he presented the pardon of fellow inmate John Downs, who had been scheduled to die. Surely, if Charles could pardon Downs he could help Wallop.[170]

Major Richard Creed had been very active in the army in the months after Richard Cromwell's fall and participated in some of the major events of this pre-Restoration period. He served with Colonel John Lambert's force that defeated Booth's rising in August 1659. Loyal to the army, he was one of the authors of the Derby petition in September 1659, which reflected the growing tensions between the Army and the Rump Parliament. Later that month he participated in the army's expulsion of the Rump Parliament. Creed had taken part in Lambert's attempted rebellion on 21 April and was captured by Colonel Richard Ingoldsby's forces.[171]

Under the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, Creed had been forbidden to seek public or church office on pain of losing his protection. However, he had been arrested and imprisoned in the Tower from 24 April after Lambert's failed rising. Claiming his protection under the act, Creed asked the king to arrange his release from prison, promising to return home to take care of his family and live quietly. At the top of the petition, however, a government official scrawled

---

[169] Davies, *Restoration*, 180, 325-26, 331; Old *DNB, s.v.* Robert Wallop; *BDBR, s.v.* Robert Wallop.

[170] Old *DNB, s.v.* Robert Wallop; PRO, SP 29/49/49; 13 Car. II., c. 15. The other men in this category were William Mounson, Henry Mildmay, James Harrington, and John Phelps. 13 Car. II., c. 15.

[171] Davies, *Restoration*, 146-47, 151-56, 335-36; Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, 738-42.

"not to be released."[172] In this case, officials ignored the act and imposed greater punishment on Creed than the law had required.

In an attempt to use the general pardon, John King, sometime crier for the High Court of Justice, begged Sir Edward Nicholas for release from Newgate. Nicholas had committed him to the prison on 6 July 1660. King fully acknowledged his previous wrongs against Charles I, including working for the court as a messenger and for Chief Justice Bradshaw.[173]

Colonel Joseph Bampfield, a former royalist military officer who became an agent for secretary John Thurloe, petitioned for release under the promised general pardon; a government official scrawled "not to be released" on the petition itself. Before the Restoration, Bampfield had had a storied career, starting as a royalist military officer and becoming a spy for Charles I in London from the fall of 1645 or the winter of 1646 until the months before the king's trial and execution. During the early years of the Interregnum, Bampfield had a rocky relationship with Charles II and his court, worked for the earl of Argyle in England and Scotland, and became an operative for the Protectorate in 1653. He served as an undercover agent for Cromwell on the Continent until the lord protector's death, after which he returned home. At the Restoration, Bampfield was apprehended and held in the Tower from 30 May 1660 until 30 July 1661. For most of his incarceration, Bampfield was under a "severe restraint" until summoned before the Lord Chancellor Clarendon and the secretaries Sir Edward Nicholas and Sir William Morice. During this interview, Bampfield defended himself against charges of misprision of treason and begged the king's mercy. As a result of this meeting, Bampfield was given more liberty in the Tower to move around and see visitors. Charles ordered his release about three months after this relaxation of his confinement. Shortly after his release, the lieutenant of the Tower Sir Allen Apsley suggested to him that leaving England would be in his best interest. Taking this advice, Bampfield left for the Continent in the summer of 1661.[174]

Francis Corker, former vicar of Bradford, Yorkshire, and spy for secretary John Thurloe in Sussex and London, petitioned Charles for release under the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion after six month's imprisonment in the Tower, hoping that "your Majestie would be pleased to grant him the benefit of your Majesties gracious act of Indempity." With his petition he included an explanation of his life, hoping for pity but not expecting it, saying, "although I cannot plead any thing as to my justification; yet I suppose a true narrative of my proceedings may moove compassion in some, though it deserve indignation from all." Corker argued that he had suffered much for his royalist leanings until 1657 when, after his third arrest, Thurloe asked him to change sides. Corker began to work for Thurloe as a spy, using his royalist ties to provide the

---

[172] 12 Car. II., c. 11; PRO, SP 29/9/177.

[173] PRO, SP 29/9/180; 29/9/180 I; 29/9/180 II; 29/9/181; 29/9/181 I; 29/9/181 II.

[174] PRO, SP 29/9/176; *CSPD*, *1660-1661*, 171; David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England, 1649-1660* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971), 62; Old *DNB*, *s.v.* Joseph Bampfield; Joseph Bampfield, *Colonel Joseph Bampfield's Apology*, ed. John Loftis and Paul H. Hardacre (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1993), 87-91; John Loftis, "Bampfield's Later Career," in *Colonel Joseph Bampfield's Apology*, 156-63, 188.

government with information. David Underdown has found Corker's explanation of his activities disingenuous, arguing that he was one of the better former royalist spies the Protectorate and later governments had. Underdown has posited futher that the Restoration government did not have the resources available to the modern historian, did not know much about Corker's activities during the Interregnum, and therefore restored him to the vicarage of Bradford in 1662.[175] However, Corker could be an example of Charles' commitment to the pardon he and the Parliament offered the country.

Establishing the act was not the magic "cure-all" that Charles had wanted. Soon after the Parliament passed the bill, the Lord Chancellor Hyde lectured the houses on the country's responsibilities under the act and complained that Englishmen were not heeding the warnings about charging others with crimes wiped away by the act. Accusations carried with them the memories of the past Charles' government wanted the country to forget in what Hyde called the "art of forgetfulnesse." Hyde tried to appeal to England to maintain the act in two ways. First he suggested that Charles did not trust anyone unwilling to follow his law, that is, "those corrupted with the passions of Envy and Uncharitableness." Hyde also argued that ignoring the act was tantamount to rebelling against Charles himself, saying, "what is this but to rebel against the Person of the King, against the excellent Example and Vertue of the King, against the known Law of the Land, this blessed Act of Oblivion?"[176] Hyde's statement amplified what Charles had written to Monck discussed above; Charles had seen addressing the past as a threat to the country's peace; Hyde explained that this behavior hurt the king and the Parliament. With this argument, Hyde put all writers who discussed the past more than the administration wanted into the same category from zealous royalists arguing for stronger punishments to moderate critics wanting a more reasonable representation of history to radicals wanting to overthrow the monarchy. He attempted to define one way Englishmen should be loyal to the crown by reinforcing the royal definition of the past.

By December, the crown was still concerned that the country was ignoring the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. In his speech to both houses before they stopped for the recess, Hyde complained again about people unwilling to allow the troubles of the past to remain silent, saying:

> if some men, by their writing, and by their preachings endeavor to continue tnose [those] Breaches, and very rashly and I think unconscientiously keep up the distinctions, and publickly justify and maintain what hath heretofore been done amiss, and for which the Act of Indempnity was the best defense; I shall say no more, then that I hope their want of Modesty and Obedience will cause them to be disclaimed by all pious and peacable men, who cannot but be well contented to see them reduced by Law, to the

---

[175] PRO, SP 29/33/16; secretary hand copy 29/33/17; 29/33/18; Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, 175; *Walker Revised*, 391.

[176] *His Majesties Most Gracious Speech, Together with the Lord Chancellors, to the Two Houses of Parliament* (London, 1660), 8-10 (mspr. 10-12).

obedience they owe to Law.[177]

In this passage, Hyde focused on writers and preachers, men who had the potential to reach wide audiences with their sermons and publications, instead of men gathered in the tavern. Hyde reinforced the government's argument that Englishmen should stop discussing the problems that led to the Civil Wars, regicide, and Interregnum; however, he did not suggest that people who broke the law would not be punished. He suggested that the good and loyal Englishman would shun anyone disobeying this act.

This threat was largely ineffective; many authors did not heed Hyde's warning and proceeded to use the Civil Wars and Interregnum in political tracts, sermons, almanacs, and other literary pieces. Perhaps the most interesting and egregious violations of the general sense of the act came from clergy who asserted the necessity of discussing the past as healthy for the present. In his sermon at the coronation, John Morley, bishop of Worcester, defended his use of the past by comparing the Restoration to the celebration of the Jewish Passover in which Jews ate bitter herbs to remind themselves how thankful they were for their deliverance.[178] In a sense, the past was a necessary part of the present, as Charles was reminded during his coronation. The bishop of Chichester, Henry King, was less subtle in his explanation. He disingenuously claimed that he was not discussing the past to remind the guilty of their crimes against the crown, but instead aimed to show "thankful duty to God to commemorate the defeat of Their late unpardonable practices."[179]

Conclusion

The crown pushed hard for a general pardon from Breda through the summer of 1660. Through his letters, speeches, and declarations, Charles enunciated support for a limited acknowledgment of the past that pardoned most Englishmen and identified a very small number of men as accountable for the last twenty years. Several people, including the regicides George Fleetwood and Robert Wallop and the crier for the high court of justice John King, petitioned the crown for their release or easing of their punishments under the benefit of the king's pardon but discovered that the government was unwilling to set them free or lessen their penalties. However, Marchmont Nedham, John Milton, and William Lilly's inclusions in the pardon were proof that the government was committed to maintaining the act publicly; all three authors had been highly visible supporters of the parliamentary cause and anti-monarchy writers.

---

[177] *His Majestie's Gracious Speech, Together with the Lord Chancellor's, to Both Houses of Parliament; on Saturday the 29th Day of December, 1660* (London, 1660 [1661]), 6-7 (mspr. 8-9).

[178] Morley, 6.

[179] Henry King, *A Sermon Preached at White-hall on the 29th. of May* (London, 1661), 5.

Debating the Meaning of the Regicides

The Act of Indemnity and Oblivion assured the country that the people the goverrnment considered the most guilty would be held accountable for their actions. In October 1660, officials continued its attempt to control the past and enact justice for the regicide with the trials, convictions, and execution of ten of the eleven regicides in custody.[180] Despite this demonstration of the government's definition of the past, subversive radicals attempted to use these circumstances to make the regicides martyrs and justify Charles I's execution. Royalists were quick to counter these assertions and sought to prove how evil these men were. The trials and executions in October 1660 generated a larger paper war than the events in April 1662. This struggle between subversive radicals and royalists to define the significance of these men rejected the government's plea for not discussing the past and attempt to control the country's historical consciousness by offering an alternate interpretation of the situation. Some of the royalists tracts presented effective rebuttals to the subversive radical publications; however, others unwittingly helped the radicals' cause by using the same texts in their own publications without significant alterations, damaging rebuttals, or solid logic.

In late 1660, various radicals assembled the first collection of speeches and stories that intended to make the regicides martyrs for all anti-monarchists. These tracts were an early collaboration of Richard Greaves' "confederates," a group of dissenting printers and booksellers who distributed illegal materials. The printers Simon Dover and Thomas Creeke produced two editions, sharing the printing duties. Because each printer produced half of the tract, and not the same half both times, the two editions had slightly different titles. *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the Late King's Justices* was the first edition, and *The Speeches and Prayers of Major General Harison* the second edition, with a list of errata at the end.[181]

A contemporary tract and a twentieth-century scholar have suggested that the regicide tracts were complete fabrications. Published in 1664, *An Exact Narrative of the Tryal and Condemnation of John Twyn*, a record of the trial of several printers for having published seditious materials, including the *Speeches and Prayers of Some of the Late King's Justices*, told readers that these regicide accounts were false:

> As to the Pamphlets whereupon the other Three were Indicted: *viz* *The Speeches, and Prayers of some of the late Kings Judges* [Justices], &c. Be it known to the Reader, that this Book was not, as it pretends to be, a true account of the *words* (written, or spoken) of *dying men*; but a meer *Forgery* and *Imposture*, *Fathered* upon

---

[180] Hutton, *Restoration*, 134.

[181] Greaves, *DUFE*, 209, 211, 213; *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the Late King's Justices* (London, 1660); *The Speeches and Prayers of Major General Harison.*

those, that were *Executed*.[182]

This indictment should be used carefully. The source was a royalist pamphlet reporting the trial of several men accused of printing libels and sedition. The author may have used the opportunity to discredit the tracts regardless of their veracity. In "The Forged 'Speeches and Prayers' of the Regicides," J. B. Williams argues against the truthfulness of the tracts, but his argument is not entirely convincing.[183] A stronger argument can be made for saying the publications were carefully crafted as elaborate propaganda pieces by radicals trying to discredit the Restoration and validate the regicides' cause. The men the tracts portrayed are nearly perfect martyrs with few human frailties or fear of death. The pamphlets resembled sixteenth-century Protestant martyrologies.

Tapping into the Protestant martyrology tradition, most notably identified with John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, these radical writers attempted to construct an account of the regicides as martyrs dying for the purpose of defending their political beliefs instead of religious doctrines, an unusual idea in the seventeenth century. The tract authors borrowed tropes from earlier Protestant martyrology such as the undaunted spirit of the martyr and the martyrs' forgiveness of the men who were punishing them. The underlying purpose of these martyrologies, as John Carew supposedly explained, was to convince readers that the regicides' cause had been just; he was made to argue that God had justified the Parliament's cause on the battlefield and would vindicate their beliefs once again through these executions, which would convince Englishmen that they had been right.[184]

The regicides of this collection were portrayed as strong and sure in their convictions; showing weakness may have implied a flaw in the cause they were defending. According to the tracts, many of the regicides, including Thomas Harrison and John Carew, welcomed their deaths because they would be joining God to rule in heaven with the saints. Carew, the author told the readers, had many opportunities to escape, but chose to remain in captivity because he understood the importance of his capture and trial.[185]

The collections contained many anecdotes intended to convince the reader that the regicides had been extraordinarily brave when faced with their deaths. These stories can be

---

[182] J. B. Williams, "The Forged 'Speeches and Prayers' of the Regicides," *Notes and Queries*, 11th series, vol. 7 (1913): 301; Greaves, *DUFE*, 212-13; *An Exact Narrative of the Tryal and Condemnation of John Twyn* (London, 1664), sig. A3r.

[183] Williams, 301.

[184] Brad S. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 140-47, 162-63; Alec Ryrie, "The Unsteady Beginnings of English Protestant Martyrology,"in *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective*, ed. David Loades (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 1999), 54; *Speeches and Prayers of Major General Harison*, sig. A2r, 12-13.

[185] *Speeches and Prayers of Major General Harison*, 11.

grouped into two main types: pre-execution and the journey to the execution. Accounts of the regicides before their executions often involved other Englishmen trying to persuade them to repent and the regicides' ability to stand fast in the face of this barrage. On the eve of his execution, Adrian Scrope entertained a relative who tried to convince him to confess and seek the king's mercy. Unfazed, Scrope "put forth his hand, and thrust him from him, using these words, AVOID SATAN." Even men who were not as strong as Harrison and Scrope made good examples for this collection. Although conflicted and not ready to die, Hugh Peter resisted the temptations to confess; he withstood a verbal assault by two Church of England clergy trying to convince him to repent and ask for mercy and survived watching John Cooke's execution.[186]

The collection authors used the regicides' journeys through London to their executions to strengthen their portrayals of these men as courageous and willing to die and often discussed the regicides' appearance and mood. Harrison went joyfully to his execution, "having a sweet smiling Countenance, with his eyes and hands lifted up to Heaven, his countenance never changing, in all the way as he went to the place of Execution, but was mighty cheerful to the astonishment of many." John Jones was made to compare the cart to the fiery chariot that took the biblical prophet Elijah to heaven. Cooke rode to his execution on the sledge with Harrison's disembodied head staring at him. Cooke, however, did not react, "notwithstanding that dismall sight he passed rejoycingly through the streets, as one born up by that Spirit which man could not cast down."[187]

In 1661 several royalist editors tried to answer these subversive radical pieces with their own tracts on the regicides. *Rebels No Saints* presented the same text as the radical pieces and offered a royalist interpretation of the events. Focusing on a different aspect of the regicides, George Bate produced a collection purporting to be short biographies for the men executed. The *Compleat Collection* combined *Rebels No Saints* with Bate's biographical information for the most extensive royalist response to the radical attempts to make the regicides martyrs.[188]

Rebels No Saints attempted to spin the same information in the opposite direction, using it to demonstrate how evil the regicides were and that their deaths were no martyrdoms but just punishment for their heinous crimes. The editor took the text of the *Speeches and Prayers* and added commentary after each individual included in the original tract intended to show readers how they should interpret the preceding story. Although the editor acknowledged that the radical publication had been intended to demonstrate the worthiness of the regicides' cause, he was assured that these stories and his additional commentary would be enough to convince the readers otherwise, saying that a "Candid Interpreter weighing in an Equal Ballance, their Black

---

[186] *Speeches and Prayers of Major General Harison*, 30, 62-63, 73 (mspr. 66).

[187] Ibid., 6, 30, 77 (mspr. 70).

[188] *Rebels No Saints* (London, 1661); George Bate, *The Lives, Actions and Execution of the Prime Actors, and Principall Contrivers of that Horrid Murder of Our Late Pious and Sacred Soveraigne King Charles the First, of Ever Blessed Memory* (London? 1661?); *A Compleat Collection of the Lives, Speeches, Private Passages, Letters and Prayers of those Persons Lately Executed* (London, 1661).

and Bloudly Lives with these last Dying Speeches, may easily find that their *Simulata Sanctitas*, was but *duplex iniquitas*, and their Burning Zeal, but an *Ignis fatuus*, to lead the rest of their Crew to the same Destruction." For example, the editor commented upon Harrison by saying, "to commit Villany unparallel'd, and bravely to outface Death, is the badge of a desperate Traytor, and an unhappy Christian."[189] Using the same story of Harrison's travel to the gallows, the royalist author gave the story the opposite interpretation from the original radical publication. However, the royalist interpretation did not follow logically. If Harrison had been a "desperate Traytor, and an unhappy Christian," he would not have faced his death with such aplomb. The man the story described seemed at peace with this fate and ready for a glorious afterlife, not one scared of his mortality and what would happen to him after death. His analysis of Scrope had the same problem. Commenting on the story cited above concerning Scrope's relative who had tried to convince Scrope to repent, the royalist editor remarked:

> *He told a Friend in prison that he was sure all his sins were Forgiven; and to another that desired him to Repent of his heynous Offence, he cryed, avoid Satan. Can Treason arm a Conscience with so much Confidence, or can a man be guilty of the Murther of a King, and put it off with a* suge [sic] Satan *being told of it.*[190]

Again, the royalist editor failed to counter the impact of the story. Scrope's confidence came from his conviction that their actions had been just, not from the idea they were committing the crime of treason. The editor tried to imply that these men chose to commit treason and that action gave them the strength they needed.

George Bate produced a collection of lives for many of the regicides and other opposition political figures, "the prime Authors and Contrivers of the most Horrid Murther that ever was committed in the Face of the Sun," intended to blacken their names, "that might make them appear the more Wicked, by how much they Murthered so Pious, so Incomparable a Prince." This approach was more successful than *Rebels No Saints* because it did not reuse a radical text and could explain the lives of these men from a royalist perspective. His focus was the men's actions before their trials and executions, providing extensive information on the regicides before the Restoration, including their roles in Charles' death and their political involvements during the Interregnum. For the regicides tried, convicted, and executed in October 1660, he included a little information about their trials and executions, but not as much purported first-hand details as *Speeches and Prayers*, or the two royalist broadsides on the trials, *A Looking-Glass for Traytors* or *A True and Perfect Relation of the Grand Traytors Execution*.[191]

The best royalist assault on the radical martyrology was the *Compleat Collection*, a large

---

[189] *Rebels No Saints*, sigs. A2r-A3r (mspr. A34-A4r), 15.

[190] Ibid., 115. "Suge" in an obsolete version of "say." *OED, s.v.* suge.

[191] Bate, sigs. A2r-v, A3v; *A Looking-Glass for Traytors* (London?, 1660?); *A True and Perfect Relation of the Grand Traytors Execution* (London?, 1660?).

volume that combined the biographical information from Bate with the *Rebels No Saints*. Therefore it compounded the advantages of Bate's collection with the disadvantages of *Rebels No Saints*. However, this collection made no attempt at further analysis and relied on *Rebel No Saints* to provide the necessary counter commentary.

Although there were fewer tracts published in 1662, the debate surrounding Major General John Barkstead, Colonel John Okey, and Miles Corbet's trials and executions had the same tenor as the earlier radical versus royalist attempt to define the regicides. Determining which tract came first is difficult, as the royalist one did not borrow whole sections from the radical tract, as had happened in 1660. *The Speeches, Discourses, and Prayers of Col. John Barkstead, Col. John Okey, and Mr. Miles Corbet* was the radical martyrology for these men that described their attempts to flee England, their capture in Holland as well as their trials and executions. It followed the same sense as the earlier radical collections, attempting to show how the three men suffered at royalist hands and their cheerful acceptance of their deaths. The three men were arrested in Holland by a warrant from Sir George Downing, the English resident in Holland, whom Okey felt had betrayed them. After their capture, they were "most barbarously used, having Shackles and Fetters put upon them, and so cast into a nasty moist and dark Dungeon, having nothing else but the damp Earth to repose upon." On the eve of his execution, Barkstead became afraid and turned to the Bible for comfort; there he found the strength he needed to face his execution and suffer for the "good cause." Okey displayed the same cheerful disposition as the earlier regicides; when a friend visited him after the trial the former "found him in a sweet and blessed frame of spirit and very chearful, not in the least under any discouragement, but acquainted the said Friend that they had been up at *Westminster*, and that Sentence was given against them; and declared he was not in the least disquieted at it." More concerned about his future glory in heaven than his present comfort, Corbet railed against friends who wanted to bribe the hangman to be gentle with the aged Corbet, arguing that he would be less of a martyr if the hangman did not do his duty correctly and treated Corbet's body to the full range of a traitor's execution.[192]

The royalist version, *The Speeches and Prayers of John Barkstead, John Okey, and Miles Corbet* made a larger attempt to counter the radical tract than *Rebels No Saints* had for the first round of regicide trials and executions. The royalists composing this riposte presented a very different Barkstead, Okey, and Corbet, in contrast to the subversive radical portrayals of the men as martyrs. This publication included extensive purported eyewitness coverage of their last minutes speaking and praying at Tyburn and a commentary on the speeches where the author condemned them for their actions and dissected their speeches to prove that the men were evil. Barkstead, Okey, and Corbet appeared more human in this version but also more talkative and willing to proclaim their innocence, something martyrs would not do. In the commentary upon the speeches, the editor argued that he was decoding the speeches to prove the regicides' guilt, accusing them of "circumlocution" of the truth. However, his logic was not always solid; for example he tried to prove that Okey's statement that he had been "no contriver of the king's death" was actually an acknowledgment of his guilt because "he would so ward the imputation of

---

[192] *Speeches, Discourses, and Prayers of Col. John Barkstead, Col. John Okey, and Mr. Miles Corbet* (London?, 1662), 1-3, 17, 35 (page number missing), 61 (mspr. 37).

it; he seems to disallow it, in saying he Contrived it not, he appears to have liked it in that he sealed it."[193] In his desire to prove that these men were guilty the royalist editor pushed his analysis too far and brought his whole investigation into question, thereby weakening the royalist cause on this issue in a different fashion from *Rebels No Saints* and the *Compleat Collection* which reused the radical tracts without much alteration or challenges to the veracity of the material.

Conclusion

The radical regicide tracts were among the most dangerous radical materials produced in the early Restoration because they supported the people's right to resist the crown, and to try, convict, and execute the country's sovereign for crimes against the country. They fundamentally undermined the Restoration by reminding the country that the Long Parliament had ended the Stuart monarchy, therefore positing that Charles II was not the legitimate ruler. Their deaths ordered by this illegitimate government were proof that God supported their beliefs. Royalist authors tried to counter these implications by demonstrating how wrong the regicides were and had moderate success; however, the Protestant martyrology tradition that the radicals tapped into was a good choice.

Unfortunately for the crown, the preceding case demonstrated why convincing the people to stop talking about past animosities was so important for the monarchy. The regicide martyrologies strove to prove that the Long Parliament's trial and execution of the king had been the right decision, supported by God. The general royalist attempts to discredit this interpretation were flawed because many tracts printed the text of the radical pieces without substantial questioning of the evidence the subversive radicals provided or presented twisted logic to prove their arguments. The subversive radicals continued to make their case through the royalist tracts.

Whose Fault? Assessing Blame and Asking Forgiveness

Despite the official targets for blame the Parliament provided, many English writers ignored this assessment and the general oblivion request and began to fault different people and groups in society for the regicide. This exercise was in direct contradiction to the government's intention to limit the accountability for the past; writers blaming other groups suggested that the government had failed to identify and punish everyone responsible and that the issue had not been resolved. Authors most often pointed to one of three groups or people. Some zealous royalists blamed Protestant dissenter groups regardless of their actual participation in the regicide. Encouraging the country to take responsibility for Charles' death allowed moderate critic ministers to help the people come together and heal. On the other hand, some radical writers blamed Charles I himself for the Civil Wars, his execution, and the Interregnum.

---

[193] *The Speeches and Prayers of John Barkstead, John Okey, and Miles Corbet* (London, 1662), 33 (mspr. 2), 35 (mspr. 4).

Dissident critics and subversive radicals used the accusation very differently. Dissident critics supported the monarchy and wanted the Restoration, but also asserted that the king had been responsible for the problems and the crown should acknowledge it. Subversive and rebellious radicals wanted to discredit the monarchy and used the accusation to attack Charles II.

Blaming Others

Loyalist authors had strong words for the regicides, using the worst examples of criminals they could imagine. One anonymous poet called them the brood of Cain, connecting them to the world's first murderer. Thomas Mayhew the poet compared them to Brutus, one of the primary assassins of Julius Caesar. The Anglican divine Thomas Fuller took a different path, comparing the regicides to cannibals. The poet Thomas Higgons argued that Christians could forgive the Jews for the death of Christ because they had not known what they were doing; England could not forgive the regicides because they had understood their actions.[194]

Typically royalist authors looking for general targets chose the dissenting Protestants. These non-Anglicans were easy marks because they had already been identified as distinct groups in society, were disliked by many, and were distrusted by the Church of England and Restoration government. The minister Thomas Reeve singled out Anabaptists, Levellers, and Fifth Monarchists as responsible for the regicide.[195] Edward Willan, the vicar of Hoxne in Suffolk, branded all radicals guilty regardless of participation or political beliefs; he argued that early radicals, by which he seemed to mean the Long Parliament, were just as guilty of Charles I's murder as those who took part in his death:

> And if *Causa causa* be *causa causati*, as certainly is, then by the *Fanaticks*, who began that Work, as *Wicked Regicides* as any others: yeah the prime Agitatours. And *re vera*, they gave the *first fatal* blow, though others gave the last. They took the King's *Crown* off his head, though others took his *Head* off his shoulders. Had not those *first Fanaticks* so murdered his *Royal Power*; the other had never so murdered his Royal person.[196]

Charles suffered two deaths, one politically and one physically; his effective reign ended when the "Fanaticks" took away his kingly power. Willan also conveyed the sense of Charles losing his power through the image of Charles getting shorter; he lost his crown, thereby decreasing his royal stature, and then his head, ending the monarchy's existence and his life. Willan did not reserve his venom for the radicals alone; he targeted the Presbyterians as having played a

---

[194] *Three Royal Poems*, 1; Mayhew, 2; Fuller, *A Panegyrick*, 10; Higgons, 5.

[195] Thomas Reeve, *England's Beauty in Seeing King Charles the Second Restored to Majesty* (London, 1661), 30.

[196] Edward Willan, *Beatitas Britanniae* (London, 1661), 14 (mspr. 20).

fundamental role in Charles' execution as well. In an analogy for the regicide, Willan called different groups particular parts of the axe that had killed Charles I: "The *fatal Axe* had an *Independent Handle*; yet it had a *Presbyterian Back*, and *Edge*, as well as a *Jesuitical* Head."[197] He did not carry through with his vivid and effective image for he did not say who had swung the axe. Willan did not take the opportunity to chastize the nation for the regicide as many other ministers did.

Blaming Themselves

In his broadside elegy on the death of Mary, dowager princess of Orange, the poet Henry Bold asked the deceased royal if she had to die "to make *Attonement*, for a *Kingdom's Guilt*?" Answering his own question, Bold told his readers that "'tis for the *Nations Sins*, a *Punishment* / On *Princes* falls."[198] Several ministers agreed with Bold's assessment of the Civil Wars, the death of Charles I, and the Interregnum, assigning responsibility to the English people for the last two decades. This approach, however, directly contradicted the government's attempts to limit responsibility for the past. Ministers holding this position were moderate critics because they wanted England to heal but did not agree with the government on the best way of achieving this end. Envisioning the results of the country's transgressions as a thunderstorm, the bishop of Worcester, George Morley, stressed to his readers that everyone was guilty of the recent mistakes, saying "the sins of *All* and *every One* of us, which rising up as a *Cloud* from us, fell down again in a *showre* of Judgements upon us." For Morley, all of England had participated in the rebellion against Charles I: "Indeed if *all* of us had not rebelled against God, *none* of us would have *Rebelled* against the *King*; at least their Rebellion would not have prospered as it did."[199] People's personal sins contributed to the success of the parliamentary cause, which led to the Interregnum. This argument connected the people personally with national political events and appealed to their sense of guilt to unite the country in the Restoration.

In his sermon for the anniversary of Charles's return, Richard Meggott, the rector of St. Olaves, Southwark, laid out one of the most extensive discussions of England's faults. Raging at his readers about the consequences of their sins, Meggott asked them:

> Tell me, tell me, what made one King *Murdered*? were they not these [sins]? another exiled? were they not these? a Church *ruined*? were they not these?

His approach hammered his readers with their mistakes, outlining them and explaining God's

---

[197] Ibid.

[198] Henry Bold, *Elegy on the Death of Her Highness Mary Princess Dowager of Aurange, Daughter to Charles the First, King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, &c* (London, 1660).

[199] Morley, 27.

punishment for their religious and secular offenses. God allowed the church to fall because its practitioners were not studious in their observances; the Anglican liturgy lost its popularity because England was not following it correctly; Meggott called this "our slight and formal using of it." Communion services declined in importance because many people were unworthy to receive communion. The Anglican creed became unpopular because Englishmen began to lead dissolute lives, which included making bad oaths and debauchery, sins that ministers had always tried to correct. God sent war because England had rebelled against Him; he also provided men to sequester estates because the original owners did not use them well.[200] Meggott made the argument for individual reformation stronger by asserting that people's personal lives had an impact on the country as a whole and attempted to shame the people by his elaborate description of the condition of God's worship.

Ministers did not usually follow their condemnations with citations of specific sins that had caused these problems; they preferred to leave the details to the individual readers. William Godman, a fellow at King's College, Cambridge, told his readers that the reasons behind the problems, not the specific details, were important:

> The source and original whereof I shall not curiously search into; as wishing rather that it may be buried in a grave of eternal oblivion. But this we may with truth and charity say, That we have felt the indignation of God, because we have sinned against him.[201]

Englishmen should expect that God would punish them for any sins they committed.

The Anglican divine William Creed understood the opportunity mourning for Charles I gave the country to unite through national repentance. Using Isaiah 1:25, "and I will turn my hand upon thee, and purely purge away thy dross, and take away all thy Tinne," Creed defined the Interregnum as a period of refining for the country. He wanted to focus England's attention away from looking for someone to blame for the past events, make England realize that the author of England's punishment was God, and convince his readers to worry about their own sins instead of sniping at others for their transgressions:

> This should teach us not to look on any kind of Instruments, *evil Counsellours*, or others, that God makes use of, for our chastisement. How apt have we all along been to complain, (and yet this Mistake is not purged out of us to this day) against this mans *Craft* and the others *Folly*; against this mans *Rashness* and the others *Treachery*; this *Laymans Faction*, and that *Priests seditious Rhetorick*; this *Tradesmans Covetousness*, and that *Gentlemans Malice*; this *Citizens Pride*, and that *Courtiers*

---

[200] Richard Meggott, *The New-Cured Criple's Caveat* (London, 1662), 15-17.

[201] William Godman, *Ben Horim, Filius Heroum, the Son of Nobles* (London, 1660), 13-14.

> *Ambition*? But have we thought of our *sins*, and of our *God*, whose Providence and Wisdome has overruled our own *sins*, to be our own *Punishments*?

Interested in healing the country, Creed tried to convince his readers that they should not blame their fellow citizens for their sufferings; God was using these people for his own purposes but allowed them to think they were working for themselves. Creed exhorted his readers to "bury our *Animosities* on all sides" and build a stronger England, just as the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion hoped the people would.[202] Creed's use of God was contrary to the government's limitation of responsibility because God could not be held accountable. If God had been the author, then government officials could not define and punish anyone for recent history.

John Paradise outlined exactly why England was guilty of Charles I's death. He believed that the people were responsible because they had not stopped the execution: "they did not rise up as one man, with an unanimous resolution to rescue their captived *Sovereign* out of the hands of those roaring Lyons, and destroying Bears, which devoured him," and England was not repentant enough for the regicide, a sentiment shared by Francis Walsall, who told his readers in 1660 that "I think you have dearly paid for this State-idolatry, though I cannot say dearly enough, because I fear the Lord hath not yet said to his destroying Angel, it is enough."[203] Paradise brought the regicide to every Englishman's doorstep and demanded that everyone acknowledge his or her silent acquiescence in Charles I's death.

These moderate critics offered their parishioners and readers a way to recognize their past sins, expiate their guilt for the previous twenty years, and reaffirm their obedience to God. However, this approach contradicted the Parliament's limited vision of the past which did not have room for a wide definition of those responsible for the past, one that suggested the government had not correctly identified and punished enough people. The Parliament and these ministers had different and competing ideas of what was best for Englishmen; parliamentarians, charged with instituting peace in the country, wanted to establish the relationship between king and subjects on a strong foundation that did not include the possibility for wide retribution for past crimes and offered an extensive general pardon to this end. These clergymen, more concerned with their audiences' souls, felt that Englishmen should acknowledge their sins and how their personal behavior affected the fate of the country.

Blaming Charles I

Despite the official objects of blame the Parliament provided, several radical authors faulted Charles I for the Civil Wars and Interregnum. This argument dared to move further than the ministers who admitted that Charles I had not been perfect discussed below; it held the king responsible for all of the problems of the Civil Wars and his own execution. The foundation for

---

[202] William Creed, *Judah's Purging*, 2, 11-13.

[203] John Paradise, *Hadadrimmon, sive, Threnodia Anglicana ob Regicidium* (London, 1661), 13; Walsall, *The Bowing Heart,* 28.

this contention was the assumption that the king had broken the relationship he had enjoyed with the English people. Radical writers deemed Charles accountable in two main ways. The dissident critics were interested in preserving the monarchy but used Charles' guilt to admonish the country in the hopes of healing it. Subversive and rebellious radicals opposed the Restoration, arguing that Charles' guilt justified their actions against him.

The first group were dissident critics because they ignored the developing government definition and Restoration mythology that delineated Charles I as a martyr and wanted to reestablish the monarchy on a foundation that required the crown to accept at least partial responsibility for the Civil Wars. The General Baptist minister Henry Adis wanted to use Charles' behavior as an example to future rulers of how not to behave. In his translation of William Drury's *Aluredus sive Alfredus* Robert Knightley presented an interesting Roman Catholic view of the monarch's sins when he argued that King Alfred and his kingdom would not be restored until the king acknowledged and repented his sins that had caused the problems and his overthrow. The analogy to the Restoration suggested that the Stuarts would have to admit Charles I's mistakes before God would restore Charles II to his throne.[204]

Adis told his readers that mistakes made by the church and state hurt the people: "God many times punisheth a People for the misactings of their Governours, whether in *Church, State,* or *Particular Families*." After mining the Bible, Adis provided multiple examples of kings, clergymen, and fathers that had made errors for which God punished the people, including Pharoah's relationship with Abraham's wife Sarah and his unwillingness to let the Jews leave Egypt despite the devastating plagues. Adis used this opportunity to exhort his king and all other governments and ministers to watch their behavior lest God take revenge on their subjects and congregations:

> This then may serve for a Use of Exhortation to thee, O King, to thee, and to all Kings, Princes, and Governours of Nations, Pastors, and Elders of Congregations, and Masters of Families, as they tender their own good, and the good of those that are under them, that they walk before the Lord, and go in and out before their People in singleness of heart, and in the sincerity of their Souls, as in the sight of God, having a single-eye to the Glory of God, and the good of the Souls that are under their charge, carefully watching over all their thoughts, words and actions, so as that they bring not the Judgements of God upon their people by their misactings."[205]

---

[204] Henry Adis, *A Fannaticks Mite Cast into the Kings Treasury,* 2nd ed. (London: Printed by Simon Dover, 1660); R[obert] K[nightley], trans., "Alfrede: Or Right Reinthroned," Bodl., Rawl. Poetry MSS 80.

[205] Adis, 40-43. See Chapter Three for further discussion of Adis' use of Abraham, Sarah, and Pharaoh.

Adis provided the opposite argument to the moderate critic ministers who posited that the English people had been responsible for the Civil Wars, regicide, and Interregnum. Through this argument that princes' mistakes affect their subjects, Adis suggested that Charles I's behavior had precipitated the Civil Wars, leading to his own death and warned Charles II to monitor himself carefully, lest he bring harm to his people and endanger his own life.

Robert Knightley's "Alfrede: Or Right Reinthroned" was a translation of William Drury's Latin play *Aluredus sive Alfredus* that told the story of the legendary English King Alfred and his struggles to protect his kingdom from the invading Danes. The action of the play took place during Alfred's attempt to keep Guthrum, a Danish commander desiring to solidify his control over Wessex, from achieving his goal. Guthrum launched his final invasion in January 878. In the closing scene Alfred and his men were preparing to meet Gothermus, the play's representation of Guthrum, at what would be the battle of Edington where Alfred would emerge victorious.[206]

Albert Tricomi speculates that Knightley finished his translation in early 1660. Knightley's preface provides evidence to support Tricomi's suggestion that the writer made the translation sometime before April 1660 for his half sister, Lady Mary Blount, wife of Sir George Blount, whose family's lands had been sequestered by Cromwell in the 1650s. What makes the play interesting, especially for the purposes of this study, is that it evinces a strong Roman Catholic sense of repentance and the intervention of saints. Both Drury and Knightley were members of Catholic families; Drury had been a Catholic priest who taught at the English seminary at Douai, where Knightley later studied. Although Tricomi discusses the play's demonstration of correct Christian piety and practices and the restoration of a rightful monarch, he does not address the core issue that combined Catholic piety with the rightful king's return to the throne.[207] Alfred's return depended on two important elements. First, Alfred had to repent and receive God's forgiveness for the sins that had caused his fall and the Danish invasion. Second, he needed the intervention of St. Cuthbert and the holy hermit Neothus, who became Alfred's confessor. The play suggested that Charles would have to admit his father's sins before he could take the throne.

At the beginning of the play, Alfred had been deposed by the pagan and bloodthirsty Gothermus and his Danish armies. Alfred vowed to fight for his crown, saying, "Ile seeke the enimy, embrace a death / more glorious from an adversaries hand." Knightley's Gothermus was appropriately evil, lusting after English blood and plunder. The Danish king exhorted his troops:

---

[206] Dale B. J. Randall, *Winter Fruit* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995), 111-12; Alfred P. Smyth, *King Alfred the Great* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 40, 67, 72, 87.

[207] Albert H. Tricomi, "Introduction," in Robert Knightley, *Alfrede or Right Reinthroned,* ed. Albert H. Tricomi, *Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies*, vol. 99 (Binghamton, NY: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1993), 1-49; Randall, 111-12. Citations are taken from the original in the Rawlinson Manuscript because I do not agree with all of his transcriptions. Bodl., Rawl. Poetry MSS 80.

> Why drown yee not this hostile Cuntry in its owne bloud? One this
> [?] a sanguine deluge flowing from the dead should have baptis'd
> this land a purple Sea.[208]

During the Civil Wars England had been awash in its own blood. Alfred had been responsible for the evils that had befallen England; his own sins had caused the Danish invasion and the loss of his crown. Neothus, a hermit and interpreter of God's will in the play, told Alfred that the king's behavior during his rule was unacceptable:

> you ought not to have
> bin insolent with too much felicity;
> nor should you have bin facile to Anger
> prone to punishment, nor proudly rul'd
> that flock, which god comitted to your Charge
> on better conditions; nor deny'd
> Assistance to the porrest of your Creatures;
> nor your Care to Widdows, nor your Mercy
> To the guilty, nor you Rigor to ye
> Indigent; nor your love to your subjects;
> Nor your Devotions and feare to God:
> Nor precipitately [?] to have indulg'd
> Your mind to the wantoness of pleasures:
> God created you a king, and you make
> yourself a Tyrant.[209]

According to Neothus, Alfred had ruled unjustly by not making the protection of his subjects his first concern; he had cared more about his own pleasures than helping his subjects through charity and mercy or his duties to God. If read as an accusation of Charles I, this description of Alfred's transgressions was a stinging indictment of the former monarch for wrongs against his subjects and God. Part of the indictment against Charles I brought before the high court was the charge that Charles had become a tyrant.[210] Humbled by Neothus' description of his sins, Alfred begged the hermit and God for forgiveness and offered to renounce his kingship if God would stop making England pay for his mistakes: "Let my People escape this heavy scourge: / Behold, I humbly prostrate at your feete, Resigne the Name of King, and my Kingdome / now violated by my offences."[211] Neothus explained God's forgiveness and promises of greater worldly success

---

[208] "Alfrede," Bodl., Rawl. Poetry MSS 80, fols. 4v, 6r.

[209] Ibid., fol. 38v.

[210] Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, 432; *ST,* 4:995.

[211] "Alfrede," Bodl., Rawl. Poetry MSS 80, fol. 39r. Alfred's acceptance of his punishment bears a resemblance to David and Bathsheba in 2 Samuel 11-12.

to Alfred. Alfred's recognition of and repentance for his sins was the central event that turned the tide for Alfred and his forces; God forgave Alfred and decided to make him triumphant against the Danes.

In this play, Knightley presented what would have been a dissident critic interpretation because he wanted Charles' restoration but insisted that the king had to acknowledge his father's mistakes before he could regain his crown, a different path to the throne than the zealous royalists intended. By extension, Knightley suggested that Charles I was responsible for the Civil Wars and ensuing Interregnum and that the Stuarts had to acknowledge Charles I's role in the conflicts and repent before God would allow Charles II to return home. After the Restoration, the play in this form could not have been published or performed. This repentance argument would have violated the Parliament's request for ending discussions of past conflict and contradicted the government's definition of the past by presenting Charles as something other than a perfect martyr.

Writers in the second group were subversive or rebellious radicals because they argued against the monarchy, justified the parliamentary treatment of Charles I, or made a subtle plea for the removal of Charles II. Radicals tried two main approaches: conquest theory and God's law. These authors did not write with the sole purpose of denigrating Charles I; their discussions of the executed king were pieces of larger arguments in their defense of the monarch or attacks on Charles II.

The anonymous author of *The Valley of Achor* (1660), one of the anti-Restoration tracts discussed in Chapter One, used conquest theory to mount an argument for the Parliament's right to try and execute Charles I based on his culpability and loss in the Civil Wars. Charles' responsibility for starting the war formed the basis of his argument; in engaging in battle the Parliament was only defending its best interest: "Whether if the Government be divided betwixt King and Parliament, if the King by Arms violates his part, the Parliament be not bound by all bonds, Sacred and Civil, to maintain their right by War?" In self defense, the Parliament defeated the prince and gained the upper hand in negotiations with him. This success on the battlefield gave the Parliament the right to do with the loser, the prince, what it wanted; therefore it could end the monarchy: "Whether if the success be given to the people, they may not depose the King?" The author also countered the royalist argument that no one was fit to judge the sovereign by arguing that when Charles was tried, he was not the ruler because he had broken England's trust.[212] Therefore a monarch did not rule by his right alone; he was bound to the people who could end the relationship when they felt the king had not maintained his part.

Perhaps the more insidious line of reasoning for the royalists was the radical claim that trying and executing Charles was in accord with obeying God's law. Some of the regicides employed this line of defense during their trials for treason; the court rebuffed their attempts to argue that they could judge the king based on God's law. At the foundation of Harrison's and Carew's defenses was the assertion that Charles had begun the Civil Wars and was therefore guilty. Harrison argued that the Parliament had determined that Charles had been the instigator of the war. In his attempt to explain the events leading to Charles' execution, Carew intimated that Charles' guilt had begun with his withdrawal from the Parliament, basing this assertion on

---

[212] *Valley of Achor, 1.*

the Parliament's own declaration of this fact. Both men were cut short and told they were not allowed to justify the past with a discussion of history.[213] At his trial Harrison argued that he had "followed not my own Judgement; I did what I did, as out of conscience to the Lord," and "I did it all according to the best of my understanding, desiring to make the revealed will of God in his Holy Scriptures as a guide to me." Outraged, the court asked Harrison if he would make God "the author of your treasonous murders?"[214]

The most concise exploration of this theme was an anonymous rebellious radical tract entitled *A Treatise of the Execution of Justice* (1660?) which argued that the people shared with the king the responsibility to carry out justice, regardless of who the perpetrator was. The author told his readers that the people could seek justice against their monarch if he had broken God's laws:

> *Quest.* But what if the Magistrate pervert Justice, violate the Law of God, oppresse the Innocent, let the guilty go free, punish those that do well, praise those that do evil, what is the people's duty in this case?
> *Answ.* 1. Their duty is to Execute Judgement and Justice without the Magistrate.
> 2. Their duty is to execute Judgement and Justice upon him.[215]

The hypothetical monarch the author described here was guilty of doing the opposite of what a good king should do; he broke the relationship between the prince and his subjects. Because the people and the sovereign had a stake in and obligation to the law, the citizens should enact justice without the ruler, who damaged their relationship and the law by his behavior. As a lawbreaker, the king was subject to the law and the judgement of the people, an assertion royalists strongly denied. A later question asked, "but what Warrant should we have to do so?" The response was, "the same Warrant that the People of *Israel* had to punish *Uzziah*; (The Law of God.)."[216] This parallel to Uzziah, a biblical king of Judah, was an interesting choice. Uzziah had ruled Judah well for many years but became overzealous in desiring to demonstrate his thankfulness to God for his successes. The king tried to enter the temple and burn incense, a prerogative of the priests. When he would not listen to the priests who tried to dissuade him, God gave him leprosy, for which the community cast him out.[217] Just as Uzziah had overstepped his boundaries by trying to perform a ritual that belonged to the priests and therefore broke the law, Charles I

---

[213] Davis, 114-16; *ST*, 5:1031, 1055.

[214] *ST*, 5:1021, 1025. For a full analysis of the regicides' defenses at their trials, see Davis. For Harrison specifically, see Sampson.

[215] *A Treatise of the Execution of Justice* (London? 1660?), 4.

[216] Ibid., 23.

[217] 2 Chronicles 26:1-21.

had crossed the line between his rightful duty to his subjects and violating their rights. Charles had damaged the relationship between sovereign and subjects; the author felt that England had the right to punish him for his transgression just as the Judeans had thrown out Uzziah for his leprosy.

After his initial discussion of theory, the author moved slowly toward an attack on Charles himself, first by making a parallel with the biblical King Rehoboam who treated his people badly and refused to govern by God's laws. However, the author did not limit himself to an exploration of Rehoboam or allow the analogy to work for him; instead he opted for an open attack on both princes, saying:

> What a grievous yoak was put upon our necks by this mans [Charles II's] Father, is not yet forgot, the Prints remain to this Day, how he made poor *England* Groan by Illegal Taxes, and unjust Exactations, Episcopal Tyranny, and Prelaick [Prelatical] Encroachments, which occasioned a bloody war, wherein many Myriads of men were Sacrificed to his Lust, and the Land miserably Impoverished is yet fresh in our memories.[218]

For the author, Charles' bad policies had been responsible for causing the Civil Wars, implying that the people had been defending themselves against Charles' administration, particularly its taxation policy and support of the Church of England under Laud. Although the tract apparently attacked Charles I by denigrating ship money and the Church of England under Laud, the real target was Charles II; the piece was a call to rebellion against the king the author felt was a modern-day Rehoboam:

> And is not this Mans little finger thicker then his Fathers Loynes? Doth he not dayly add to our Yoak, and make it more grievous? Are we not chastized with Scorpions, in stead of his Fathers Whips?

His delineation of the people's hardships continued.[219] The passage referred to Rehoboam's response to his subjects' complaints of high taxes in 1 Kings 12:10-11 where the biblical king explained that he would be harsher than his father had been. Charles II was the king guilty of perverting justice and the people had a duty to judge and punish him. The author skillfully used the readers' assumption that he was discussing Charles I to lead them to the core of his argument, the attack on Charles II. Therefore *The Treatise of the Execution of Justice* was one of the most radical tracts printed in the early Restoration as it justified the execution of one king and called for the judgement and execution of another one.

Despite the dissident critics' basic support for the monarchy, some contemporaries may

---

[218] *A Treatise of the Execution of Justice*, 15.

[219] Ibid.

have lumped them with the subversive and rebellious radicals who wanted to dismantle the monarchy because they advocated a position the crown and many royalists denied: that Charles had not been a perfect monarch and bore at least some responsibility for the Civil Wars. The radical tactics discussed above that connected Charles I's guilt with Charles II's administration made assessing Charles I for his role in the past more dangerous for dissident critics.

Conclusion

The Parliament provided Englishmen with the appropriate subjects for blame. The Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, the Act of Attainder, and the regicide trials illustrated whom parliamentarians felt Englishmen should hold accountable for the past. However, many Englishmen did not heed the Parliament's limited definition of the guilty, preferring to see the crimes of the past as the responsibility of other groups. Those blaming distrusted religious groups, implying that the guilt was more widespread than the several individuals listed in the acts above, were moderate critics because they ignored the law for revenge.

Others, particularly ministers, saw the Civil Wars and Interregnum as the responsibility of the country as a whole, and asked the people to acknowledge and repent their sins as an act of national healing. As moderate critics, they disagreed with royal policy because they felt their solution was better for the country. This group ranged from bishop John Morley, who presented his moderate critic opinion in the coronation sermon, a pulpit from which he contradicted the Parliament's desire to circumscribe English guilt, to William Creed, the archdeacon of Wiltshire.

Authors who argued Charles I was responsible for the past animosities either espoused dissident critic ideas in the hopes of making Englishmen reconsider how the monarchy was fallible, or subversive and rebellious radical ones, intent on destroying the monarchy. Separating the intentions of these two groups would have been difficult for contemporaries, an idea that probably kept dissident critic Robert Knightley from publishing his *Alfrede* after the Restoration. Even a slight association with subversive radical pieces such as *The Valley of Achor,* which argued that Charles I's culpability and loss on the battlefield had been all the opposition needed to execute the king and abolish the monarchy*,* and *A Treatise of the Execution of Justice*, which turned a diatribe on Charles I into a subtle attack on Charles II and called for the downfall of the latter, could have severely damaged his reputation and identified him for the government as a person to watch.

Changes in the National Calendar

The Restoration shaped the English calendar in two important ways: the establishment of 30 January as a national day of mourning and the changes made by almanac authors to their publications. David Cressy has demonstrated that the English Protestant calendar had moved away from the continental Roman Catholic pattern of saints' days and toward celebrating national deliverances, Elizabeth's accession and the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot

specifically, as major events in the national calendar.[220] However, 30 January was not a triumph for loyal Englishmen; it was a disaster that marked the victory, albeit temporary, of anti-monarchical forces. After the Restoration, the Parliament instituted a national day of remembrance to provide Englishmen with the appropriate way to remember and discuss the previous monarch; Charles should be regarded a martyr and his death as a national tragedy. Yet, this day gave ministers the opportunity to comment negatively on Charles I, suggesting that he had not been the best monarch. Ministers' interpretations of Charles provide a good distinction between zealous royalists and moderate critics, both of whom supported the monarchy but had different approaches. Cressy does not discuss either, instead focusing on the development of 5 November.

The other changes to the national calendar occurred through the many almanacs produced in England. Although these astrologers could not predict the Restoration, their almanacs for 1661 and later echoed the political changes in the kingdom. Some writers followed the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion's directive to obliterate the past animosities and removed many mentions of recent history from their publications. The royalist John Gadbury and republican John Tanner did not agree with the government on this issue and continued to keep the past in the country's historical memory through their publications.

Commemorating the Regicide on 30 January

Charles II and his kingdoms had to deal with the regicide of Charles I, an indelible part of the kingdoms' past that directly affected the present and became a significant part of the government's attempt to dissolve English historical memory. As part of the Act of Attainder against the regicides who had fled, the Parliament instituted a national day of mourning on 30 January to "implore the mercy of God that neither the guilt of that Sacred and Innocent Blood, nor those other sinns by which God was provoked to deliver up both us and our King into the hand of cruell and unreasonable men may at any time hereafter be visited upon us or our posterity."[221] The Parliament also developed and published a form for the new national remembrance, hoping to ensure uniformity across the country and lessen the chance disaffected people might take the opportunity to celebrate rather than lament his death.[222] The government intended this day of mourning for England to repent the sins that led England up to the regicide and reflect upon why Charles I had died and the Interregnum that ensued, thus reinforcing the current monarchy by reminding the people of conditions without a king.[223] However, invoking

---

[220] David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*: *National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart Britain* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989), xii-xiii.

[221] 12 Car. II., c. 30.

[222] Spurr, 241.

[223] Lois Potter has commented that the 30 January commemoration in 1661 was the first time Englishmen were able to mourn Charles I's death together as a country. Lois Potter, "The

the past was always a dangerous gamble because the people might remember the past differently than the government intended.[222] In conjunction with this commemoration, the Parliament augmented the idea that the regicide was a horrid act by ordering the public display of the decaying bodies of Oliver Cromwell, John Bradshaw, John Ireton, and Thomas Pride. Thomas Rugge described the scene in gruesome detail:

> That morning the Carcassee [Carcasses] of Oliver Cromwell and Henry Ireton and John Bradshaw (which the day before was brought from Westmin[ster] to the [Red?] Lyon Inn in holborne) drawne upon a sledge to Tyburne and there taken out of their coffines and in their shrouds hanged by their necks untill the going downe of the sun: then cutt downe[,] their heads cut of and their bodies buried in a grave made under the gallows.[223]

Others confirmed Rugge's account. The diarist John Evelyn, who called Tyburn "that fatal & ignominious Monument," recorded the impact of this display: "Thousands of people (who had seene them in all their pride & pompous insults) being spectators: looke back at November 22: 1658, & be astonish'd *–And* (fear) *God & the honor the King, but meddle not with them who are given to change*."[224] Evelyn felt that England had received some retribution for its sufferings and indicated that the crowds that gathered felt the same way. In a letter to Sir William Curtius, Secretary Nicholas called this spectacle "ce mervilleux & agreable object de la Justice Divine" (this marvelous and pleasing act of divine justice").[225]

Royal Martyr in the Restoration: National Grief and National Sin," in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 240.

[222] In *Constructing Cromwell*, Laura Lunger Knoppers argues that this public ceremony, along with all the satirical and derogatory publications that emerged about Cromwell served to keep the former lord protector in the public memory but does not take the argument in the same direction as this author; she does not consider how the government did not approve of this repetition of history in the current discourse. Laura Lunger Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print 1645-1661* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 173-95.

[223] *CSPD, 1660-1661*, 406; Thomas Rugge, "Mercurius Politicus Redivius," BL, Add MSS 10116, fol. 154v.

[224] Evelyn, 3:269.

[225] Sir Edward Nicholas to Sir William Curtius, 8 February 1661, PRO, SP 29/30/52. Paula Backscheider takes a similar approach to interpreting the exhumation, treatment, and display of the bodies, arguing that this "hideous but magnificent theater" was part of Charles'

Although the government could manufacture the spectacle, it had less control over the church ceremonies it ordered for the same day. Publishing an official worship order was not a guarantee that these events would go as planned; anniversary sermons gave ministers the opportunity to discuss Charles I as a king and to suggest that he was not the glorious martyr or good king other authors depicted.[226] Nathaniel Hardy, royal chaplain and the rector of St. Martin in the Fields, preached a zealous royalist sermon that represented the height of the developing Restoration mythology of Charles I as the perfect martyr. Hardy compared Charles and the biblical King Josiah without hinting at or acknowledging any wrongdoing on Charles' part; in fact his hyperbolic praise bordered on blasphemy as he argued that Charles' suffering had been worse than Christ's. Acknowledging that Charles I had not been the best king was not necessarily a radical opinion; categorization depended on how an author used Charles' past. Three anniversary sermons will illustrate some shades of differences within the moderate critic position. Using the Josiah parallel, John Winter, the curate of East Dearham, Norfolk, produced a moderate critic sermon, which used the analogy to intimate that Charles had made serious mistakes while providing plausible deniability for his suggestion. John Paradise produced a moderate critic sermon with his comparison of Charles' execution to the murder of the biblical King Saul, an unusual choice for a minister trying to glorify his sovereign. However, Paradise used this Saul parallel to stress royalist theory that the people did not have the right to rebel against their monarch, no matter how bad he was. Simon Ford, royal chaplain and the minister of Allhallows, Northamptonshire, preached perhaps the most interesting moderate critic sermon. Instead of making Charles a martyr as Hardy had, Ford took an approach similar to that of Paradise. In a highly defensive sermon, Ford recognized Charles' mistakes but used this admission to reinforce the sanctity of the prince, reminding Englishmen that it was not their place to criticize their sovereign. However, his equivocation and ardent defense of Charles indicated that Ford wanted to stress Charles' mistakes more than a royal chaplain should have.[227]

Nathaniel Hardy enjoyed preferment after the Restoration and became a prominent Church of England minister, heading the important London parish of St. Martin in the Fields. In 1643 Hardy had been installed as rector of St. Dionis Backchurch in London, replacing the sequestered George Hume. Hardy served this parish through the early Restoration, when he became a chaplain in ordinary to the king, the dean of Rochester, and the rector of St. Martin in

---

desire to "reinscribe" his authority on England. Paula R. Backscheider, *Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern England* (Baltimore, MD and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 5, 7-8. However, the Parliament, not the crown, ordered the gruesome ceremony.

[226] *A Form of Common Prayer to Be Used upon the Thirtieth of January* (London, 1661). For an interesting discussion of the image of Charles I as martyr, see Keeble. Keeble, *The Restoration*, 36-40.

[227] Nathaniel Hardy, *A Loud Call to Great Mourning* (London, 1662); John Winter, *A Sermon Preached at East Dearham in Norf. Jan. 30, 1661* (London, 1662); John Paradise, *Hadadrimmon*; Ford, *Parallela Duaogzallela.*

the Fields.[228] During his career Hardy saturated the market with sermons for weddings, funerals, and going-away celebrations. His anniversary sermon mourning Charles I's death was an extreme zealous royalist tract, a panegyric verging on the sacrilegious; he moved from a comparison between Charles I and Josiah to an appraisal of how Charles I's death had been worse than Christ's.

Hardy laid out an extensive comparison between the two kings by enumerating Josiah's good qualities and demonstrating how Charles I had shared some of these characteristics. For example, he pointed to how Josiah had supported places of worship by providing money and employees. Charles I's concern for St. Paul's Cathedral paralleled the biblical king's interest. Josiah had a "very tender heart" and Charles' grieving for Strafford attested that he shared this attribute as well. Both monarchs had suffered because their subjects had been wicked.[229] Using Josiah as a model for Charles I allowed Hardy to resist change and to deny dissenters' claims for further reformation. He implied that Charles had patterned his life after Josiah, and anything not in keeping with how Josiah had lived and reigned was improper for the present. Hardy refuted the argument for further reformation by saying that God had not intended Charles I to remove all Roman Catholic influence from the church, and doing so was not really justified by Josiah's example.[230]

Hardy's zeal for exalting Charles I led him to compare the latter with Christ and to use a standard rhetorical device to suggest to his readers that Charles' murder had been more heinous than Christ's crucifixion. Assuring his readers that "I would not in this be *misconstrued*, as if I went about to *equalize* the *sufferings* of my *Sovereigne* with *those* of my *Saviour*," he focused on the executioners:

> And as I do not *equalize* the blood of my *Sovereigne* with my *Saviours*, so neither the *guilt* of his *murthers* with *theirs* who put *Christ* to death. But yet (*I hope*) without offence, we may take *notice* how *near* a resemblance there was, and how as in *some* respects the *guilt* of the *one* was far *greater*, so in *some* of the *charge* lyeth *heavier* against the *other*.[231]

Hardy did not "equalize" his sovereign with Christ; he made regicide worse than crucifixion. He posited that the special relationship between the monarch and his people was the main reason Charles' execution had been more atrocious than Christ's death; Christ did not have as close a

---

[228] *Walker Revised*, 51; Nathaniel Hardy, *The Choicest Fruit of Peace Gathered from the Tree of Life* (London, 1660); *The Apostolical Liturgy Revived* (London, 1661); *The Hierarchy Exalted and Its Enemies Humbled* (London, 1661).

[229] Hardy, *A Loud Call*, 28-35.

[230] Ibid., 31.

[231] Ibid., 36-37.

bond with the Jews as Charles did with the three kingdoms, particularly because the Jews did not recognize any relationship. Not realizing who Christ really was, the Jews accused him before a legal Roman court, which executed him. Charles, on the other hand, was accused, tried in a dubious court, and executed in public by his own subjects, who knew what they were doing.[232] Therefore England should weep for Charles I more than Christ, an argument that bordered on blasphemy. The Commons approved of Hardy's sermon; on 31 January it thanked him and ordered the sermon to be printed.[233]

Across the country in Norfolkshire, John Winter preached a different anniversary sermon using the Josiah parallel. Winter carefully presented his comparison so that he could argue that he did not intend his readers to interpret his sermon as criticizing Charles I. Instead of trying to glorify Charles I as a modern Josiah and demonstrate how much worse Charles' circumstances were than Christ's, Winter used the Josiah analogy to question Charles' judgement at the outset of the first English Civil War. He argued that Josiah's decision to start a war with the Egyptians had been a bad move for his kingdom and the only mistake for which he could be blamed. Josiah took the opportunity to defeat a neighboring enemy, engaged the Egyptians while they battled the Assyrians, and was defeated. God used this situation to execute a "manifold judgement" on the Jews for sins committed under Josiah's grandfather Manassah:

> *Josiah* was delivered from a rebellious people, to keep a perpetuall holy day with Saints and Angels; whilest they have leave to sigh and groan under a long *Babylonish* servitude. *And then all Judah and Jerusalem mourned for Josiah*.[234]

Winter's material suggested two interpretations. On one level, he hinted that Charles' major mistake had been starting the first English Civil War, which led to his death and misery for his people. On the other hand, he implied that God had directed everything and used Josiah for his own purposes; Judah's sufferings were not caused by Josiah's bad decision-making but by the sins of the country's forefathers. Winter cleverly ensured plausible deniablity for his assertions.

John Paradise chose the relationship between David and Saul in 1 Samuel 24:5-6 to illustrate the country's obligation to the monarch regardless of his behavior. Paradise exalted the office of the king and told his readers that England owed loyalty to any prince, no matter how bad a monarch. Although this theme of loyalty was an important current in early Restoration sermons, Paradise's choice of this text and his argument for the anniversary of the regicide suggested that he was implying that Charles I had not been a good king, but that his subjects did not have the right to rebel. He took great pains to lay out his argument in defense of monarchy as an institution and cited various examples from Scripture of giving loyalty to bad kings, including

---

[232] Ibid., 39-40.

[233] Ibid., sig. A1v.

[234] Winter, *A Sermon Preached at East Dearham in Norf. Jan. 30, 1661*, 9-10.

Christians praying for heathen sovereigns and Christ's dictum of "render unto Caesar."[235]

Ford took a different approach than his fellow royal chaplain Hardy; instead of highlighting Charles as a martyr, he made him very human but stressed the relationship between sovereign and people. Much like Paradise's use of 1 Samuel 24:5-6, Ford's choice of 2 Samuel 1:14, "and David said unto him, How wast thou not afraid to stretch forth thine hand to destroy the Lords Anointed?," was appropriate for the anniversary of Charles' death; however, expanding from the passage to the murder of Saul was not the best option for any minister wanting to glorify the memory of a deceased king. His treatment of Charles I in the body of the sermon suggested that he was implying that Charles had made mistakes and was disliked, not errors such as Saul had made, but mistakes nonetheless. However, Ford's ardent explanation of the differences between Saul and Charles, his hesitant language, and his defensiveness belied his ostensible intention to deflect criticism from Charles.

Ford demonstrated to his readers how Charles' murder had been worse than Saul's. First, Ford argued that Charles' superior personality had made his murder worse. He had not been the cruel king Saul had been: "A person (take him either as *Man*, or *King*) of a Temper so far different from *Sauls*, that as the one seemed to be composed of *Cruelty*, so the other seemed to have nothing in his Constitution but *Clemency*." Saul had been killed by a foreigner in private, whereas Charles died at the hands of his own subjects in public. Saul's murderer had had various excuses for his actions, but Charles' killers did not. Assuming his readers knew the biblical story, Ford contrasted Charles' circumstances to Saul's. For example, instead of saying Saul had been old, Ford pointed out that Charles had been "in the very *Prime of his Age*, *Health* and *Strength*."[236] Discussing Charles instead of Saul was an unusual choice; instead of allowing the literary device to work for him, Ford spent time defending his analogy with the present.

Despite this glowing comparison to Saul, Ford acknowledged that Charles I had not been the saint some poets and ministers tried to portray: "And I dare not perswade my self or others, that our *late Sovereign* was *so much a Saint*, as to be *altogether free*; nay he was *so much Saint*, as (more then once) to *confesse miscarriages in his Government*."[237] However, his language was somewhat noncommital; after making the Saul parallel he seemed unwilling to allow his comparison of Saul and Charles to stand without many qualifications. After acknowledging Charles had made mistakes, Ford tried three tactics to lessen the impact of this revelation. His first approach attempted to convince readers that investigating Charles' mistakes was not a good idea. The rude masses could not understand the pressures on a king or the reasoning process a monarch must employ. People interested in probing Charles' past would commit worse sins than those of Charles. Ford's second approach involved convincing the readers that worse kings existed, an extension of his comparing Charles to Saul. He contrasted Charles with David and Solomon, arguing that the two Hebrew kings had "more and fouler spots upon their Names" than

---

[235] Paradise, 31-34. This subject will be discussed in Chapter Four.

[236] Ford, *Parallela Duaogzallela*, 37-44.

[237] Ibid., 46.

Charles.[238]

In his third tactic, Ford ended his equivocating by declaring that Charles's crimes did not matter; he had a duty to ignore them and expound upon the deceased king's good qualities:

> In a *word*, Were I sufficiently instructed in the *Cabinet affairs* of our *late Sovereign*, and had I a *revelation* withall afforded me, to discover the *secret springs* of those *Counsels* upon which he acted, and his own mind in acting; and were I inabled thereby to conclude him really guilty of whatever, and more, then what malice and prejudice have ever charged him withall, I should think my self obliged to do (what is the duty of every *good man*) that *right* to his *memory*, as to *bury his errours and miscarriages* in his grave, and *proclaim his vertues* as Royal examples to all Posterity.[239]

Ford would never be able to gather the evidence he suggested was necessary to judge Charles, making investigation an irrelevant exercise. He excused himself and the country from trying to understand what had happened by positing the unavailable verification. However, his sermon up to this point indicated that he believed Charles guilty of something because his willingness to defend an innocent man would be unnecessary. Ford hinted that he wanted the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion to apply to Charles I as well as the people; England should forget what the monarch had done wrong and remember only the good. Ford was not the only minister to propose England should disguise the king's failings; Richard Eedes argued that the kingdom owed its sovereign this forgetfulness, for "it is the duty of loyal subjects *to hide and conceal their Princes failings*." England's "mantle of love will *hide a multitude of sins*."[240]

Ford's sentiment that England should forget Charles' mistakes and continue to sing his praises was in line with the government's intent when establishing the day of national mourning. Nonetheless, most of the sermon indicated that Ford wanted to point out Charles' errors, not bury them as the close of the piece suggested. In the end, the image of Charles Ford created was not the martyr king the Restoration government wanted to perpetuate and his sermon did not help the government's desire for the people to stop talking about past conflicts. His sermon was a moderate critic piece because he agreed with the administration's desire to ensure the people's loyalty to the crown but did not feel its approach was the appropriate one. He felt that Englishmen should be loyal to and respectful of the monarch despite the sovereign's faults and mistakes.

Although 30 January accomplished the government's goal of providing official recognition and mourning for the regicide in its attempt to dissolve English historical conscience

---

[238] Ibid., 46-47. David was an interesting choice; many ministers compared Charles II to David in a favorable manner, unlike Ford's suggestion here. See Chapter One.

[239] Ibid., 47.

[240] Richard Eedes, *Great Britains Resurrection* (London, 1660), 12 (mspr. 14).

into myth and ritual, the day gave ministers the opportunity to discuss Charles I under the guise of lamenting his execution. The three moderate critic sermons discussed here varied in their approach to the deceased king. John Winter was the most conservative of the three; he carefully provided himself with plausible deniability for his suggestions about Charles' decisions. John Paradise used his comments on Charles to demonstrate how Englishmen did not have the right to rebel against their prince, regardless of his fitness to rule. On the other hand, Simon Ford expressed the opinion closest to the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion when he argued that the country had an obligation to ignore all of the prince's faults. However, Ford's sermon showed that he disagreed with the government's approach to securing the people's loyalty.

Charles II's Place in the National Calendar: The Almanacs

Almanac authors gave Charles II a larger place in the public's current memory by including him in their tables of kings and queens, chronologies of important dates, and verses scattered throughout the almanacs. Bernard Capp has addressed the political nature of the almanacs, but has not examined them for their potential to demonstrate political belief. A detailed analysis of tables of kings and queens, chronologies, and verse scattered throughout these publications will expand on Capp's analysis and partially challenge his argument that after the Restoration, censorship and the consciences of the individual authors ensured that the government had few problems with astrologers; this is especially the case of John Tanner, the republican almanac author who expressed some of the most radical republican sentiments in the early Restoration.[241] Tables of the kings and queens of England represented support for or at least acknowledgment of a monarchy and legitimate succession. However, chronologies could also be used to back up the ideas that had contributed to Charles I's overthrow, and almanac censors began to realize this ploy and force some writers to remove the suspicious materials. Authors wishing to appear in favor of the new king adjusted their almanacs accordingly, removing information about the Civil Wars and Cromwell and inserting Charles II's dates where appropriate. Verse in these almanacs was often as political as the broadsides published during 1660 and provided these authors with a more direct way to express their feelings.

Cardanus Riders' almanacs demonstrated this alteration of the table of kings and queens to reflect the transition between Cromwell and Charles II. In his almanac for 1658, Riders listed Charles I's death on 30 January as the last item in the table. Under the table Riders placed Cromwell, giving similar information about when his rule began and the number of years since it had begun. In 1659, Riders added Cromwell's death and the proclamation of his son Richard as protector. With the fall of the protectorate and the chaos in late 1659, Riders altered his table of kings and queens to demonstrate dislike for Cromwell. Now he listed Cromwell inside the table itself with the notation "Oliv. Prot." and provided the same information for Cromwell as he did for all the monarchs. However, underneath the table Riders added a couplet against the late protector: "Protector, Tyrany, *and curst* oppresion / *Be banisht hence*, *and claim no more* succession." By 1663 Riders removed all traces of Cromwell and added Charles II, with his reign beginning the day his father had been killed. The anti-Cromwellian couplet was replaced

---

[241] Capp, *Astrology*, 89.

by a pro-monarchy one: "Now may we look on Monarchy and sing / In health & peace, long live great Charles our king."[242]

Readers of Thomas Trigge's almanacs saw a different approach to recent political events. In his almanac for 1659, Trigge listed the lord protector inside the table of kings and queens and proclaimed "God Preserve our Lord PROTECTOR" underneath the table itself. Instead of putting Charles into the table for 1661, Trigge took out the table altogether and printed "God Save the King" on the last page after the highway listings. His almanac for 1662 ended the same way.[243] Trigge's removal of the table of kings and queens, after having put Cromwell in the previous one, suggested that he was denying Charles' accession to the throne; without a table, Trigge did not need to worry about including Charles II.

Chronologies offered readers a sense of the historical past through often extensive lists of important events in history and how many years had passed since they had happened. Some authors included items specific to the area in which they were working. Many included biblical and English historical information. This section provided authors with a place to express their political opinions by carefully selecting which incidents appeared.

George Rose's almanacs presented a good example of how authors altered their chronologies to respond to changing political situations. In his almanacs for 1659 and 1660, he provided an extensive chronology, using a lot of Civil War and Interregnum information. In 1661, he added the return of Charles II but kept the history of the last two decades. The almanac for 1662 represented a major change; not only did Rose remove major sections of material, but he also changed the wording on key events that were significant for Restoration England. For example, in the almanacs for 1659, 1660, and 1661, he described the death of Charles I as "the late king Charles beheaded." In 1662, his language changed, expressing anger about the event: "the late king Charles murthered." The notation of Oliver Cromwell's death changed as well; before 1662 Rose simply recorded his death. By 1662, Cromwell had become a "tyrant," the appropriate loyalist Restoration opinion of the lord protector.[244]

The monthly calendars were the third location authors could retell the past. Each month had one or two pages facing each other. The right-hand column usually contained one of three kinds of information: weather predictions, vague and inflammatory suggestions of plots against the government, or historical information about the last three decades. Providing readers with detailed information would have reminded them of what the crown wanted them to forget; the Civil Wars and Interregnum stayed in the historical memory of the people. Because these calendars were intended for everyday use, they provided constant reminders to the average citizen. Once censors discovered this device, they forced authors of all political beliefs to remove this kind of information. In his almanacs for 1658, 1659, and 1660, Riders outlined the

---

[242] Riders, 1658, sig. A5r; Riders, 1659, sig. A7r; Riders, 1660, sig. A5r; Riders, 1663, sig. A5r.

[243] Trigge, 1659, sig. A2r; Trigge, 1661, sig. C4v; Trigge, 1662, sig. C4v.

[244] Rose, 1659, sigs. B8r-C2v; Rose, 1660, sigs. B8r-C2v; Rose, 1661, sigs. B8r-C2v; Rose, 1662, sigs. B8r-C2v.

Civil Wars and Interregnum, with special attention to the events surrounding Charles I's imprisonment, trial, and execution in the January pages. By 1663 he had removed this information, using that right column for health advice instead.[245]

The republican almanac author John Tanner attempted to evade the censors by rearranging the location of his monthly observations. Although he did not use historical information in his almanac for 1659, he filled the monthly observations for 1660 and 1661 with data about the Civil Wars and Interregnum. However, in 1662 he reported to his readers that he had been forced to stop printing historical information in his almanacs: "*Here as before I'd writ a Chronology, / 'T would not be licenc'd by Authority. / I well contented am, why should the same / Page memorize our Glory and our Shame?*"[246] The statement was cleverly designed to be read in more than one way. Readers could assume that "our Glory" was the Restoration and the "Shame" the period before. However, given Tanner's political beliefs, he probably intended the reverse, considering Charles' return as "our Shame." Tanner did not obey the censors for long. In his next almanac (1663), he tried some visual deception and altered the layout of his monthly observations. Instead of using the far right column for his chronology, he transposed the two columns on the recto page, allocating the traditional place for historical facts to weather predictions and moon phases. Censors scanning the right column found nothing to concern them. Tanner also significantly reduced the amount of material he included in his chronology and chose events that suggested the larger points he was trying to make. For example, he did not record Charles I's death on 30 January, but he did note that the king had left London on 11 January 1641. He also mentioned the battle of Naseby in 1645 and the surrender of Oxford in 1646 as reminders of the Civil Wars. For February he acknowledged Monck's readmission of the secluded members in February 1660 and the dates of Charles II's birthday, return to England, and coronation.[247]

Censors did not target dissenting voices alone; John Gadbury, one of the most outspoken royalist almanac writers of the period and the author of several attacks on William Lilly discussed in Chapter One, also used the monthly observations to pack historical information into his almanac. Not surprisingly, Gadbury highlighted events and people significant to the royalist cause. He attempted to minimize the High Court's legal proceedings against Charles I by including other unrelated information in his January calendar between his references to Charles' appearances before the court. Just as Tanner removed the chronology from his almanac for 1662, so did Gadbury, leaving most of the right column blank.[248]

Poetry scattered throughout an almanac provided authors with another place to express

---

[245] Riders, 1658, sigs. A8v-B8r; Riders, 1659, sigs. A8v-B8r; Riders, 1660, sigs. A8v-B8r; Riders, 1663, sigs. A8v-B8r.

[246] Tanner, 1659, sigs. A4v-B8r; Tanner, 1660, sigs. A4v-C2r (three months are printed twice); Tanner, 1661, sigs. A4v-B84; Tanner, 1662, sigs. A5r-B8r.

[247] Tanner, 1663, sigs. A4v-B8r.

[248] Gadbury, 1661, sigs. A3v-B7r; Gadbury, 1662, sigs. A2v-B7r.

their views. Gadbury and Tanner supplied the best examples of the effective use of this form of political commentary. Throughout his almanacs Gadbury included loyalist verses that glorified the monarchy and denigrated Cromwell:

> When *Oliver*, Protector was proclaim'd,
> The *People* mus'd to hear the *Monster* nam'd:
> And when *He* pass'd through th'City, Men did stare!
> Some asking, *What's He?* Others, *Who goes there?*
> But when we did proclaim *Our Sov'raign KING*,
> The *Streets* were all on *Flames*; the *Bells* did ring:
> *All sorts of Men*, to sing *VIVE LE ROY*,
> Did *spoil their Hats*, and *tear their Throats*, for *Joy*![249]

In this stanza, Gadbury shifted legitimacy from Cromwell to Charles II using the citizens of London. Few people recognized Cromwell as he traveled in London; everyone rejoiced when Charles II, the prince England had not seen in over ten years, was proclaimed. He also used sound to distinguish between the two men. For Cromwell's travel through London, Gadbury implied that people queried each other in hushed tones or challenged him as someone might shout at a burglar in a dark house. In contrast, his description of Charles' passage was filled with joyous sounds of shouting for joy, singing, and bells tolling. Censors may not have realized that almanac authors employed verse in this manner; Gadbury's almanac for 1662 contained more political verse, some more vicious about Cromwell:

> Why should the Frantic Tribe thus troubled be
> That *Oliver* disgrac'd the Triple-Tree?
> The Gallows was more properly his own,
> Then ever *Britain's* sacred Crown and Throne.
> And if't be lawful for to murther Kings,
> Protectors (sure) may dance in Hempen-Strings.[250]

Gadbury touched on the republican dissatisfaction with Cromwell's rule; they felt he was not staying true to the original point of the Civil Wars – the establishment of a republic – and had become a monarch himself. Working from this point, Gadbury suggested to these radicals that if they could justify killing Charles as their sovereign king they should have rationalized Cromwell's execution as well.

Tanner expressed this discontent throughout his almanacs during the early Restoration. In his almanac for 1660, written in the fall of 1659, he evinced the republican lament that their goals of a republican government and the good old cause were being thrust aside for other

---

[249] Gadbury, 1661, sig. A2v. Gadbury used "spoil" in the sense of removing one's hat. *OED, s.v.* spoil.

[250] Gadbury, 1662, sig. A2v.

political ambitions:

> The People cry Reform, let us be free,
> The long Robe stinketh still of Monarchie;
> The Regal Title to the Law's best known,
> For Liberty, nor Freedom it can own:
> Give them th'old [sic] Title, or give us new Laws,
> Or farewell our *Free*-State and good old Cause.[251]

Surprisingly, he was even more daring in his almanac for 1661, presumably written well after the return of Charles II and the passage of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. In his monthly observations, Tanner used the top banner area for poems much like his contemporaries. For February, he included one of the strongest republican statements in early Restoration literature:

> *We knockt down King and House of Lords, hard fate!*
> *And we to building of a glorious State;*
> *Our builders quite deceiv'd us; so we lost*
> *What we desir'd, besides our pains and cost:*
> *Thus barmioss [barminess?] men, rockt in security,*
> *Are quickly overturn'd by treachery.*[252]

Tanner's placing of this poem in February on the verso side of the second page for January was a good way to avoid the censors. He did not run the risk of officials reading the poem proclaiming republican values at the top of the page and then scanning down to the mention of Charles I's death; however the placement on top the first February page, the verso of the second January page, connected well with the bottom of the recto side that cited Charles I's execution.

After several more poems with the same republican undertone, Tanner concluded his poetic politics with the last December poem, urging fellow republicans to keep quiet:

> *Thus have I with my blunt and rurall Rhymes,*
> *Sung forth the Changes of these giddy times:*
> *O that the great ones now would 'gin to see,*
> *Where'tu [unto] their Int'rest lyes! I wish that we*
> *Could see our Peace, our Safety, whats our best*
> *Estate, and all subscribe* quietus est.[253]

Tanner provided constant support for his republican ideas, even in this final poem encouraging

---

[251] Tanner, 1660, sig. A2r.

[252] Tanner, 1661, sig. A5v.

[253] Tanner, 1661, sig. B8r.

fellow republicans to stay out of the public eye. This warning was even more important in 1661 after Venner's rebellion in January that shook English confidence and most likely spurred religious and political legislation.[254] With these expressions of his opinions, Tanner's readership may have been small, restricted to republicans and other radicals. His reference to Nedham's *Interest Will Not Lie* would not please any supporter of the monarchy – no royalist reader wanted his almanac to tell him that Charles I's death had been a good thing.

Through an analysis of standard almanacs and the changes authors made in response to the Restoration, the preceding discussion has expanded Capp's examination of the political nature of seventeenth-century almanacs. Many almanac authors welcomed the Restoration and altered their publications, and hence the English calendar, to support the monarchy. However, Tanner made effective use of the same elements to express his discontent with the Restoration, lamenting the loss of the republican cause.

Conclusion

The success of altering the national calendar is hard to determine. Although the government incorporated 30 January as an official day of mourning into English historical memory, it provided for discussion of Charles I, whom various ministers suggested or stated outright had made mistakes during his reign. Censors had to restrain the republican Tanner and the zealous royalist Gadbury from employing information in their almanacs that reminded readers of the past, but they did not catch many of Tanner's other political avenues.

Conclusions

The government's attempt to shape English historical memory had mixed results. The Act of Indemnity and Oblivion was partially successful in its attempts to define the small number of men the government would hold accountable and punish for the crimes of the past two decades and the provision of a general pardon for most of the country, assuring that the relationship between sovereign and subjects would not have an element of fear about future recriminations.

However, the government was unable to convince some Englishmen to accept its narrowed list of the guilty. As the section "Whose Fault?" above has shown, many English authors had other ideas about who had been responsible. Moderate critics blamed distrusted religious minorities and the country as a whole. Asking the country to acknowledge and repent its participation in the Civil Wars, regicide, and Interregnum contradicted the government's narrow definition of the guilty but may have helped Englishmen better to come to terms with the past and help unite the loyalists in the country at the Restoration. Dissident critics, interested in Charles' return on their terms, wanted the monarchy to acknowledge Charles I's faults and role in the preceding conflicts. Henry Adis argued that Charles I should be a model for future kings to

---

[254] Hutton, *Restoration*, 150-52.

avoid; in a translation made before the Restoration, Robert Knightely suggested in *Alfrede* that Charles II would have to accept Charles I's mistakes before God would restore him to his father's throne. Subversive radicals, wanting to undermine the current government, argued that Charles I had been responsible for starting the Civil Wars and that his loss on the battlefield entitled his opponents to prosecute, convict, and execute the king. The tract *A Treatise of the Execution of Justice* segued from this argument to an attack on and call for the downfall of Charles II, making this pamphlet perhaps the most dangerous radical publication in the early Restoration. The censor Sir Roger L'Estrange and other officials understood the dangerous meanings of the *Treatise* and prosecuted its printer John Tywn for treason. Convicted by a jury containing some fellow printers, Twyn was sentenced to die a traitor's death.[255]

Perhaps the most obvious place for contemporaries to see how the Restoration altered English life was the national calendar. The Parliament established 30 January as a country-wide day of mourning for Charles I in an attempt to express its limited acknowledgment of the past. Despite lawmakers' best intentions, the first 30 January commemoration did not go as originally planned. Several ministers who printed their sermons for the occasion did not follow the Parliament's lead on how to define Charles. Instead, they posed moderate critical opinions that suggested in varying degrees of subtlety that Charles had not been the perfect monarch. They preferred to portray a more human and realistic Charles. Englishmen would have also noticed a change in their almanacs. Because they purchased these household items in the late fall of the previous year, they could have compared the current year to the next one and noticed how many authors voluntarily or under government orders altered their almanacs to suit the changing political situation.[256] Many places in these almanacs offered writers the opportunity to express their political beliefs; the royalist John Gadbury and the subversive radical republican John Tanner took advantage of the layout of the almanacs, particularly on the monthly calendar pages, to sneak in selected facts and verses supporting their causes.

Judging from the extant evidence, the government was also highly unsuccessful in convincing Englishmen that they should stop discussing past conflicts. The materials discussed throughout this chapter attest to this thesis. Despite the crown's best intentions, authors would not relinquish the right to use the past and grew more bold about it. In 1663 two of the most interesting and significant literary pieces set during the Interregnum appeared in bookstalls, both of which ignored the government's request to forget past conflicts. Ignoring the crown's plea to bury the crimes of the average citizen, the poet Samuel Butler created *Hudibras*, a moderate critic mock epic poem lampooning the political situation and religious freedoms of the Interregnum. His hero, the Presbyterian military officer Sir Hudibras, would have been just the type of person who would have benefitted from the pardon and the ability to prosecute those who would berate him for his record. The poet and playwright Abraham Cowley used the past to critique some of the monarchy's supporters as well as its opponents. Cowley's *Cutter of*

---

[255] *A Treatise of the Execution of Justice*; *An Exact Narrative of the Tryal and Condemnation of John Twyn*, 9-33. Harold Weber has confused the former tract with *Mene Tekel*. They are two separate pieces. Weber, 156.

[256] Capp, *Astrology*, 59.

Coleman Street, a moderate critic play set during the 1650s, satirized both the Interregnum and the Cavaliers' behavior before the Restoration. The piece addressed the concerns of the royalists who had lost their estates for their loyalty but suggested that although the opposition had been wrong, not all people calling themselves royalists had been honorable either. Although Butler published anonymously and did not list the printer or booksellers' names, Cowley issued *Cutter of Coleman Street* under his name from the first time it was printed.[257]

Perhaps part of the reason the government was unsuccessful in convincing Englishmen to accept its model of limited acknowledgment lay in its lack of legal backing for enforcing these ideas. First, the government could not have mounted a full campaign to enforce the provisions; it did not possess the financial or manpower resources. Parliamentarians understood this fact and built its acceptance into the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, shifting the responsibility for bringing charges to the individuals whose wartime or Interregnum records had been used to damage them. In addition, this provision lapsed after three years. For the Licensing Act passed in 1662, parliamentarians had the opportunity to put the full force of law and to put the appropriate censoring bodies into place to maintain its earlier commitment to keeping past conflicts out of the current discourse. Committed to stopping the printing and publication of "any heretical seditious schismatical or offensive Bookes or Pamphlets," the Act focused on establishing a licensing system for all printed materials that involved the offices of the highest ranking church and crown officials in the perusing and licensing process, regulating printers and booksellers and made them partially responsible for keeping illegal materials off the English market, and tightly controlling any books imported into England.[258]

Second, political leaders and the crown had more pressing concerns than some authors who wanted to use the past in their publications; as Richard Greaves has demonstrated, the early Restoration was a time of constant threat of radical activity considered far more dangerous than most publications. The government focused its attention on the publications that threatened the current monarchy and a few were radical enough to attract the attention of the government's main censor, Sir Roger L'Estrange, who used his authority to pursue printers and booksellers for distributing these seditious and treasonous materials.[259]

The result of the government's unwillingness to enforce its model or its inability to convince many Englishmen to accept it was the important presence of the Civil Wars, regicide, and Interregnum in the Restoration. This tension between the official view of the past and the various moderate critic, dissident critic, and subversive radical alternatives confirms the view

---

[257] Samuel Butler, *Hudibras, the First Part* (London, 1663); *Hudibras, the Second Part* (London, 1663); Abraham Cowley, *The Cutter of Coleman Street* (London, 1663). The best critical editions are: Samuel Butler, *Hudibras*, ed. John Wilders (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967); Darlene Johnson Gravett, ed., *A Critical Edition of Abraham Cowley's* Cutter of Coleman Street, *The Renaissance Imagination,* vol. 21 (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1987). Cowley will be discussed again in Chapter Three.

[258] 12 Car. II., c. 11; 14 Car. II., c. 33.

[259] Greaves, *DUFE*, passim and 207-25.

that the Restoration was accepted reluctantly by some and that some Englishmen did not want Charles to return, and furthers the argument that a wide range of loyal critical writers existed between the zealous royalists and the subversive and rebellious radicals. The tension also suggests that the early Restoration was not as stable as some historians have thought. Chapter Three examines the relationship between the crown and the people from the angle of Charles' promises and England's expectations for the returning prince, an area where Charles' inability to fulfill the most visible of his promises and the expectations placed on him, despite his completion of some of them, contributed to the tensions in this period.

CHAPTER THREE
PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES CREATE DISAPPOINTED EXPECTATIONS

This chapter will discuss three kinds of concerns Charles and his subjects had for the reestablishment of the monarchy.[260] Charles himself laid the groundwork for the first set of issues about a general pardon with his Declaration from Breda in which he attempted to attract the largest support base possible for his restoration. The second type of concern involved the king's behavior and rule. Economic issues, specifically the crown's revenue and the church and private lands sequestered or sold under pressure during the Civil Wars and Interregnum, comprised the third category.

This analysis will expand the general argument of this study by laying out more areas where moderate and dissident critics voiced opinions that commented on how the government sought to reconstruct the monarchy. Unlike the themes discussed in the first two chapters, the issues examined here impacted the general population far more than how some authors understood the Restoration in general, or how the government defined recent history in its limited acknowledgment of the past. The concerns in this chapter highlight another layer in the complex reactions to Charles' return and demonstrate that the national confusion was not an entirely intellectual issue.

In his Declaration from Breda, Charles wanted to connect with as many of his subjects as possible, making promises that should have appealed to his former enemies, most Protestants, and the Cromwellian soldiery.[261] He declared a "Free and General Pardon" for most of his subjects, intending to enable the country to move forward from the past. As Chapter Two has demonstrated, the Parliament's Act of Indemnity and Oblivion laid out the government's definition of the past, identified those whom the government would hold responsible, and asked Englishmen to negate the past in their memories.

---

[260] Issues about the religious settlement have been thoroughly discussed by Anne Whiteman, Robert Bosher, Ian Green, and John Spurr. Whiteman, "The Restoration of the Church of England;" Bosher; Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663*; Spurr.

[261] Keeble also discusses the Declaration from Breda but does not analyze Charles' promises and the attempts to fulfill them. Keeble, *Restoration*, 68-70.

Third, he averred that he would pay the army's arrears and accept Monck's soldiers into the royal army. Again, he demonstrated his desire to share these responsibilities with the Parliament, saying, "and We do further declare, That We will be ready to consent to any Act or Acts of Parliament to the purposes aforesaid, and for the full satisfaction of all Arrears due to the Officers and Soldiers of the Army under the Command of General *Monck*, and that they shall be received into Our Service upon as good pay and conditions as they now enjoy."[262] Despite the government's positive reaction to the soldiers, many Englishmen did not share this enthusiasm and regarded the soldiery with deep distrust and suspicion. Royalist authors manipulated the image of the Cromwellian soldier to their advantage, while radical pamphleteers tried to tap into the army's political tradition and convince soldiers to rise up and overthrow the monarchy.

Many English writers expressed expectations about how Charles would rule England and his personal conduct, concerned that the king should behave in a manner fitting an English prince and for the betterment of the kingdom. In the early Restoration, authors did not directly attack the sovereign; instead they chose to pressure him, trying to obligate him to rule well. Despite Charles' sexual behavior most Englishmen did not comment on the king's private affairs. By the end of 1662, the ruler had fulfilled part of the largest royal obligation, getting married, and was apparently pursuing the second part, producing an heir.

Both sovereign and subjects had high expectations of the English economy. Charles desired a stable revenue. Royalists wanted to recoup the lands they had lost during the past two decades. Land purchasers wanted to hold onto their acquisitions. Everyone wanted trade to improve. Surprisingly, the Parliament did not face a lot of opposition to its revenue-generating policies, in particular the re-application of the excise, one of the hated Interregnum revenue instruments, and the hearth tax which assessed all Englishmen on the basis of their heating and cooking fireplaces and stoves. The three major responses to these taxes were intended to be helpful, offering moderate critic perspectives in which the writers sought to explain why the government's policy was not beneficial for the country and how it could be fixed. The excise drew the ire of the Church of England minister Thomas Bradley, the rector of Castleford and Ackworth, who used his pulpit to decry the government's method of collecting this revenue, the tax farm. An anonymous manuscript poem lamented the legal damage the government was doing to the lower classes. Taking this idea further, one anonymous broadside poet used the hearth tax as a starting point for complaints regarding the aristocracy and warning the king that he should pay better attention to his government.

The controversy over lands sequestered and purchased from the church and royalists during the last two decades attracted more attention and bigger names to wage a publication battle over the legitimacy of the land sales and how they should be handled after the Restoration. Many royalists and churchmen were very concerned about recouping the lands they lost or were forced to sell during the last three decades and looked to the government to provide them satisfaction. Those who had acquired these lands, on the other hand, wanted to maintain their investments or at least make equitable arrangements for their continued enjoyment of the properties.

The conclusion will suggest that this discussion of problems in the early Restoration is a

---

[262] Ibid., 10.

needed expansion on Tim Harris' assessment of the period and should be added to Ronald Hutton's description of the growing problems after the end of his second Restoration settlement.

The Soldiers: Promise Fulfilled but a Remaining Negative Public Image

Even though Charles fulfilled his Breda promise and helped Parliament to pay and disband the army, a subject Lois Schwoerer covers in *No Standing Armies!*, the issue of the soldiers remained significant because some Englishmen thought they posed a serious threat to the security of the government. Schwoerer does not discuss the published reactions and attempts to manipulate the army through the press.[263] Radical and royalist authors had different agendas in their commentary on the soldiers, but the same negative image of these men emerged from their various publications. Rebellious radicals pushed for soldiers to oppose the restored monarchy. Royalists attempted to counter the military threat by demonstrating to their readers how dangerous the army men were and used one of two approaches to accomplish their goal. Some loyalist writers painted the army men as arrogant and cruel overlords who had demolished English liberties. At least one anonymous poet made this issue more personal and discussed the soldiers' damaging impact on the average citizens. The second solution to the military threat was to instruct the soldiers in proper behavior and their place in Restoration society. This tutelage probably reassured the average Englishmen that the soldiers would act accordingly more than it impacted the lives of the soldiers themselves.

The soldiers' condition before the Restoration was not advantageous. Due to inadequate tax revenues, the addition of more regiments to the payroll, and military units returning to England after service outside of the country, the financial burden was increasing rapidly. The government owed many arrears and chose to quarter many soldiers with families that had to bear that burden.[264] At least two dialogues parodying the Rump Parliament discussed the army's poor economic conditions and demonstrated the political leaders' lack of sympathy for and superior attitude to the soldiers. One anonymous author incorporated this situation into a dialogue parody of Colonel John Fleetwood, Sir Arthur Hasilrig, Sir Henry Vane, and Colonel John Lambert.[265] In this exchange between representatives of the soldiers and the four men busy playing cards, the soldiers asked for relief and Hasilrig reprimanded them:

> *Jest.* Sir *Arthur* many maimed *Souldiers* wait for you.
> *Arthur*, Let them wait and be hanged.
> *Pud*. Speak to them your self, youl please them.

---

[263] Lois G. Schwoerer, *"No Standing Armies!" The Antiarmy Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England* (Baltimore, MD and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974).

[264] Hutton, *Restoration*, 62-63.

[265] *A Phanatick Play* (London, 1660).

> *Hasl*. Who desires to speak with Arthur *Haslrig*?
> *Souldiers*. Your honors *Souldiers* for their Pention, we are all
> in arears fifteen Months.
> *Hasl*. You are no *Souldiers*, but a pack of rogues.
> *Soul*. It becomes not your honour to call all *Souldiers* Rogues.[266]

Through this section of dialogue the author demonstrated two sides of the soldiers' situation. First, his portrayal of Hasilrig showed the highly dismissive attitude many political leaders had toward the soldiers. Second, the soldiers' request for their "Pention" highlighted their bad economic condition. Hasilrig was a good choice for the villain in these lines; he had been a military officer, commanding Tynemouth Castle and watching Newcastle in 1648, before joining civilian attempts to control the army. During the uncertain times between Richard Cromwell's fall and Charles' return, Hasilrig had been one of the most important political figures who stood against the army and believed in military subordination to the civil state. From the soldiers' perspective, Hasilrig was a traitor to their cause, ending his support for the army when it was politically expedient. The piece above may have referred to Hasilrig's capacity as a member of the army council that supplanted Colonel Fleetwood as commander-in-chief of the army after the scandal of the Humble Representation and Petition, or as a colonel in the service.[267]

The Restoration government had many reasons to worry that disbanded soldiers would act against the state. Greaves has documented the role of some of these men in many of the major plots of the early 1660s. During the same period, government officials heard additional whispers about secret plots to overthrow the government involving former soldiers and groups of soldiers misbehaving. In August 1661 a Henry Garritt informed the crown that disaffected persons in London were attempting to bribe former soldiers for nefarious purposes: "There is a sort of people in London that disperse money to discontented soliers: and disperse themselves in the severall companyes of soldiers to seduce them."[268] Presumably these plotters intended to use the soldiers to protest against an important courtier intending to have him removed from the government as many had protested against the earl of Strafford: "they intend to pitch on some Courtier (as formerly on Strafford) and run the same Courses, under pretence of Evill Counsellors." In October 1661, a Will[iam] M. told government officials that one Master Brewer Thomas Moore told him of a planned uprising and expected many Cromwellian soldiers to take part: "He was confident they would carry it for there weare forty thousand old souldiers that would quickly take there partes, besides the Anabaptists and many of the Presbiterians weare

---

[266] Ibid., 5.

[267] Robert Ashton, *Counter-Revolution: The Second Civil War and its Origins, 1646-8* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), 366, 402, 437; Davies, 145; Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, 739-41.

[268] Greaves, *DUFE*; PRO, SP 29/40/42.

invyued [invited]."[269] Later that year Sir Philip Musgrave reported to Secretary Williamson that he had been having trouble with "a pack of disbanded Soldiers that weare nested here." A Sarah Morton petitioned Charles "on the bended knees of a most sorrowfull hart " for the pardon of her fiancée, a John Rydings, a soldier in George Monck, the duke of Ablemarle's, foot regiment. On Lord Mayor's day Ablemarle's troop had been ordered to assemble and during the event, a fight broke out where one man died. The local courts arrested, charged, and convicted Rydings and another man, an Edward Boardman.[270] If the soldiers could not assemble peacefully, they might not have been capable of behaving themselves among the civilian population either.

The Parliament agreed with Charles that disbanding the army should be a top priority for the restored government. By Midsummer 1660, the government owed the soldiers in England and Scotland at least £445,000 and the sailors at least £300,000 in arrears. During the summer of 1660, parliamentarians discussed how to pay and effect the dissolution of the Cromwellian army, reaching a final Disbanding Act on 13 September. Government officials proceeded to disassemble the army during the fall and finished their work in December. The government was able to pay the soldiers' arrears and one week's pay.[271]

Charles maintained his commitment to the soldiers throughout their disbanding. In his speech to both houses of Parliament on 13 September, Hyde praised Charles' commitment to the army's disbanding by arguing that Charles realized the best way to maintain the soldiers' affection was to disband them. He also pointed out that Charles was the only monarch in Europe who would have allowed his standing army to be dispersed, saying "no other Prince in Europe would be willing to disband such an Army; An Army to which Victory is entayled, and which, humanely speaking, could hardly fail of Conquest whithersoever He should lead it."[272]

Radicals Reach out to the Soldiers

Plain English was not the only radical tract that appealed to part of the military to prevent Charles II's return; the rebellious radical tract *Eye Salve for the English Armie, and Their Assistants* spoke to the rank and file, not the officer corps, and focused its argument on how the Restoration would impact their individual lives. The pamphlet strongly urged the soldiers to oppose Charles II's reinstallation, denigrated both kings, and laid out a series of legal, religious, and economic reasons why the monarchy's return would have a negative impact on the

---

[269] PRO, SP 29/43/89.

[270] PRO, SP 29/43/135; 29/45/59.

[271] Schwoerer, 74-78; Chandaman,, 197; 12 Car. II., c. 9; 12 Car. II., c. 10; 12 Car. II., c.16; 12 Car. II., c. 20; 12 Car. II., c. 27.

[272] *His Majesties Most Gracious Speech, Together with the Lord Chancellors, to the Two Houses of Parliament* (London, 1660), 4-7 (mspr. 6-9); Schwoerer, 74-78.

soldiers.[273]

In the beginning of the tract the author attempted to convince his readers that Charles I and Charles II were not worthy of their loyalty and the throne of England. Charles I had been an oppressor of English liberties and was guilty of starting the first English Civil War, charges other radicals leveled at him as well. The author charged Charles II with two kinds of offenses: supporting his father during the Civil Wars and committing his own transgressions against the Scottish Kirk, the republic, and the godly. According to the writer, Charles II had delivered war materiel to royalist troops "for which he was proclaimed a Traytor to the Common Libertyes of *England*." Afraid that the Parliament and Charles I might come to an agreement and end hostilities, Charles II had opposed the Treaty of Wight. Second, Charles had proven to be cruel and untrustworthy. After taking the Solemn League and Covenant at his Scottish coronation, he broke his commitment to the Kirk. He had invaded England and had countenanced the atrocities that his soldiers had committed. The author's last accusation, although dramatic, would have been harder to prove but worked well for this inflammatory tract. His warned his readers that Charles intended to destroy the godly in England:

> The visibility of his present designe to strike at the utter exterpation of all the Godly in the three Nations in various formes, under his and his friends new Coyned destinguishment of Phanaticks, looking upon the Presbiterians to be the greatest, from whose Pulpits all their late miseryes flowed, as many of his Friends in their Familiar discourses do frequently manifest; Though they say they are constrained to make use of them at present, and to that end many of them profanely say they are constrained to be out of measure Godly, yet in their private Quaffings, can drink healths to the Confusion of Sion.[274]

In this incendiary statement, the author carefully targeted the Presbyterians as well as members of the gathered churches by arguing Charles planned the "utter extirpation" of all godly people. He set out to attract Presbyterian attention in two ways. First, he explained that Charles lumped Presbyterians, the gathered churches, and the more radical groups into one category, an idea that would have angered many Presbyterians. Second, the author suggested that the royalists considered having Presbyterian allies as a necessary evil and would disassociate from them at the earliest convenient time.

After explaining why the Stuarts were not worthy of the soldiers' respect, the author attempted to convince the men and his readers that they should "abandon King and Lords Spirituall and Temporall." His fundamental reason for this course of action was the soldiers'

---

[273] *Eye-Salve for the English Armie, and Their Assistants* (London, 1660). *Plain English* warned Monck not to rely on the soldiers to oppose Charles II because they would become enamored with the "splendour of that *Gay Thing*." *Plain English*, 7.

[274] Ibid., 1-2 (mspr. 2-3).

own self preservation; the Stuarts wanted revenge on the army for its actions toward the Stuarts during the Civil Wars and Interregnum. Reinstituting monarchy would have serious religious and economic consequences. Under Charles II, the godly would not be allowed to worship as they saw fit. The soldiers would not receive their arrears because those funds would be diverted to pay the king's debts collected during his exile. Allowing a single person to rule also meant the continuation of monopolies which would lead to an economic decline for the country.[275]

The solution to these problems, the author told the soldiers, was the downfall of the monarchy and the establishment of a commonwealth. According to the author, this political system was in the best interest of the army men and society as a whole because this government would transform society by making advancement based on merit not birth and establish institutions designed to provide work for the poor to eradicate stealing and begging.[276]

Eye-Salve for the English Armie was a more dangerous tract than *Plain English* because the former's approach addressed the present situation. *Plain English* appealed to the past (the Long Parliament's Vote of no Address) to explain why Charles II should not return to the throne; *Eye-Salve* asked its readers to consider the present and the negative impact a restoration would have on their lives. The former reminded people of the past; the latter tried to motivate the soldiers to resist actively.

Royalists' Reactions: Condemnation and Control

In their desire to make good use of the army in their arguments, some royalist authors employed two methods for persuading their readers that the army had been and still was dangerous. First, several poets conjured images of the army's rough handling of England and the potential danger soldiers posed currently. Second, a few writers tried to instruct the soldiers on how to behave in this new era. These pieces, a short dialogue and two sermons, however, were intended to ensure the civilians that the soldiers could be tamed and would not pose a future threat.

Before the Restoration, an anonymous poet published *A New Ballade, To an Old Tune*, a broadside that commented on the current behavior of the soldiery intending to scare Englishmen with a representation of the present danger the soldiers presented.[277] Taking the voice of a Cromwellian soldier becoming restless for lack of pay, the poet portrayed the soldiers as mercenaries willing to use their sword to effect any political change that would benefit them. At the beginning and end of the poem the poet repeated the soldiers' desire for pay as the only motivation for their service: "'*Tis the Cash does the Feat*, / *All* the rest'*s but* a Cheat, / *Without* That *there's no* Faith, *nor* Quarter." Moreover, the poet began to suggest that these soldiers would fight for anyone with the money to pay them:

---

[275] Ibid., 3-4 (mspr. 4-5).

[276] Ibid., 4 (mspr. 5).

[277] *A New Ballade, To an Old Tune* (London?, 1660?). The broadside bears the handwritten date of 17 January 1659.

When our Masters are Poor, we Leave 'em,
'Tis the *Golden Calf* we bow to:
We Kill, and we slay,
Not for Conscience, but Pay;
Give us That, we'll fight for you too.[278]

In these lines the author intimated that the soldiers were worse than followers of the Parliament; they were godless. The golden calf reference signified to the readers that the soldiers did not worship the Judeo-Christian God anymore, preferring money instead, just as the Hebrews had forsaken God and revered the idol Aaron had made in Exodus 32:4. They carried out war not in God's name but for cash. Because they fought for material gain only, they did not care what side they served as long as their masters could pay them. This image of the godless mercenary struck home in the final stanza where the author made explicit the underlying danger that the soldiers would put into power whomever they felt could best provide for them:

If our *Masters* w'ont supply us,
With *Mony*, *Food* and *Clothing*:
Let the *State* look to't.
We'll find one that will do't.[279]

Although probably published before the middle of January, 1660, this piece could have been available in the bookstalls and up in taverns well into 1660. The threat was more dangerous than most of the radical pieces published in this period; it meant the overthrow of the Stuart monarchy. However, the poem intended to convince the readers how dangerous the soldiers were to the peace of the country.

In the omnibus verse collection *Merry Drollery* (1661), a few poets published pieces against the military that demonstrated the memory of past army control and the fear of future military rule in England. The poem "The Power of the Sword" examined the triumph of the sword over the word and how the army could determine what words could be used by disabling the traditional Church of England and providing a place for mechanic preachers to fill the pulpits with their language. The poet told his readers that the army had triumphed:

Lay by your pleading, Law lies a bleeding,
Burn all your Studies down, and throw away your reading;
Small power the Word has, & can afford us
Not half so many Privledges as the Sword has:
It fosters your Masters, it plasters Disasters,
And makes your Servants, quickly greater than their Masters;
It venters, it enters, it circles, it centers,

---

[278] Ibid.

[279] Ibid.

And makes a Prentice free in spight of his Indentures.[280]

Law and social order, symbolized by words, were trampled by the military, embodied in the sword. The army flipped the traditional social order by putting servants over their masters and allowing apprentices to break their contracts with their employers. The author of another anonymous poem, "Mardike," agreed with the previous poet that the army wrought destruction on the traditional social order, saying:

> It is the Sword that doth order all,
> Makes Peasants rise, and Princes fall;
> All Syllogisms in vain are split,
> No Logick like a basket hilt;
> It handles 'um joynt by joynt, Sir.[281]

In this analogy, logic was no match for the sword, which was stronger than the written word. The sword also transposed the social order by raising the peasants and subverting the rulers. The image here pitted a syllogism, a system for presenting arguments, against a blade that sliced through the syllogism, separating the three major parts of the argument at the "joynt[s]."

The author of the broadside poem *England's Joy* expressed a more detailed perspective on the army's behavior. The soldiers in this piece did not subvert traditional English society but extracted money and goods from the people. Intended to make contact with the average reader, this approach should have struck a chord with many readers who remembered the army treating them and their communities badly:

> We will not Garrisons of Lubbers feed,
> To plunder, drink, and gather pay,
> While they lye lazing, and are both agreed
> To fetch our goods and us away;
> And although they Swear,
> We will not care,
> Nor to such Skowndrells servile be;
> We will not stand,
> With Cap in hand,
> Beseeching them to let alone
> The goods which justly are our own.[282]

---

[280] "The Power of the Sword," in *Merry Drollery* (London, 1661), 120 (mspr. 118). The title page has no printed date but bears the handwritten year 1661.

[281] "Mardike," in *Merry Drollery*, 7 (mspr. 5).

[282] *Englands Joy for the Coming in of Our Gratious Soveraign King Charles the II* (London, 1660).

Rallying the readers, the speaker defiantly stated that England would not be subject to the "Garrison lubbers" any longer; for Charles' return had ended the military's dominance of the government. This stanza evinced deep anger toward the "Skowndrells," the men who did nothing useful for the communities and wasted their time drinking and stealing Englishmen's goods. Englishmen would no longer beg the soldiers to stop stealing from them. Although the poet did not portray these soldiers as motivated enough to turn England upside down, he successfully reminded readers of the dangers they had wrought on the average citizen.

Perhaps the most clever piece of anti-army literature was a poem that pretended to be a kind look at the life of a soldier and his predicament after the Restoration. The broadside *Lamentation of a Bad Market*, however, was a poem intended to ridicule soldiers and suggest to its readers that these men deserved the obscurity they found after Charles' return. The refrain, "Alas poor Souldier, whither wilt thou march?" ended each stanza on a condescending note and reminded readers that they should not have any sympathy for the army men.[283]

The poet described the army's misdeeds in blunt terms, painting the soldiers as mindless killing machines: "*Brittain* these 18 years has known my desperate slaughter, / I've killed ten at one blow, even in a fit of laughter / Cone [Gone] home again and smil'd, and kiss'd my Landords Daughter." The army destroyed the monarchy for material gain and established peace to protect what it had taken from England: "When we had *murdered* King, confounded Church and State, / Divided *Parks* and *Forests*, *Houses*, *Money*, *Plate*, / We then did Peace desire to keep what we had gat." The poet also discussed the fertile ground the army proved to be for various religious groups including the Quakers and for creating mechanic preachers who spread their gospel wherever the army went.[284]

More importantly than this recitation of the army's past wrongs, the poet spelled out another reason why Englishmen did not like the army men; the soldiers reminded them of the Civil Wars and Interregnum:

> Some say I am forsaken
> by the great men of these times,
> And they're no whit mistaken,
> it is my Fate
> to be out of date [?]
> my Masters most are guilty of such crimes;
> Like an old Almanack I now but represent,
> How long since *Edge-hill* fight, or the Rising was in *Kent*,
> Or since the dissolution of the first Long-Parliament.[285]

Employing a simile between the soldiers and almanacs was a suitable choice because as

---

[283] *Lamentation of a Bad Market* (London, 1660).

[284] Ibid.

[285] Ibid.

discussed in Chapter Two, almanac writers often provided extensive historical information, particularly about the seventeenth century, that could evoke memories the government rather Englishmen not remember. The author's choice of the battle of Edgehill was appropriate for this situation, allowing him to demonstrate how the soldiers reminded Englishmen of the royalist losses during the first Civil War or of the beginning of it all.

The absence of any wit or grace in these verses suggested that a deep seated bitterness and ability to relate to the sentiments evinced explained anyone publishing or purchasing these poems. Acquiring, reading, and repeating these broadsides helped perpetuate the negative stereotype of the Cromwellian soldier and probably encouraged the continued anger toward the army.

Several authors used the press to instruct the soldiers on how they should behave in the Restoration. An anonymous dialogue published in 1661 titled *Robin Hood and His Crew of Souldiers* attempted to show the army that it should accept the Restoration and stop posing any threat to the government.[286] Set in the few weeks before a coronation, this piece portrayed a discussion between the sheriff's representative and Robin Hood and his men. During the conversation, the messenger convinced Robin Hood that the king was not oppressing the people and that his rule brought freedom to the citizens. Miraculously, Robin Hood decided to give up being an outlaw and become loyal to the king, saying "I am quite another man; thaw'd into conscience of my Crime & Duty; melted into loyalty & respect to vertue."[287] Soldiers should learn from Robin Hood's example by becoming loyal to the crown. The analogy to the Restoration was unmistakable but the expectation that the army would take responsibility for its past actions was perhaps unrealistic and linked this piece with the anti-army materials that set out to show the military's culpability and to the sermons discussed below that tried to explain what the soldiers' role was post Interregnum.

Two Church of England ministers used their pulpits to address the soldiers and explain to them how they should comport themselves in this new era. However, the audiences for these sermons were not soldiers but citizens concerned about the army. John Paradise, an author of one of the anniversary sermons discussed in Chapter Two, told his congregation that

> Souldiers of all men, have most need of Loyal Instruction, that it may be an *Antidote* against the *Poyson* of the Temptations arising from a *military Employment*. All is fish that cometh to net with Sword-men, they are apt to put no difference between the *Princes Robes* and the *Peasants Russet*; they are so accustomed to Instruments and Acts of Cruelty, that *immanity* becomes *natural to*, and *habituated in* them.[288]

---

[286] *Robin Hood and His Crew of Souldiers* (London, 1661).

[287] Ibid., sig. B2r. The piece did not indicate whose coronation, Richard or John's.

[288] Paradise, 23. "Immanity" from "immane" is an obsolete term meaning cruel or monstrous. *OED, s.v.* "immane."

Paradise argued that serving in the army caused men to become vicious by nature and therefore in need of reeducation for civil society. He based his idea of this "Loyal Instruction" on Luke 3:14 and 1 Samuel 24:6-7 which included refraining from hurting anyone, accepting their pay, and acknowledging the supremacy of the civil power over the military.[289] John Price, minister of Hollowell in Oxford University, felt similarly to Paradise and did not offer the soldiers any sympathy, instead admonishing the soldiers for the army's past actions, saying

> I tell you what you did before, you rul'd us with a rod of Iron, every one of your swords was turned Scepter, and every one of you a Tyrant. You behaved your selves like an army of Turkes and Saracens, rather then like a Christian civilized army, you scar'd us into a forced compliance, [and] all were afraid of you.

With this parallel, Price used a misinformed stereotype to denigrate the soldiers, comparing them to the blasphemous and infidel Muslims. After this thrashing, Price told the soldiers that they should know their place in society, particularly their obedience to their commanders and their acceptance of their pay.[290]

Conclusion

The pieces discussed in this section indicated that the army was a more important issue to contemporaries than modern scholars have realized. Both radical and royalist authors maintained the growing negative stereotype of the ragged and disloyal Cromwellian soldier. Two major radical tracts, *Plain English* and *Eye-Salve for the English Armie* reinforced the idea that Cromwellian soldiery was a good audience for radical diatribes against the monarchy. Some royalist poems reinforced this image with derogatory images of these soldiers, painting them as mercenaries willing to listen to sectaries and working for anyone who would pay them, regardless of the legitimate government. The royalist ministers John Paradise and John Price tried to reassure their listeners and readers that the soldiers no longer posed a threat to Restoration society by instructing military men in how they should behave in post-Interregnum England. Despite Charles' ability to keep this commitment to the soldiers in his Declaration from Breda, this issue remained an important one in the early Restoration.

Advising Charles II on How He Should Be

Gilbert Sheldon, Anglican divine, dean of the Chapel Royal, and the future bishop of

---

[289] Paradise, 24.

[290] John Price, *The Christians Excellency*, in *Four Sermons Preached in Oxford* (Oxford, 1661), 35-36.

London, warned Charles II that the king could not escape his subjects' scrutiny; everything the monarch did would be judged, regardless of the king's culpability. Charles would have to learn how to handle this attention.[291] Although the Restoration became famous for sometimes scathing satire directed at the king in such pieces as the "Instructions to the Painter" series and the earl of Rochester's works,[292] the early 1660s did not experience this. Authors chose to pressure the king to behave well through three main approaches: explaining how his history should make him a better sovereign, telling him their expectations for his rule, and reminding him of his duty to God.

Charles did not have a typical experience growing up as the prince of Wales. Considering his extended absence from England and the throne, Charles' preparation for the position was far from clear. Several authors used the situation to their and the king's advantage; by explaining how his unusual royal life had been a good training for the throne, these writers could use these circumstances to pressure the king to live up to the standards for which his life had prepared him. Edward Willan attempted to alleviate this problem by enumerating Charles' educational experiences. Charles II's first tutors had been the Church of England and Charles I's court, far more practical teachers than most political thinkers then available in print. Through his own experiences and his *To the Prince of Wales*, Charles I had instructed his son in kingship. In his education for the throne, Charles II had watched his father struggle with the Parliament and face execution on charges of tyranny. God had taken control of the third part of Charles' education, preparing the young prince by teaching him the lessons of hardship: "God himself, for divers yeares, was pleased to School him with the *Severer Discipline* of sad Providences."[293] Many authors echoed Willan's insistence that Charles' exile had been a positive learning experience for the young prince that had been necessary for England to turn out as it did. Through discussing Charles' "School of Afflictions," these authors insisted that this part of the past could not be forgotten and was necessary for England to prosper in the future.

Redefining what was important for kings to know before taking the throne, several authors turned Charles' lack of traditional education to his advantage. Edmund Waller assured the king that his experiences taught him to govern by watching how various continental states

---

[291] Gilbert Sheldon, *Davids Deliverance and Thanksgiving* (London, 1660), 5, 11. See Keeble for a discussion of contemporary descriptions of the monarch. Keeble, *Restoration*, 58-64.

[292] There is a large body of criticism available on Restoration authors and the use of satire, including John M. Wallace, *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968); Warren L. Chernaik, *The Poetry of Limitation: A Study of Edmund Waller* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968); Annabel M. Patterson, *Marvell and the Civic Crown* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); David M. Vieth, ed., *John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester: Critical Essays* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1988); Marianne Tormählen, *Rochester: The Poems in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.)

[293] Willan, 33-34.

operated: "We have you now with ruling wisdom fraught, / Not such as Books, but such as Practice taught."[294] The anonymous author of *To the King, upon His Majesties Happy Return* reassured Charles that his exile experience had made him a stronger person and ruler. His enemies wanted to tarnish Charles, but the challenges had made Charles more resilient. The writer's analogy for how Charles survived under mistreatment found parallels between Charles' enemies and pagan Roman emperors, and Charles with early Christianity: "Thus Persecution did but more dispense / Throughout the World the Gospels influence."[295] The poet created a dichotomy between people under God's protection and people working against God's wishes. With God's help, Charles was building his support base while in exile as more Englishmen realized that his return would be better than the current government.

Two Anglican ministers addressed this issue of Charles' past hardships, using the approach to pressure the king into ruling well. In his coronation sermon Bishop Morley told his sovereign that the monarch's previous absence should make him a better ruler, saying "Princes that are bred up in that *School* of *Affliction*, are commonly much more prudent, and patient, and wary, and thrifty, and more inclinable to Piety, to Charity, to Clemency, to Modest, and Moderation in time of *Prosperity*, and to all other Moral and Religious Vertues, then they would be otherwise."[296] By reminding Charles of the past, Morley tried to obligate his sovereign to behave well in the future. He was holding the prince accountable before the country.

Although the Anglican minister Francis Gregory agreed with Morley that the sovereign's past would be beneficial and fundamental for ensuring Charles was "more fit to govern," he did not lay the same expectations upon the monarch as the bishop had, instead arguing that all rulers did not live up to the great expectations of the people to rule well. Because Charles had experienced exile, he was less likely to become a tyrant. However, Gregory changed his approach at this point and commented that all rulers were a little tyrannical sometimes:

> Surely, it is hard for *Princes* to keep exactly within the bounds of justice, tis naturall for *mountaines* to *crush*, for *milstones* to *grind* to powder. When *power* is exercised without *controll*, it is too apt to degenerate into *oppression*. He, that meets with no interruption in his Government, is a rare man, if being a *King*, he proves not, in some degree, a *Tyrant* too. David, one of the *best* of princes, becommeth an *oppressour*, as well as *Ahab*, one of the *worst*.[297]

Gregory did not give Charles much of a chance to conduct a lawful government; he seemed to be

---

[294] Edmund Waller, *To the King, upon His Majesties Happy Return* (London?, 1660), 3 (mspr. 5).

[295] *To the King, upon His Majesties Happy Return* (London, 1661), 2.

[296] Morley, 53.

[297] Gregory, 20.

telling Charles that he would slip but that slipping was natural. The message to the readers informed them that Charles would go beyond his boundaries but so did David and that they could not expect him to abide by the rules all of the time. Gregory did not hold his sovereign up to the high standard that Morley did; instead he excused future infractions before they happened. Comparing Charles with the biblical King David was a common Restoration device; in this case Gregory justified what he thought would be Charles' future actions by arguing that the best biblical princes did not rule appropriately at times. His use of this comparison presented both men in a less than flattering light, perhaps intending to remind Englishmen to look beyond of the flattering rhetoric available in the press.

Many royalist authors shared the same general expectations of Charles, arguing that the monarch would bring peace and prosperity back to England. The materials discussed in Chapter One that described Charles' restoration as a renewal or "revolution" illustrated the more general type of these expectations. For example, the broadside poem *A Pair of Prodigals Returned* presented the most vague articulation of this formula, saying "These Nations did flourish, 'tis true, brother *Scot*, / In those blessed days of yore, / But *Charles* restored will soon place our lot / In the self-same ground as before."[298] Nathaniel Hardy, the rector of St. Martin in the Fields, laid out three main expectations for Charles' rule. First, Charles should maintain the correct religious law. Second, the king should work to extirpate crime. Third, and most vague, the monarch should provide the kingdom with "peace and quietness."[299] One anonymous broadside poet explained that Charles' return would bring everything good to England:

> Rejoice, brave Brittans now for Charls our King
> Is coming home, into his Realms to bring
> Peace, Piety, and Plenty, Law and Love,
> Religion, Justice, and what else may move
> Your hearts to exultations; Trade, and Arts
> Shall flourish more than ever, in all parts
> Of his Dominions, and we shall be free
> As well in Conscience, as propriety.

The poet promised his readers that Charles' return would make their dreams reality. Laying out these qualities he argued that had been absent in England without the monarch and his return would bring them into the kingdom. However, his formulation was not the typical royalist position; the poet added a statement of religious toleration, "we shall be free / As well in Conscience," to this general revival.[300]

Ames Short, a dissenting minister in Lyme Regis, presented his listeners and readers with

---

[298] *A Pair of Prodigals Returned*.

[299] Nathaniel Hardy, *The Apostolical Liturgy Revived*, 28-29.

[300] W.L., *Good News from the Netherlands* (London?, 1661). The broadside bears the handwritten date of 31 May 1661.

an extensive list of what England should expect from the returning monarch. For Short, Charles had already done England great service by his reestablishment of the legitimate monarchy:

> At present [we have been] freed from our feares and dangers of being *haressed* by the attempts of every *aspiring*, *ambitious Adonijah*, to make himselfe King. We need not now to feare the aspiring ambition either of a *Cromwell* or a *Lambert.* Nor need we now feare of being kept in bondage and slavery by an inconsiderable part of a *Parliament*, or a *Phanatick Committee of saftey* under the notion *of a free State, or Commonwealth.*[301]

However, Short had other expectations for the sovereign, presenting him with a seven-part list of what he felt Charles would give England. He told the country that he had seen every indication that Charles would decrease the country's tax burden by eliminating the excise tax and monthly assessments. Second, he felt that Charles shared his vision of the Church of England, one free from "soul-destroying and damning universall tolleration." Although Short wanted unity in the church he also believed that England needed further reformation, his seventh requirement for the restored monarchy. Charles would reestablish the English monarchy based on "our antient Government of King, Lords and Commons," the definition of the three estates adopted from the *Answer to the Nineteen Propositions*. Charles would promote peace, law, justice, and "liberty of our persons" for all of his subjects. The sovereign was also responsible for resurrecting England's honor and rightful place in Europe. Charles would also support a "thorough reformation" in the Church of England and an end to splits in the English protestant community.[302]

Several ministers used Charles' relationship with God to obligate the monarch to rule and behave well. William Cole, a minister in Preston, Lancashire, told the assembled congregation on 24 May 1660 that God had promised England a good king: "The *Qualification* of the persons God doth promise shall weild the Scepter of Authority: they shall be such as *Moses* and *Joshua,* and *David*, and *Solomon*." God would not give England someone unequal to the task:

> If God do restore to a people such a Government, then their Government is vested in the hands of such as have parts and abilities from God for the fitting of them to manage their Authority. God had put the spirit of Government upon *Moses* and *Joshua*, and *David*, and the whole earth came to hear the Wisdom of *Solomon*."[303]

---

[301] Ames Short, *God Save the King* (London, 1660), 30-31. Short preached this sermon on 18 May, the day of Charles' proclamation as king.

[302] Ibid, 31-35.

[303] William Cole, *Noah's Dove with Her Olive Branch* (London, 1660), 11, 23.

Although Cole's formulation seemed to praise Charles as a capable ruler, these sentiments also laid a heavy expectation upon the monarch to live up to the high standards Cole had set. Since God had chosen Charles to rule England, he must behave accordingly. The intruded minister and fellow of Corpus Christi, Cambridge, John Spencer tried to pressure his sovereign by reminding Charles of his miraculous return to England and God's expectations for all rulers. Spencer argued that the manner of Charles' restoration was the reason that he would make a good king. God, the primary agent of the return, provided kingdoms that had experienced bad times with worthy kings to help them heal and Charles' innate good qualities of mercy and truth would be the basis of his rule.[304]

Dissenter and dissident critic Henry Adis also used this tactic when addressing Charles. He told his sovereign to think about all that God had done for him in his restitution and contemplate whether he had repaid God adequately:

> This then may serve for a Use to great ones; and first, to thy self, O King, to Exhort thee in the Name and Fear of Cod [sic!], seriously to consider particularly what God hath done for thee, how God hath preserved thee both abroad and in this Land of thy Nativity; and let me humbly beg thee once again; seriously to consider the *Hollow Oak*, and that little Vessel which rides in thy constant view, and those that were acting in and by them, for thy personal preservation (the which, if report be true, thou hast in a great measure already done, which is very commendable) But this is that, O King, that I am chiefly pleading for, that thou wouldst endeavour to look *through and beyond them, even to the Finger and Power of that God that wrought in and by them*; not only for thy Temporal, but also (if though beest not wanting to thy self) for *thy Eternal preservation*, if thou dost make *suitable Returns to him*; that so *wrath may not follow*.[305]

In this passage, Adis reminded Charles of the extraordinary circumstances of his escape from Worcester, referencing the oak tree that hid the prince and the ship that carried him away from England and out of immediate danger. However, he argued that Charles should reward the earthly agents of his survival and praise the heavenly reason these items, and by extension, people, who were able to help him. If Charles did not recognize, acknowledge, and thank God for his deliverance, God would punish the sovereign and put the ruler's salvation into question. For Adis, the idea of "*suitable Returns*" may have had a more acute meaning, suggesting that Charles should repay God by not persecuting dissenters, to "*leave men to their Liberties*." In the second part of his address to the king, Adis planted the beginnings of this subtle threat when he informed Charles that if the sovereign did not rule as God thought he should, then God would

---

[304] John Spencer, *The Righteous Ruler* (London, 1660), 38-47.

[305] Adis, *A Fannaticks Mite*, 35.

remove him from the throne: "*for if thy Actings* shall not *answer Gods End (if his Word be true)* thou must then expect a *removal*, and a *pulling down*."[306] For Adis, Charles would lose his crown if the ruler did not follow Adis' idea of what God wanted the prince to accomplish. Very likely Charles did not agree with Adis, but he would have understood the threat the above pieces carried.

Charles should worry about his behavior and public persona because God judged everyone on the same criteria. The sovereign was human, and Bishop Morley felt the responsibility to remind his king of his fragile existence, saying "he is to devest himself of all his *Majesty*, and to look upon himself as made of the same *Clay*, and of the same *brittle Constitution* that other men are; that he came into the world as other men did, and must go out of the world as other men do." God would assess Charles II as he adjudicated all other men, and for this reason Charles should monitor his behavior. Morley offered Charles a short list of guidelines that would prevent him from making mistakes that would cost him in the final judgement: control his passions, learn to understand his feelings and experiences correctly, and do not give into temptation.[307]

Charles' personal behavior raised another issue for some writers: his viability as a role model for Englishmen. English princes should behave appropriately because they were models for their subjects to emulate. Morley told Charles that monarchs should be good examples for the people to follow. To encourage the growth of the country, Charles should reward his subjects for good service in the Church of England and in the national government, thus encouraging his people to recognize those further down the socio-economic scale, thereby passing on the king's blessings throughout the kingdom.[308] In the tragedy, *Andromana*, perhaps erroneously attributed to James Shirley and first published in 1660, the playwright attempted to demonstrate the importance of the king in the kingdom's moral fabric with a short scene between King Euphorbas and his son. The king wanted to scare his son Plangus from continuing an affair with a married woman, Andromana, by instructing his son in his proper role as a prince. Euphorbas explained that if kings did not behave appropriately, neither would the kingdom:

> What will this world come to at last!
> When Princes that should be the patterns of all virtue
> Lead up the dance to vice.
> What shall we call our owne, when our owne wives
> Banish their faith, and prove false to us.[309]

---

[306] Ibid., sig. B2r-v.

[307] Morley, 46-47.

[308] Ibid., 50.

[309] J.S., *Andromana* (London, 1660), sig. B4v (mspr. B3v). *Andromana* was probably written in the early 1640s but not published until 1660; the play was listed in the Stationer's register on 19 May 1660 and perhaps incorrectly attributed to Shirley. Randall, 253-54. The text

Euphorbas suggested that rulers were the moral benchmark for the kingdom. If the monarch was the "pattern of all virtue," then the people would lead good lives. On the other hand, if the sovereign lacked character and behaved immorally, the people would take his actions as permission to act as they would like. Shockingly, wives would no longer consider fidelity part of their marital obligations and the right order of society would be subverted. After the king's marriage to Catherine of Braganza in 1662, readers may have begun to associate these lines with the king himself, thinking that the prince's own behavior might lead to the infidelity of his wife, a dangerous situation if Charles wanted to ensure any children were his. Before his wedding and during the early years of his marriage Charles carried on what became a publically known affair with Barbara Villiers, the cousin of the duke of Buckingham and the wife of Robert Palmer, whom Charles created the earl of Castlemaine after the affair had been well underway. She bore the king a child in the spring of 1661.[310]

Conclusion

Charles' return presented Englishmen with the opportunity to impress upon the king their expectations of his behavior and the writers surveyed in this study chose to pressure the king through rhetoric instead of deriding him through satire. Several royalists tried to explain that the prince's unusual life had been good preparation for his current role, hence implying that if he did not govern well then he was not drawing what he should have from his experiences. Other more bold authors addressed their sovereign directly and told him how they felt he should conduct his administration. Reminding Charles of his obligations to God was the third popular way for pressuring the king for both royalist Bishop Morley, whose coronation sermon gently admonished the sovereign to rule well and reminded him that God and England would be watching his rule, and the dissenting minister Henry Adis who warned Charles that if the king did not follow what God wanted God would remove him from the throne.

Economic Considerations

At the Restoration, Englishmen had concerns about the economy. The government had heavy debts and expenses from running the newly formed administration. Arrears owed to the armed forces have been discussed above; the administration also inherited at least £530,000 of

---

did not provide a printer, but the seller was John Bellinger, a London bookseller with a shop in Cliffords Inn Lane, Fleetstreet. Henry Robert Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers Who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* (London: Printed for the Bibliographic Society, Blades, East, & Blades, 1907), *s.v.* John Bellinger. Before *Andromana*, Bellinger had not put his name on many pieces; perhaps the only other piece was the proceedings of the Court of Sewers for London. *Sewers London* (London, 1653).

[310] Hutton, *Charles II*, 186-88.

Charles I's debts and £320,000 in bills from the various Interregnum governments. Charles II also brought the financial obligations collected during his exile.[311] Many in the Church of England desired the return of lands taken from the church in recent decades. Royalists who had suffered for their loyalty wanted the crown to help them retake the estates that had been sequestered from them.

These economic issues affected all levels of English society. Everyone would benefit from a prosperous economy. The crown desired a steady income capable of funding the government. Church officials worried about recouping the land that wartime leaders had taken from the church and sold to laymen. Royalists who had been sequestered or had chosen to sell their estates to protect them from sequestrations wanted to regain their former lands. Englishmen who had purchased these church and private lands were interested in maintaining their investments or making suitable arrangements for their continued enjoyment of them.

This section will examine two aspects of the Restoration economy: the moves to establish a regular revenue and the struggles surrounding the land issue. Evidence in this part will suggest that the government's implementation of taxes did not generate much complaint in the press; the two moderate critic voices discussed in this section were interested in supporting the monarchy but felt that the administration was not approaching the important economic questions from the right perspective. The second part will investigate the issue of the lands sequestered and sold under pressure before the Restoration. The struggle over the rights to church land ownership headed by the royalist John Gauden, arguing for the return of these lands, and the dissenting minister Cornelius Burgess pressing for the rights of the purchasers, generated an important part of the debate over the nature of the English church. Authors writing about private estates either tried to convince those who had lost their lands to stop worrying about the past or used the stage to present solutions to this issue that benefitted both sides.

Establishing a Regular Revenue

Establishing a regular revenue for the crown was one of the most important concerns the Convention and Cavalier Parliaments faced. Two of the government's taxes generated small comment in the press: the excise and the hearth tax. The moderate critic opponent of the excise was the Church of England minister Thomas Bradley, former chaplain to the duke of Buckingham and Charles I and brother-in-law of the royalist earl of Sussex, who used his pulpit to speak out against what he saw as major abuses in the government's use of tax farming to collect the excise.[312] One anonymous poet used the hearth tax as a platform for attacking the inadequacy of this imposition, and the aristocracy, who did not suffer as much as the lower classes.

Some ministers specifically encouraged their congregations to support their king financially. The Scottish minister John Paterson told his readers to

---

[311] Chandaman, 199.

[312] Old *DNB, s.v.v.* Thomas Bradley, Sir John Savile, Thomas Savile.

> be content to beare *Burthens* for a time, to pay publique *Assesses* & *Impositions*, which yet the *Necessity* and *Condition* of affairs call for. What was payed to *Usurpers*, let non [none] grudge to pay to Our just *KING*, for the great *Affaires* of the *Kingdom*. [313]

Royalist minister Lawrence Womock was more strident; he told his congregation that they had a responsibility to support their king with everything they owned, saying they "must water it [the crown] with your Estates" and citing Romans 13:5-7 to explicate the subjects' duty to their king. Explaining why the government needed the people's financial support, Womock said:

> the needs of the Crown must be supplyed, the charges defrayed, the State and Grandeur of it supported. We must share in the burden, if we would share in the honour and benefit; and unless we do support it, it cannot protect us.[314]

Womock made the people partially responsible for the successful production of the state. If they did not endorse the government, then the administration would not be strong enough to provide for the people.

The Excise. The excise was part of the government's solution for replacing the revenue lost to the crown from the destruction of the Court of Wards, long seen as an outdated feudal burden not appropriate in seventeenth-century England. A parallel to the customs duties, the excise was a tax on goods made and sold in England. However, the excise had been an Interregnum taxation tool and not well liked in England. Thomas Pierce, the rector of Brington, Northamptonshire, complained that the excise had been a poor reward for the price they paid for the Civil Wars: "With how vast an expense of *blood*, and *conscience*, and as well of *Publick* as *Private Treasure*, did we *buy* the sad Priviledge of paying *Assessments* and Excise?" In his sermon preached in celebration of Charles' proclamation, the dissenting minister Ames Short hoped that the Restoration would save Englishmen from "our *unsupportable burdens* of *Excise* and *monthly Taxes*."[315] Deciding to use the excise as a revenue measure was a risky choice for the government. Nonetheless, this tax did not find much opposition in the press; the crown was able to handle and correct the minister Thomas Bradley, the one voice that spoke out virulently against the government's collection method, tax farming. Bradley had a history of using his pulpit to speak on economic issues and perhaps should have been seen as a potential concern for the Restoration government.

Despite any reservation about utilizing an excise tax, the Parliament decided in November 1660 to grant the king all of the liquor excise receipts, half of which was to replace

---

[313] John Paterson, *Post Nubila Phoebus* (Aberdeen, 1660), 21.

[314] Laurence Womock, *The Dressing Up of the Crown* (London?, 1660?), 17 (mspr. 19).

[315] Chandaman, 37-38; Thomas Pierce, *Englands Season for Reformation of Life* (London, 1660), 12; Short, 31.

the Court of Wards income and the other half was to be added to his permanent revenue. The tax went into effect on Christmas of that year and officials had high hopes for their returns, having earlier estimated the yearly value at £30,000. Expanding the list of taxable items to include coffee, chocolate, lemonade, and tea, parliamentarians also modified the Interregnum version by specifying that the tax did not apply to home brewers, only retailers of these potables.[316]

When parliamentarians first framed the Restoration excise, they diverged from the Interregnum practice of using tax farmers and created a system to be run by the government. Originally parliamentarians envisioned a well-regulated administration of taxation governed by a royal commission based in London that communicated with regional administrators established in major market towns. Commercial manufacturers, but not persons who brewed at home, would submit reports of their goods to their local representative on a regular basis and would anticipate spot checks of their honesty. Violations of the excise laws were handled in the existing legal system; offences in London went to the Commission or special commissioners for appeals. Outside of the capital, two justices of the peace acted as judges; however, when these officials were themselves brewers, the regional commissioners took over this role. In some circumstances, cases could be taken to the Quarter Sessions.[317]

However, this direct government involvement did not last long. Selective use of tax farming began in 1662 and another excise act in 1663 instituted more wide-spread tax farming but also attempted to put more checks into the system including requiring that brewers receive copies of all reports filed on examinations of their materials and a commission made up of excise men and brewers to check everyone's stock on a regular basis. This Act took legal jurisdiction from the excise officers and vested it in the justices of the peace everywhere.[318]

In the spring of 1663 Thomas Bradley emerged as a strong critic of the excise tax farm. His published sermon addressing the topic established Bradley as a moderate critic of the royal administration and attracted the crown's attention. Bradley served the duke of Buckingham and Charles I before his appointment by his father-in-law Sir John Savile, baron Pontefract, to the livings of Castleford and Ackworth in Warwickshire. Bradley's marriage to Francis Savile, the daughter of Sir John Savile and sister of Thomas Savile, earl of Sussex, was an advantageous one and may have protected him from serious punishment for his attack on the excise farmers. For his royalism he was created D.D. at Oxford in 1643. Although ejected by parliamentary visitors, Bradley was restored to both positions at the Restoration.[319]

---

[316] Chandaman, 37-42; 12 Car. II., c. 23.

[317] Chandaman, 42, 51.

[318] Ibid., 43-44, 53; 15 Car. II., c. 11.

[319] Old *DNB, s.v.* Thomas Bradley, Sir John Savile; *Walker Revised, s.v.* Thomas Bradley; Thomas Bradley, *A Present for Caesar* (London, 1658?); *Appello Caesarem* (York, 1661); *A Sermon Preached in the Minster at York* (York, 1663); *Cesars Due, and the Subjects Duty* (York, 1663). This Old *Dictionary of National Biography* entry for Bradley appears to be incorrect in some places. For example, the article reported that Bradley became a prebendary of York in

Bradley's first foray into Restoration politics came in an unusual tract, *Appello Caesarem*, an apology for an earlier pamphlet published in 1658 entitled *A Present for Caesar* that showed the lord protector how to generate more income for the English government. In *A Present for Caesar*, Bradley suggested that the government should examine the first fruits and tenths it received from the church and begin to demand that the clergy pay their real value.[320] In 1661 Bradley felt that he needed to justify his earlier piece. His explanation, however, was unsatisfying and sounded more like an insincere vindication for an action not currently politically acceptable than a sincere explanation for his earlier actions.

In his defense, Bradley argued that he had proposed this scheme to harm the Presbyterians, who he felt had been responsible for the Civil Wars, and to help Charles II, who he had been sure would be restored. First, Bradley claimed that he had been trying to preserve the tithing system by suggesting that the government should better regulate first fruits and tenths. Second, he explained that implementing this more rigid tax system would be revenge on the intruded ministers for taking the positions of the ejected ministers, such as himself. Third, this revised tax collection would shift the tax burden from the people to the church, some of whose ministers had been responsible for the Civil Wars: "But let them and all others look back to the beginning of these wars and troubles, the cause, the quarrell, the incendiaries and promoters of it, and will it not fall upon the turbulent discontented Church-men, and where were the coals of it first kindled, was it not in the Pulpit, the rigid Presbiterian Pulpit." For Bradley, the Presbyterians were one of the root causes of the Civil Wars. Fourth, Bradley claimed he had known that Charles would be restored and therefore had wanted to ensure that Charles had the first fruits and tenths he deserved.[321]

However, after these elaborate claims for his earlier tract, Bradley began to attack pluralism in the Restoration church, despite the fact that he had held two positions before being ejected in 1643 and was restored to these two positions after the Restoration. His primary complaint against pluralism argued that a few men held several benefices while many suffering royalist clergy continued to be unemployed. He blamed pluralists for being greedy, saying, "and there is another thing that makes these Pluralities so unreasonable, and that is the insatiablenes of greedy men in those accumulations, that heap up mountain upon mountain, *Pelion* upon *Ossa* Dignity upon Dignity without either end or measure as long as mony or meanes, or interest, or friends will last to procure them." He also partially blamed the bishops, the archbishop of York Accepted Frewen apparently included, for this state of affairs, claiming that none of the bishops had visited their diocese to review the situation or sent their agents to take care of the

---

1666; however, the title pages for several of his sermons printed before 1666 indicated that he already held this position. The article also stated that all of Bradley's publications were sermons, which was not true.

[320] Bradley, *A Present for Caesar*, 7-8.

[321] Bradley, *Appello*, 9-21 (mspr. 11-23).

problems.[322]

In the spring of 1663 Bradley used his pulpit again to attack abuses in England, this time broadening his reach to the secular government and running afoul of the crown in his attack on the excise farm.[323] When taken as a whole, Bradley's sermon was an assault on the financial leaders of the country and how Englishmen conducted business. Therefore, Bradley threatened not only the king but also the monied interests. His first volley targeted the collection of the excise, complaining about the tax farming and suggesting how the king could improve the efficiency of the tax itself.

Bradley spared no words in his discussion of excise collectors. Setting out to prove they were worse than usurers, Bradley argued that the system was corrupt because there were too many layers of businessmen involved; the person granted the farm might rent it out to someone else, who in turn leased it to another party. Each level in this pyramid had to profit and all of the people who did the leg work, including spies, had to be paid. Therefore less of the actual tax collected went to Charles. He labeled these excise collectors as "biters" and used vivid imagery to convey his meaning:

> But where there are so many Biters on worke at once; and with such long teeth too, dayly and hourly tearing of by such full bitts as they do; no marvail, if the poor people shrinke under their teeth, and complain so sore; no marvail, if they grow so fatt, and the people so lean, upon whom they prey: these long teeth of theirs would be filed at least, if not broken off; they are both too sharpe and to long: the Government of this Kingdome is in no particular Arbitrary, but in this Male-administration of the Excise: the Excise-man is a Biter.[324]

Bradley's metaphor of the excise collector as a rodent nibbling its food or a scavenger eating carrion effectively conveyed his desire to defame the tax men. More surprising, however, was his assertion that Charles' government was arbitrary in its administration of the excise. By leveling this very serious charge, Bradley elevated his attack from the excise machinery to the king himself, calling into question the sincerity and legitimacy of the crown.[325]

---

[322] Ibid., 28-33, 35 (mspr. 30-35, 37). Coming from Virgil's *Georgics*, the expression "Pelion upon Ossa" referenced a mountain in Thessaly and illustrated the idea that more of something being piled onto what was already there. Bradley used the phrase to help drive home his argument that pluralists kept collecting more benefices. *OED, s.v.* Pelion.

[323] Bradley, *A Sermon Preached in the Minster at York.*

[324] Ibid., 38-39.

[325] His solution for protecting Englishmen and increasing the king's yield echoed the government's original plan for the excise collection that officials had decided was not practical:

After his discussion of the problems with the excise tax, Bradley denounced several other professions, proclaiming that merchants and lawyers were not honest and lower government officials took bribes. He also focused on men who mistreated country people by purchasing land and kicking the tenants off or charging high rents. His ire against these "Rack-renting Landlord[s]" led him to portray these people almost as negatively as he had described the excise collectors. According to Bradley, they were greedy and cold, not caring about their tenants at all:

> Yet [he] is not willing that a poor Tennant should live upon his labour: he will have rent not only for his Land, but for his Tennant's labour too, and so live by the sweat of other mens brows; peeping into every corner, every Cottage, to see whether he can spy any advantage, out of which he may squeeze if it be but the other crowne, to mend his Rentall.

Bradley suggested that these landlords required their tenants to pay rent for the land and to pay for the right to work the land they were already leasing. In his discussion of landlords, Bradley then made the distinction between landed gentry, whom he felt treated their renters well and behaved appropriately, and "City-purchasers, that hath rais'd himselfe into an Estate out of small wares," merchants who bought lands in the country with the wealth they acquired through trade. These new landlords did not know how to act properly and were only concerned with their financial gains by overvaluing their lands to increase the rents, unlike the older landlords who understood the proper relationship between owner and tenant.[325]

Not surprisingly, the crown was unhappy with Bradley's discourse and chose to force the minister to preach and print a retraction sermon. Accordingly, Bradley delivered an assize sermon, entitled *Cesars Due, and the Subjects Duty: Or, a Present for Cesar*, that combined strong support for the crown's taxation with an apology for his earlier heated comments against everyone he had attacked.[326] Preaching on Matthew 22:21, "Give unto Cesar the things that are Cesars," Bradley tried to atone for his earlier denunciation of the excise men and the government's "Male-administration." The piece trumpeted monarchy as the best form of government and staunchly defended the king's right to collect tribute, which Bradley argued people should pay happily and willingly.

Bradley examined this issue from the perspective of the people and the government. Englishmen should pay the excise because it was their duty; failing to pay was a sin:

> In like manner it is with your Tribute to the Prince when you pay Tribute to the Prince, you pay him no more then is his Due; you

---

the establishment a thorough system of government tax collectors, "Officers of Trust," in every parish throughout England and the end of the tax farm. Ibid., 39.

[325] Ibid., 43-49.

[326] Bradley, *Cesars Due, and the Subjects Duty*.

> only *give unto* Cesar *the things that are* Cesars: it is not a matter arbitrary, whether you will pay it or no, but a matter necessary, you must pay it: it is not a courtesy, but a duty, not a gratuity, but a debt; St. *Paul* expresly calls it so, *Rom*: 13.7.8. To detain it therefore is a sin, not only against the Law of justice & gratitude, but against a Principle of common honnesty. which [Which] commands us to give every man his own; and if every man then Cesar amongst the rest; and therefore *give unto* Cesar *the things that are* Cesars.[327]

Arguing from the point of view of the king, Bradley argued that there were three reasons why the king was owed this tax. Three different governing agencies had mandated this levy. First, the revenue was part of the "right of his Crown." Second, God commanded that this tribute be given to the king. Third, the Parliament had enacted the excise tax as binding on the country.[328]

Bradley apologized to the people he had verbally attacked and tried to leave behind his comments on the government's choice of the tax farm to collect the revenue. He told the tax farmers that "I was too sharpe in those expressions, and while I spake of and against Biters, I myself became a Biter."[329] After this admission, Bradley attempted to distance himself from his attack on the government through the following statement at the end of the sermon:

> And these passages which have been by me here mentioned, I thinke fit to be retracted, and disowned: particularly that wherin I say, *That the government of this Nation is Arbitrary in the male-Administration of the Excise*; which words, together with all other Indiscretions whatsoever contained in that Sermon and drop't either from my tounge or penne, I do here in the presence of you all, fully *retract*, *disclaime*, and *disowne*.[330]

This episode demonstrated how seriously the government took publications, even short pamphlets and sermons, that spoke against the government. Although concerned about Bradley's comments, officials apparently did not ask the church to remove him from his post or discipline him. Instead, Bradley was called before the privy council where Charles told the minister that it was not his place to "*meddle with State-affaires*." Scared and sobered by his king, Bradley

---

[327] Ibid., 13 (mspr. 17).

[328] Ibid., 13-15 (mspr. 17-19).

[329] Ibid., 35 (mspr. 39).

[330] Ibid., 35-36 (mspr. 39-40).

promised his listeners and readers that he would henceforth refrain from discussing politics.[331]

Aside from a verbal reprimand from the king and the retraction sermon, Bradley did not appear to have suffered for his lashing out at the government. His marriage connections may have protected him from harsher punishment after his attack on the excise tax. However, his earlier publication, *A Present for Caesar*, demonstrated that Bradley had been willing to appeal to the Protector for his own benefit, thereby putting his loyalty into question. His explanation after the Restoration, as mentioned above, was more of a justification after the fact; it is hard to believe that he had felt those devious and loyal intentions when he wrote the first piece. Unfortunately, no records survive in the state papers; the only source for Bradley's punishment was his own sermon. However, claiming that ministers had no right to comment on political issues was slightly hypocritical; at least Bishops John Morley and Seth Ward used their pulpits to extol monarchical political values. Morley came closer to Bradley than most royalist clergy, offering moderate criticism of the crown. However, Bradley used his position to berate the government and landlords for practices he deemed wrong. Bradley's sermon cannot provide enough evidence to argue that there was any serious opposition to the excise; nor can it serve as an example of the sentiment. What it can tell modern historians concerned the existence of a hitherto overlooked incident, caused by a moderate critic who shared the monarchy's goals for the country's development but offered critical commentary on how the crown chose to pursue these goals.

Hearthmoney. The hearth tax was another Restoration revenue expedient intended to help fill out the king's income that caused critical reactions to the government and the aristocracy. It was the only new tax invented in the Restoration and it was levied directly on every tenant and landowner in England. Like the excise, the hearth tax was not popular with lawmakers, but was seen as the best solution to the revenue problem. Supporters of this tax desired a steady source of income and taxing heating sources provided them that constant flow of receipts.[332]

Discussions about the hearth tax began in the summer of 1661 when the Commons realized that the government was £300,000 short of the £1,200,000 per annum budget the Convention Parliament had promised. Parliamentarians floated several other ideas before considering a tax on hearths, including an expanded excise, a tax on salt, and a tax on paper goods. Significant headway was not achieved until the spring of the following year, when a bill for taxing paper failed and the Commons turned its attention to a hearth tax. The Hearthmoney Act became law on 19 May and was scheduled to go into effect on Lady Day 1662.[333]

Although the guidelines for implementing this assessment were fairly simple, the organization for its collection was not well delineated. The new hearth tax was an assessment based on the number of hearths and stoves each residence had; each hearth and stove cost two shillings per annum. Exemptions were granted to people whose estates were worth less than £10

---

[331] Ibid., 36 (mspr. 40).

[332] Chandaman, 77-78.

[333] Ibid., 77-82; 14 Car. II., c. 10; 15 Car. II., c. 13.

"capital value" or twenty shillings per annum, or rented property worth less than twenty shillings in rent a year. Unlike for the excise, the government did not establish a system of administration for the hearth tax, relying instead on the people to report honestly and the local constables to handle most of the collection work. The law expected Englishmen to inform their local administrator how many hearths and stoves their domiciles contained and pay the appropriate tax. Constables then made their reports and delivered the collected taxes to the high constable of the hundred, who in turn took the reports and monies to the county sheriff.[334]

Not surprisingly, the hearth tax did not yield the level of income that the parliamentarians had hoped, a circumstance likely due to the collection method. Government officials learned from their earlier mistakes and strengthened the collection system in the next Hearthmoney Act of 1663. In this system overhaul, parliamentarians no longer relied on the word of the taxpayers and required the constables to certify what the taxpayers claimed. Armed with the new power to enter people's homes in the presence of witnesses, the constable gained a power he had not possessed before and the responsibility for verifying his returns. The law also decreed that the constables' returns should be checked as well and required the constables to present all of the information they gathered, including the names of people exempt from the tax, to the high constable.[335]

In the early Restoration, an anonymous manuscript poem and a verse pamphlet expressed moderate critic views of the hearth tax. The manuscript poem entitled "Well! Say What You Will, Our Noble King Charles" expressed the inequality in the assessment of this tax: "Yet this full oft made the poor souls to weep / To pay in Taxes, what they earnd for hire. / Thinking it hard, at least, a legall harm / To pay for fire, which never made them warm." Acknowledging that the tax was legal, the poet explained that legality did not automatically mean the law would be beneficial for the people. The published tract, *The Chimneys Scuffle*, laid out what was inherently unfair about the assessment and used it to criticize pretentious courtiers, Church of England clergymen, and Presbyterians. In a bold move, the writer used his assessment of these people to tell the king to pay better attention to his own government.[336]

The author demonstrated how the tax affected the poor more seriously than it did the wealthy; the tax was a much larger percentage of the poor's income that it was of the wealthy's revenue. He also set up a contrast between the courtier who paid taxes on hearths and stoves that lay unused because the owners were attending the court and the houses of the poor where the hearths were always in operation:

> Batts now and Scrich-Owls may keep open house,
> While their Lords sated with a *Court Carouse*,
> Display their loose debauch'ry: yet must they
> For their Starv'd Smoakless Chimneys duely pay

---

[334] Chandaman, 79-82.

[335] Ibid., 81-83; 15 Car. II., c.13.

[336] Bodl., Rawl. Poetry MSS 66, fol. 14r; *The Chimneys Scuffle* (London, 1662).

> This late *enacted Tax*: O precious Jewel
> That pays the State for Fire-work without Fuel!
> And this is just: for These get any day
> More by one Suit than thousand *Chimneys* pay.
> Whereas poor *Tradesmen* who live by their Booth,
> Earning no more than serves from hand to mouth,
> With all their Stock can scarce pay Scot and Lot,
> Eating at *night* more than the *day* had got
> These must be *Smoak'd* too, though their *Chimneys* speak.[337]

Here the author tried to argue that the state should only tax hearths that were not necessary for the household to survive; the poor should not have to pay the assessment on the hearth they used to heat their homes and cook their food. The poet reminded his readers that these subjects already paid city taxes, the "Scot and Lot;" unlike the hearth levy, this assessment was calculated in proportion to the citizen's income. The representation of the family that consumed more at dinner than it had been able to make during the day was a powerful image; people who could barely afford to feed themselves could not pay the required tax on the hardware needed to cook and heat their homes.

After setting the tone of the poem with a discussion of the economic effects of the tax on the poor, the writer launched into an attack on courtiers and ministers who he felt were useless parasites only interested in their own welfare and who damaged the king's government. Many he felt were claiming rewards and benefits they did not deserve for supporting and restoring the king:

> These be those lazy fruitlesse *Droans* who thrive
> By sucking Honey from Your Princely Hive,
> What they ne're wrought nor duly labour'd for,
> And these may rest securely on the Shore;
> While Your *endeered Zealots* who have lost
> Their *Fortunes* for Your sake are hourly crost
> By adverse Winds.[338]

The bee analogy worked well to demonstrate how these "lazy fruitlesse Droans" were useless for the community but received the attention the worker bees deserved. This complaint that the real royal supporters were overlooked for less deserving people was not new in the Restoration, but significant because it came in a piece published in late 1662.

Instead of pleading for favor and acting like the "lazy fruitless *Droans*," the author addressed his sovereign directly, telling him that he needed to take care of his government: "Awake Great Prince, intend [attend] your own Affairs, / Let no light *Dalilah* rob you of Your hairs; / Those *royal nerves* should now imployed be / In *Steering* th' *Rudder* of Your

---

[337] *The Chimneys Scuffle*, 2-3. *OED, s.v.* scot and lot.

[338] *The Chimneys Scuffle*, 4.

Monarchie."[339] The analogy cast Charles as Samson, the biblical hero whose strength depended on his full head of hair. The courtiers served as the Delilah, desiring to weaken the king and seducing him so he would allow them to succeed in their self-serving goals, more interested in personal gain than the king or country's good. With this rather forward address to the king, the author expressed moderate critic opinions about the Restoration, desiring to see the crown succeed but disagreeing with the current state of the court and the behavior of some attending there.

Although *The Chimneys Scuffle* was probably the only piece published on the hearth tax, it echoed the citizens' anger over this assessment. The Venetian resident Francesco Giavarina commented several times on the discontent over the tax and seemed to consider the issue as important as the Act of Uniformity. In June 1662 the people "grumble[d] loudly" about what they were now required to pay. Pepys agreed with Giavarina, saying that "they clamour against the Chimny-money and say they will not pay it without force."[340] Two weeks later the Venetian commented that "as the country cannot be brought to the quiet which is desirable, owing to the many evil humours which still remain and many not easily be purged, indeed they rather tend to increase, as men cannot easily adapt themselves to the two acts recently passed, for uniformity in religion and the hearth tax." By August, Giavarina reported that the protest was still strong: "the general outcry is so great and the desire to be rid of the burden so strong that it seems some are offering to pay the king for one turn, their entire income for one year rather than submit to pay 2 shillings a hearth each year but it is impossible to foretell what will happen."[341] The ambassador's last comment seemed to be based on an unlikely rumor, as many Englishmen would not have been able to afford pay one year's revenue at one time. Nevertheless, the rumor did suggest that sentiment was still intense against hearthmoney, leading to the conclusion that August 1662 must have been a very tense month with this protest, the spate of dissenting ministers preaching farewell sermons, and the implementation of the Act of Uniformity's ejection clause on 24 August.

Conclusion. Although these three publications on their own cannot signify wider scale resistance to the government's taxes and suggest that the willingness to print against these policies was small, they do demonstrate that critical commentary on government policies did not have to be radical in nature. As Bradley and the two anonymous poets demonstrated, Englishmen could support the monarchy but criticize how the crown and the Parliament conducted the restored government.

---

[339] Ibid.

[340] *CSPV, 1661-1664*, 158; Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. R. C. Latham and W. Matthews (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970-1983), 3.127.

[341] *CSPV, 1661-1664*, 161,180.

Sequestered Lands and Purchased Estates

Sequestered church lands and private estates meant more to contemporaries than the potential revenues they would generate. The possession of these lands also signified prestige and for the rightful owners the correct alignment of the pre-revolutionary social order. Joan Thirsk and Ronald Hutton have explained the mechanics of how the government sorted out the land question but do not discuss reactions in the press. Both authors point out that the government had to consider the needs of those who had purchased these lands as well and took measures to appease both sides of this debate.[342] The government's reaction to and handling of this situation was part of its limited vision of the past. Realizing that it could not order the wholesale return of these lands, the government admitted that the last three decades had made an irrevocable impact on the present and the crown could not turn back the clock to pre-revolutionary England. As with the regicide, the crown accepted that the land sales had happened but did not discuss the reasons why. Several ministers used the press to influence the government and their fellow citizens either to support their point of view on the ownership of church lands or to convince Englishmen who had failed to retain their properties to accept their losses.

On the first of these issues the royalist John Gauden called for the return of the lands but compensation for the purchasers, while the dissident critics Cornelius Burges and the anonymous author of *An Apology for Purchases of Lands Late of Bishops Deans and Chapters* defended the purchasers' rights to own the lands they had acquired. The private estates issue will be examined through two zealous royalist sermons that encouraged readers and listeners to consider their losses as necessary sacrifices for the king, and two playwrights who did not offer much consolation to royalists.

Sequestering lands was a common topic in the anti-Interregnum parody materials, critical of the major players in the last decade. In *The Famous Tragedie of the Life and Death of Mris. Rump*, Gossip Vane asked her companions as they attended the death bed of Mris. Rump, the personification of the Rump Parliament as an old and sickly woman: "Is there no more reprobates left, that we may bring them under an Act of Sequestration, This parting of Estates is a rare piece of employment, me thinks 'tis a gallant frollick."[343] Another dialogue, *A Phanatick Play*, made good use of Sir Arthur Hasilrig's purchase of lands formerly belonging to the bishopric of Durham. In the piece Hasilrig referred to the lands as "my Bishoprick of *Durham*," and one of the comedic characters spelled out the vast estate Hasilrig had acquired:

> Sir *Arthur* play *Durham* Bishoprick, the old quit rents or yearly revenues, was one thousand six hundred twenty one pounds eighteen shillings and three pence, whereof the Bishop paid to the King, one hundred sixty pounds, two shillings six pence and odd,

---

[342] Joan Thirsk, "The Restoration Land Settlement," *The Journal of Modern History* 26 (December 1954): 315-28; Hutton, *Restoration*, 139-43.

[343] *The Famous Tragedie of the Life and Death of Mris. Rump* (London, 1660), 1 (mspr. 2). "Mris" is an disused abbreviation for mistris, hence mistress. *OED, s.v.* Mris.

> beside Mr. *Colingwoods* lands, and several Parks and other Lands which for the company sake I forebear to name.[344]

The comedy in this piece came from the description of exactly how much the lands at Durham were worth and how much the bishop had paid the king. These numbers may have been purely fictitious; however the author intended them to remind readers of the estate Hasilrig had amassed and of the king's lost revenue from the first fruits and tenths.

The Debate over Church Lands. The loss of ecclesiastical lands had been an economic and social blow to the Church of England and signified its declining importance in Civil War and Interregnum England. With the Restoration, many churchmen saw the opportunity to undo past wrongs and recover the lands they had been forced to turn over to secular authorities for sale. Although Hutton has outlined the general principles behind the government's attitude toward these lands, he did not examine the small paper debate that emerged during the early fall of 1660 that centered on the significance of these properties for the church. John Gauden, before his promotion to the see of Worcester, argued that these lands should be returned to the bishoprics and cathedrals that had owned them before the Civil Wars. In this defense, he took two different approaches to convincing his readers. First, he made a financial argument, pointing out that their retention of these lands was detrimental to the king's revenues. Second, and more interestingly, Gauden suggested that these lands were a fundamental part of the church; their loss had damaged the church's power and position in society and those holding the properties had committed sacrilege against God for acquiring lands that had belonged to the church. The authors defending the land purchasers, the dissenting minister Cornelius Burges and the anonymous author of *An Apology for Purchases of Lands Late of Bishops Deans and Chapters,* had to contradict Gauden's basic assertions that owning property formerly belonging to the church was sacrilege and that possessing these lands was fundamental to the nature of the Church of England.[345] To accomplish this task, the pro-purchaser writers made three main arguments. They posited that there were no precedents in the early church for owning lands. Second, they presented precedents for selling and purchasing church lands, focusing on the English reformation. Third, *An Apology for Purchasers* explained the necessity of selling off church properties.

The process of reclaiming and releasing these lands began in the fall of 1660. On 7 October, Charles established a commission to investigate past sales and to sort out current ownership and leasing rights. In practice, the process was fairly smooth. Many of the land purchasers had been the previous tenants and the episcopal owners usually dealt civilly with those who had acquired the lands and wanted to establish a lease.[346]

Two important events in the reconstruction of the Church of England were simultaneous

---

[344] *A Phanatick Play*, 2-3, 5; Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, 455.

[345] Cornelius Burges, *No Sacrilege nor Sin to Alienate or Purchase Cathedral Lands* (London, 1660); *An Apology for Purchases of Lands Late of Bishops Deans and Chapters* ([London, 1660]).

[346] Green, 101-2.

with the Gauden-Burges debate. During September and October Presbyterian and Anglican divines gathered at Hyde's residence, Worcester House, to work out a basic plan for the church along the lines of a reduced episcopacy. In the resulting Worcester House Declaration, Charles tried to reassure his subjects that he still supported the broader definition of acceptable religious beliefs and practices that he had enunciated in the Declaration from Breda. Second, Charles began to fill the ecclesiastical vacancies that dotted the church. At the Restoration, eighteen of the twenty-seven bishoprics were empty.[347] With the appointment of more bishops, the need for reestablishing their ancient lands became more acute.

In two main tracts Gauden made two major arguments supporting the return of the disputed properties to the ecclesiastical owners. First, he pointed out that this situation decreased the revenue from the first fruits and tenths that the crown would have gained from the lands owned by the church. Second, and more interestingly, Gauden explained that land was fundamental to the Church of England. In *Tears, Sighs, Complaints, and Prayers of the Church of England*, he discussed the condition of the Church of England at the Restoration and proclaimed that buying church land was a sacrilege:

> Who almost is there of these *new Illuminates* that makes any scruple or conscience to shark, to defraud, to detaine, to delay, to deny any thing that belongeth to the *Clergy* or *Ministry*, comply they never so much with the populacy? ... Thus *Sacriledge* is in every corner, yea and in *Market-places*, and *on house-tops*, yea oft in Churches and Pulpits; *Murmuring, Cavilling*, *Repining, Coveting* and *Plotting* how to eate up, not onely all the Houses of God in the *Land*, but all his chief servants, the Rulers and Ministers of his *Son Jesus Christ*, the Pastors and Teachers of his Church.

Gauden tried to conjure an image of groups of disaffected men whispering in corners supported by dissenting ministers ("*new Illuminates*") to destroy the Church of England and absorb all of the church's wealth and lands for their own uses, an attitude he called "this *Gangrene* of *covetous* and *sacrilegious* Humor."[348]

In his next publication, however, Gauden expanded the reach of his sacrilege argument to include officials who condoned the past sales. In late August or early September 1660, several purchasers tried to make deals with the crown over these lands, offering money, which the government needed, to allow them to retain use of the properties. In the broadside *It Is Humbly Proposed on the Behalf of the Purchasers of Bishops, and Deans and Chapters Lands* the men argued that Charles II should follow the agreement Charles I had made in the Treaty of Wight, allowing them to lease the bishop's lands they had bought for ninety-nine years for one fourth of

---

[347] Spurr, 34-35.

[348] John Gauden, *The Tears, Sighs, Complaints, and Prayers of the Church of England* (London, 1660), 665-67.

the original price or be given them "in fee" in which case they would pay one third of the original price over time. The author proposed that the purchasers give the crown twenty percent of the value of the rents on the land. In all, the authors promised the crown about £600,000. This solution, the broadside argued, would be beneficial for the king and country:

> Hereby, a considerable sum of money for his MAJESTIES service, will be speedily raised; the Kingdom so much eased, and discharged of so great a debt as three and twenty hundred thousand pounds, for which the said Lands were sold; the Honour of Parliaments, and the Public Faith given for the same, repaired; as great a Revenue as formerly to his MAJESTY, or the Church, continued; the Purchasers satisfied, their Possessions quieted, Industry and Improvements encouraged; no Sales, Settlements or Securities disturbed, and infinite Suits prevented.[349]

In this passage, the authors kept the main focus on the financial and legal benefits of this proposed deal; their offer put money into the royal treasury and established a regular revenue for the crown to replace the loss of the first fruits and tenths. Allowing the purchasers to retain control of the lands would prevent a host of future legal problems.

Gauden was not impressed with this offer, which he compared to the proposals Satan made to Christ in the wilderness, and felt that this arrangement was detrimental to the government and the church. To frighten the government from compromising with the purchasers on the rightful ownership of the lands he explained that then it too would be "*guilty* of that *enormous sin* and *curse of Sacriledge*."[350] Gauden defined this sacrilege as taking from God what was rightfully his; any move that did not return the church lands was an affront to God and stealing from him. With this assertion, Gauden made ecclesiastical ownership of property a tenet of the Church of England's creed.

For Gauden, those lands brought the church honor, revenue, and respectability; without them the church could not be whole:

> This design of the *Purchasees*, if obtained, would so cruelly weaken, peel, barkround, and exhaust the plenty, honour, power and authority of this Church, and its Clergie, both as Christian, and reformed, in all its ancient *Rights*, *Immunities* and *Enjoyments* (which are as well settled by Laws ancient and modern, as any civil estates are, or can be) that it would never recover its beauty and

---

[349] *It Is Humbly Proposed on the Behalf of the Purchasers of Bishops, and Deans and Chapters Lands* (London?, 1660?). The broadside was hand dated 8 September 1660.

[350] John Gauden, *Antisacreligeus* (London, 1660), 4, 6 (mspr. 6, 8). The title page bears the handwritten date of 15 September.

> flourishing lustre, of late so much deflored.[351]

Most of his arguments continued along the same lines, trumpeting the damage to the honor and power of the Church of England. For example, he explained that "this *wretched project* would be a continued injury and indignity put upon this *Famous Church* of *England*, and its learned Clergy." The only people who would benefit from this transaction were the country's enemies: "To *peel* and *pillage* the Church and Clergy of *England*, after so many and long *exhausting* will give joy and satisfaction to none but the enemies of the King, the *Church*, and the *Nation*." The purchasers' proposal was also financially harmful for the country; if Charles and the Parliament accepted this deal the crown's revenues would decrease from the loss of first fruits and tenths.[352]

Gauden's solution to this situation attempted to accommodate the church and the purchasers. All lands would be returned to the church which would reimburse the purchasers for the difference between the original purchase price and the profits they had received until then, or lease these lands out to the purchasers.[353] Either way, the church would regain possession of the properties.

Authors arguing for the rights of purchasers of church lands had difficulty counteracting Gauden's principle that church lands were a fundamental part of the church itself. To accomplish this goal, Cornelius Burges and the author of *An Apology for Purchasers of Lands Late of Bishops Deans and Chapters* took three approaches: attacking the church's ownership of lands, proving that selling and buying these grounds was not sacrilegious, and laying out precedents for the alienation of former church properties.

In his first attack, Burges addressed the principle of the church possessing lands. Mining the Bible and the history of early Christianity, he posited that there were no precedents in scripture or early church history for the church owning lands. Christ and many of his apostles did not own properties, nor did the church until Constantine. After appealing to the primitive church, Burges then tried to persuade his readers that the Roman Catholic church had gained all of these lands through fraud, using spiritual blackmail against the landed classes to wrest their family inheritances and wealth away from them in exchange for securing their places in heaven, saying,

> The Clergy, being sole Masters of the times, and holding all the chief Offices and Places of Power and Judicature in the State, as well as in the Church, did what they list both with King and People. And with their familiar spirit of Excommunication (the great *Mormo* and Scare-crow of the Laity, with which they daily frighted them) they could, and did conjure into their own Churches, to fill their own coffers, what quantities of *Lands*, or ought else

---

[351] Ibid., 5 (mspr. 7). Deflored, the past tense of deflore, is an obsolete term for deflower. *OED, s.v.* deflore.

[352] Gauden, *Antisacreligeus*, 2-9 (mspr. 4-11).

[353] Ibid., 14-15.

> they pleased. ... And as they held the people in ignorance, the more easily to prey upon them; so they purposely winked at the wickedness of Princes, great ones, and rich men, their adulteries, rapes, murders, and other villanies (so they did not fall upon the Clergy) till they had, by these means, got them most sure within their nets, and found it most seasonable to cut large gobbets out of their Estates. Then indeed, they would fall foul upon them, with a witness terrifying them with unsufferable torments; first in Purgatory, and afterwards in Hell, unless they redeemed themselves, and expiated their sins, and that speedily, by giving such large portions of their best Lands, as those Harpies pleased.[354]

According to Burges, the main reason the church possessed lands had been the unscrupulous behavior of the priests who had claimed to have power over the future of their parishioners' souls. He did not need to remind his readers that the reformed faiths did not believe in the same cosmology as the Roman Catholics; ridicule of the belief in purgatory was inherent. Although the author appealed to anti-Catholicism in England by pointing out that these lands had been gathered by the church under Roman auspices, the next logical step in his argument suggested that continued ownership and espousal of possession rendered the Church of England more Roman Catholic than contemporary Anglicans would have liked. By maintaining these properties, the Church of England perpetuated the damage the Roman Catholic Church had done to England. However, Burges did not take this argument to its logical conclusion, the implementation of which would have altered English society even further than the Civil War and Interregnum land sales. The simple way to remove this blight on church and people was to sell these properties, regardless of the fact that the people currently buying them were not the same social group that had lost them in the first place. This transfer would not put the lands back into the hands of the landed aristocracy, but into the possession of the rising "middling sort," merchants and soldiers who had the cash necessary to afford these properties. If the original acquisition of these estates had affected traditional English society, so had their transfer from the church to the "middling sort."

To counter the sacrilege argument, Burges needed to address God's message to Moses explaining how he would care for the tribe of Levi. In Numbers 35:1-9, God explained that he would provide homes for the priests in cities that he would designate for them. Burges' task was to explain how these verses were not a scriptural justification for church lands. Burges responded to this challenge by arguing that God specifically defined what lands the Levites were to receive, including the measurements of how much land composed each city and its suburbs. The only open lands included in this allotment were intended for cattle grazing, not for the Levites to generate income.[355] For Burges, these scriptural passages did not reinforce Gauden's claim that the church had a fundamental right to own more land than was necessary to sustain it

---

[354] Burges, *No Sacrilege nor Sin*, 29, 32-34, 36-38.

[355] Ibid., 18-21.

and therefore purchasing these lands was not sacrilege. If anything, the passages suggested that the clergy were limited to a small number of lands with which to supply its needs.

Perhaps the strongest but most controversial part of the pro-purchasers' argument concerned citing English precedent for seizing, selling, and maintaining the rights of the purchasers of church lands. In the second part of his defense, the anonymous author of *An Apology for Purchases of Lands Late of Bishops Deans and Chapters* laid out significant times in history when the crown had seized lands from the church or when the government had decided that attempting to recover the lands lost to the church through seizure and sale was not practical. As part of his proof he cited the English Reformation as the ultimate example of church lands being sold to private individuals. The writer made two interesting parallels to the land situation in 1660. First, he argued that the Reformation was a fitting precedent for the removal of lands from church control. Second, and most interestingly, he presented Queen Mary's decision to leave acquired church lands in their purchasers' hands after her restoration of Catholicism in England.[356] Using the official return of Catholicism with the accession of Mary I as precedent was a daring choice for the anonymous pamphleteer and Burges; the analogy between Charles II's restoration and the revitalization of Catholicism was unmistakable. With this comparison, the authors implied that the two events were similar and imputed religious motives to the Restoration that royalists would have strongly rejected. To defend his claim that Pope Julius III had told Queen Mary not to be concerned about reclaiming church lands, Burges included a supposed copy of the pope's letter to the queen explaining his reasons for confirming the previous sales of church lands. Because the pope was not preoccupied about restoring these lands, neither should the Church of England worry: "Lo, here a Pope (more concerned in such alienations from the Church by others, than our sowre Masters) is so far from making the selling, or purchasing of such Lands to be Sacrilege, that he gives many weighty reasons against the restoring of them, and for warranting the holding of them."[357] Burges' suggestion that the church hierarchy should take Pope Julius III's attitude on this subject would not have been received well by administrators of a church that split from the Roman Catholic Church over a century before. Coupled with the earlier suggestion that the Church of England had a stronger connection to the Roman Catholics than the English would have liked to believe, this parallel to the Reformation and Mary I's decision to leave purchased lands in the possession of the purchasers argued that Burges intentionally used an undercurrent of smearing the Church of England with the Roman Catholics.

Pro-purchaser disputants presented two arguments for why church lands should have been sold. Since the Parliament had deprived the bishops of their baronial status with the statute of 17 Car. I., c. 28 they did not need the lands that they had acquired in this capacity. The bishops had possessed a dual nature, part spiritual and part temporal. In their spiritual roles they were

---

[356] *An Apology for Purchases of Lands Late of Bishops Deans and Chapters*, 3; Burges, *No Sacrilege nor Sin*, 50-51.

[357] Burges, *No Sacrilege nor Sin*, 51-54. Mary herself was not very interested in restoring church lands; she even sold monastic properties herself. David Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 246.

members of the church hierarchy and deserved only those monies due to them in this capacity. Bishops had been barons of the Parliament and gathered properties and wealth as such. However, the Parliament abolished the bishops' secular standing with their expulsion from the house of Lords with the statute of 16 Car. I., c. 27. Shorn of their baronial status, bishops no longer needed these properties, "the reason of their greatness." Burges commented that:

> It was their usurped Dignity, not their Evangelical Ministry, that is taken from them. Now, their Lands were given and fixed (as is before shewed) to their elated Episcopacy, as Barons and Peers in Parliament; not to their Ministry: to their *state of Prelacy*, not to their Presbytery, as themselves distinguish this from the other.[358]

Burges explained their double status as "Prelacy" and "Presbytery" and argued that in the bishop's Presbytery these churchmen served a useful function. In their "Prelacy," the bishops considered themselves superior to the majority of clergy and amassed lands to augment their status. This argument was particularly prescient because the bishops had not been readmitted to the Parliament at this time. The bishops did not take their seats in the house of Lords until 1661, after the passage of an act specifically for this purpose.[359] Asking Englishmen to halt the return of these lands based on a parliamentary act from a period that the crown wanted everyone to forget was a dangerous proposition.

The second position, based on financial need during the Civil Wars, was not calculated to appease the royalists. The anonymous pamphleteer suggested that the Parliament had needed to sell the church lands to finance its war effort:

> There is no such measure of ill consequence, in the Sale of these Lands, as in keeping up two Armies, supernumeraryes, and Free-quarter, or as in continuing Sequestrations upon the Estates of such as were under hardship, or as in such Excesse burdens, as would have destroyed Private mens Estates. If ever necessity lay upon an oppressed People, of restoring to unusual waies of ease, our times have seen it: And constraint goes farre in excusing, what otherwise were not warrantable. Marriners (the Governours of a Ship) may, in extream Tempest, throw away any mans goods over-board, to save the rest.[360]

---

[358] *An Apology for Purchases of Lands Late of Bishops Deans and Chapters*, 1-2; Burges, *No Sacrilege nor Sin*, 58-59; 16 Car. I., c. 27.

[359] Bosher, 222-23; Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 57; 13 Car. II., c. 2.

[360] *An Apology for Purchases of Lands Late of Bishops Deans and Chapters*, 4.

The author argued that selling church lands and using those funds to finance the war effort was a better solution than taking more from individuals. It was better to take from the church than ruin people and families, whether royalists under sequestrations or parliamentarians not willing to invest their estates in the war. His second point, and one reminiscent of Charles I's argument about the necessity of ship money, posited that extreme measures were permissible in dire times. Interestingly, the author carefully suggested that the king had been oppressing the English people and they were acting in self defense: "necessity lay upon an oppressed People."

Although they debated the issue, parliamentarians did not establish any concrete laws regarding the former bishops, deans, and chapters lands. Hutton has termed this approach to the lands issues as the "principle of repossession," but the implications were deeper than he has suggested. By allowing the church to resume ownership of these lands, parliamentarians were suggesting that the Church of England could not be reestablished without the same foundation that it had enjoyed before the Civil Wars and reinforcing Gauden's tenet that these lands were a significant part of the church's identity.[361] This did not bode well for a more comprehensive religious settlement; if a traditional and loyal Convention Parliament had been unwilling to allow that these lands had been alienated from the church and permit some or all to remain so, an even more royalist Cavalier Parliament was not likely to countenance changes in the beliefs and practices of the church. Whether or not the pro-purchasers or anyone else realized this is hard to determine. Perhaps the church lands issue should have been a warning to the Presbyterians seeking a broader definition of the Church of England.

Private Estates. The press did not offer private landowners much consolation for their losses, instead acknowledging that the sales had happened and that recouping the lands was likely not possible. Two ministers, one conforming and one dissenter, told their congregations and readers that good loyal Englishmen should not complain about their financial losses, taking their inspiration from Mephibosheth and Charles as models of self sacrifice. Landowners did not find comfort on the English stage either. Richard Brome and Abraham Cowley both presented audiences with untenable solutions to the estate problem, the former proposing an ideal scenario and the latter a comic one.

In 1660 two clergymen attempted to tell their congregations and readers to stop worrying about the lands they lost during the last three decades. Preaching a thanksgiving sermon on 2 Samuel 19:30, "And Mephibosheth said unto the King, yea, let him take all, for as much as my Lord the King is come againe in peace to his own house," the minister Francis Gregory wanted to celebrate Charles II's return to England and provided his readers with a model of loyal behavior in Mephibosheth, son of Jonathan, grandson of Saul, and loyal subject of David.[362] Mephibosheth was a particularly appropriate selection because he had lost his estate to his servant Ziba, who took his assets by claiming that Mephiboseth had committed treason. When David returned to the throne, Mephibosheth exonerated himself from Ziba's false charges. David did not return all of Mephibosheth's estate to him, however, but divided it between him and Ziba. The wronged subject did not complain and instead responded in Samuel 19:30 quoted above.

---

[361] Hutton, *Restoration*, 140-41.

[362] Francis Gregory, *David's Returne from His Banishment* (Oxford, 1660).

Gregory used this story, which he spelled out for his readers, to show them how they should deal with their losses. In leading up to explaining Mephibosheth's reactions, the author played into his readers' anger over the loss of their estates by stirring their indignation over David's casual treatment of Mephibosheth's goods:

> *David* had now recovered his *owne right*, and is *Mephibosheth* content, that *David* should give away *his?* Surely, *Mephibosheth* being the *Grand-child* of a *King*, the *Son* of a *Prince*, and the sole *Heir* of *both*, his estate must needs be somewhat considerable: now, to lose but *one halfe* of a fair estate were a losse that *every* man would not bear.[363]

Gregory argued that Mephibosheth accepted his losses in good faith as a gesture of good will toward his sovereign: "Why, to manifest his *love* to *David's person*, to testifie his *joy* for *David's returne* to his Throne, he is willing, upon that account, not onely to part with *halfe*, but *all* [of his estate]."[364] Therefore anyone who complained about their losses and petitioned the crown for redress was not properly demonstrating their fidelity to the king. The body of this sermon was an exposition of why Englishmen owed the monarchy their loyalty.

Ames Short took a similar approach to Gregory's by presenting a model of behavior for his readers.[365] Instead of Mephibosheth, Short asked his readers to imitate Charles II himself. Preaching in celebration of the proclamation of Charles on 18 May 1660, Short tried to demonstrate how Charles was a good man and therefore would make a good king. Among his many qualities, Charles was a "self-denying Prince" because he wanted Parliament to be a significant part of the government, settling England and giving him advice on secular and church issues. The third reason was Charles' attitude toward the crown lands that had been lost to the Stuarts. Charles considered England's "peace and tranquility" more important than his holdings: "his *willingness to part with his Lands and Revenues* (if the Parliament shall thinke fit) in order to the settlement *of these Nations in peace and tranquility*."[366] If Charles, whose family had been wronged more than any other in the kingdom, was willing to forgo some of his rightful properties and goods for the peace of the country, then so should his subjects. For Short, Charles was the model of self sacrifice that Englishmen should imitate for the betterment of their country.

Two playwrights suggested implausible solutions to the estate question. This approach might have been an accident. Henry Brome, a London bookseller and brother of deceased playwright Richard Brome, reprinted two of his brother's plays in 1661: *The Royal Exchange* and the *Joviall Crew: Or the Merry Beggars*. The latter was originally produced in April 1641 and

---

[363] Ibid., 1.

[364] Ibid.

[365] Short, *God Save the King*.

[366] Ibid., 60.

printed in 1652. At the Restoration, the King's Company performed the piece four times in six months.[367]

During the resolution of the play in Act Five, Oldrents, the gentleman protagonist, discovered that the wealth he inherited his grandfather had been stolen from someone else. His grandfather had cozened a neighbor out of his estate and left that family poor enough to beg. Several years later, Oldrents discovered this hard truth and met Wrought-on, the grandson of the man his grandfather had cheated. Unlike his ancestor, Oldrents was an honorable man and deeply concerned over what had happened. Although Oldrents did not give his entire estate to Wrought-on, he did try to provide for Wrought-on, saying "To live a moderate gentleman, I'll give you / A competent annuity for your life." Wrought-on graciously accepted this offer.[368] This exchange proposed an honorable solution to this situation and provided two models of behavior for the parties involved. Purchasers and heirs of the purchasers should provide the relatives of the original owners enough from the estate to live comfortably. Persons whose lands had been sequestered or sold under pressure should be thankful for what they receive and not press to recover all of their former holdings. For this solution to work, both sides would have to give up something: the purchasers part of their lands and the original owners claim to all of their estates.

For the Restoration, however, this was not a workable resolution because these lands meant more than status and income; they represented the struggle between royalists and parliamentarians. For the royalists, their estates were their birthrights and were taken from them for their loyalty to their king. On the other hand, the purchasers saw these lands as sanctioned by legal processes that were little short of sanctified. Recouping their estates somehow helped negate the effects of the Civil Wars and Interregnum and reestablish the rightful order in England. Maintaining their purchases signified the opposite, that the past three decades had made an indelible impression on the present that could not be undone.

The poet and playwright Abraham Cowley provided the other solution. In *Cutter of Coleman Street*, Cowley resolved his poor Cavalier Colonel Jolly's financial problems by marrying him to the puritan widow Mrs. Tabitha Barebottle whose husband had purchased the Cavalier's estate. The late soap boiler-turned-Colonel Barebottle had been substantial purchaser of sequestered estates, gathering lands in Hartfordshire and Worcestershire, including the estate of the former Dean of Worcester.[369] To insure his financial security and provide his daughter with a decent marriage portion, Jolly tried to defraud his niece and ward of her inheritance and eventually married the widow of the man who purchased his forfeited estate. However, the widow was a staunch puritan who did not approve of Jolly's lifestyle, so he would have to fake a conversion to woo Mrs. Barebottle. In the end, Jolly tricked the widow, married her, and enjoyed his former fortune again.

---

[367] Catherine Shaw, *Richard Brome* (Boston: Twayne, 1980), 29, 129.

[368] Richard Brome, *A Jovial Crew*, ed. by Ann Haaker, *Regents Renaissance Drama Series*, general ed. Cyrus Hoy (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1968), 5.1.483-84.

[369] Cowley, *Cutter of Coleman Street*, 2.8.126-138.

This solution was untenable in the Restoration because it suggested that cavaliers should marry into the class that had benefitted greatly from their demise. Cowley's portrayal of Tabitha Barebottle was calculated to entertain his audience with a well-drawn stereotype of a puritan, the exact opposite of the kind of people who typically attended the theater. Jolly's daughter Aurelia lamented her father's desire to marry the widow, arguing that Barebottle would turn their house into a sterile and strictly religious place:

> What humming and hawing will be i' this house! What preaching, and houling, and fasting, and eating among Saints! Their first pious work will be to banish Fletcher and Ben Johnson out o' the Parlour, and bring in their rooms Martin Marprelate, and Posies of Holy Hony-suckles, and a Sal(ve)-box for a Wounded Conscience, and a Bundle of Grapes from Canaan.[370]

Aurelia commented that the proper reading for a parlor, plays, would be replaced by devotional literature. Intended to raise a laugh from the audience, the piece made fun of the numerous religious tracts published by dissenters (as the Restoration audience would have understood them) to guide their fellow believers and attack conformists.

Cowley's portrayal of Jolly, the cavalier, did not reflect well on the king's supporters, leading to the question of why the playwright took the character in this direction. Apparently some contemporaries asked the same question and accused Cowley of disloyalty to the crown. He answered his critics with a preface to the play in the printed edition, arguing that he had not wanted to make Jolly a shining example of perfect virtue but instead felt that giving the colonel some bad choices in moral dilemmas would make a better play, saying "If you be to choose parts for a Comedy out of any noble or elevated rank of persons, the most proper for that work are the worst of that kind." He swore that he intended no parallel between Jolly and any group in England.[371] The author's explanation was somewhat disingenuous; it was hard to believe that he did not intentionally connect Jolly with the cavaliers and all that stereotype entailed or did not realize what he had created after crafting the character and circumstances.[372]

During the period covered by this study, the play had one run in December 1661 at Lincoln's Inn Fields and did not appear in print until 1663. No one mounted the play again until 1668. If the opening night on Monday, 16 December had been any indication of the play's reception in London, then Cowley had written a play touching themes some Restoration

---

[370] Cowley, *Cutter of Coleman Street*, 3.1.29-34. Two Martin Marprelate tracts from the 1590s were reprinted in the 1640s. No tract entitled "Salve-box for a Wounded Conscience" exists in the Short Title Catalogue.

[371] Abraham Cowely, "Preface," in *Cutter of Coleman Street*, 34-35.

[372] For a discussion of this stereotype, see Stephen Joel Greenberg's dissertation on the subject. Stephen Joel Greenberg, "Cavalier: Propaganda Stereotypes in Seventeenth-century England,"(Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1983).

theatergoers were not willing to face. Although the audience verbally protested the play, Cowley enjoyed five more performances before the piece closed on 21 December.[373] His treatment of Jolly might explain why the play was not printed until 1663, and then with a defensive Preface, and not performed again until 1668. *Cutter of Coleman Street* was an attack on the dissenters but it also represented the cavaliers in a highly negative light. The play suggested that the king's followers were not upright honest men, but rather greedy, self-serving, and morally deficient. This characterization reflected badly on the king because a good sovereign would not have such supporters. The author's prologue suggested that Cowley realized the risks he was running in publishing the play and took measures to lessen the impact of the piece.

Englishmen expecting to see the press reinforce their desires to regain former lands would have been disappointed. The ministers who published on the topic, John Paradise and John Price, apparently felt the stability of the restored regime was more essential than the fortunes of the individual families, an idea that reinforces Hutton's assessment of importance of the state over the individual in the land settlement.[374] On the stage Brome offered an idealistic solution to the property dilemma, one that told loyalists that the lands should stay with the purchasers and that they should accept pensions from the men who held their former estates, not a solution many royalists would have found attractive. Cowley, on the other hand, showed his audience a not-so-honest Cavalier desiring to regain his estate but considering less than moral ways of accomplishing his goal.

Conclusion

In these economic considerations, government officials tried three different approaches, many of which met with moderate critic responses. First, they acknowledged that some things from the past were workable solutions to current problems, specifically the excise tax and policy toward individual property owners who had been sequestered or had sold their lands under pressure. Although parliamentarians were wary about implementing the excise tax, they realized that it had been successful during the Interregnum and decided to use it to increase government tax revenue. The Church of England minister Thomas Bradley derided the excise tax farming from his pulpit and suggested that the government should ditch the system. For the private estates, the government acknowledged that the lands had changed hands legally, and was not willing to put its force and credibility behind a large effort to transfer these lands back to the original owners, thereby upsetting the class of purchasers who had benefitted from the sequestrations and sales. The press offered these people little comfort; two zealous royalist ministers encouraged their listeners and readers to forget about their losses and two playwrights offered unacceptable visions of how the situation could be resolved. Second, government officials tried to return the Church of England to its pre-Civil War state with the decision to enforce return of bishop, dean, and chapter lands to their previous owners. Despite Burges and the anonymous pamphleteer's efforts to argue that the lands should stay in the hands of the

---

[373] Gravett, "Stage History," in *Cutter of Coleman Street*, 12-13.

[374] Hutton, *Restoration*, 142.

purchasers, the administration sided with Gauden's theory of property as an important part of the church. Third, administrators instigated a new policy with the hearth tax. Many Englishmen reacted negatively to this new imposition, resenting the government's taxation of heating and cooking facilities. The moderate critic poem, *The Chimneys Scuffle*, enunciated some of that anger and warned the king that he should pay closer attention to his government than he had been previously.

Conclusions

In *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II*, Tim Harris has argued that at the Restoration "support for the king was conditional upon his ability to solve specific economic, constitutional and religious grievances." As Harris and others have detailed, the religious settlement was not congenial to many Englishmen.[375] This chapter has filled out Harris' evaluation of the general expectations of the restored monarchy and should suggest that although the religious situation was undoubtedly important, other issues deserve attention. This chapter has also demonstrated this study's main argument that reaction to the Restoration was wide and varied, expressing many moderate and dissident critic opinions about practical problems that affected English citizens.

In his Declaration from Breda, Charles promised that he supported the paying and disbanding of the Cromwellian army, a pledge that he maintained throughout the early Restoration. The Parliament was able to supply the military personnel's arrears and one week's pay before decommissioning them for return to civilian society. Nonetheless, the dispersion of the forces did not remove them from the public memory; authors on both sides of the spectrum perpetuated a negative stereotype of the serviceman, trying to manipulate these men and sometimes public perception of them. Rebellious radical tracts *Plain English* and *Eye-Salve for the English Armie* played into the negative image by trying to convince the soldiery to stop Charles' return or rebel against the reestablished monarchy. On the other hand, several contemporary royalist poems depicted the Cromwellian servicemen as cruel overlords who terrorized the citizens and spread unsound religious doctrine. Royalist authors and Church of England ministers John Paradise and John Price attempted to reassure their listeners and readers that the soldiers could be conformable to Restoration society despite their past behavior.

Many of the monarch's subjects expected him to behave and rule in a manner befitting an English king. Using the press to pressure the king, many authors explained how Charles' unusual past was beneficial to the country and himself in his current role, how they expected him to conduct his administration, and how the prince was responsible to God for his actions and treatment of his people.

Although the government was not able to satisfy its financial needs, it did not face much opposition to its tax plans in the press. The Church of England minister Thomas Bradley

---

[375] Harris, *London Crowds*, 61; Bosher; Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663*; Spurr.

mounted a serious moderate critic attack on the excise farm and farmers, but Charles and the privy council scared the minister into submission; Bradley preached an apologetic retraction sermon that expressed royalist opinion on the subjects' duty to pay taxes. Officials would have had less luck countering the anonymous published piece *The Chimneys Scuffle* that attacked the inequalities of the hearth tax and asserted that Charles needed to pay closer attention to his own government lest the useless hangers-on drag down the government for their own benefit. Nevertheless, these pieces cannot prove the existence of wide-spread resistance to the revenue-generating strategies.

The question of church lands and private estates generated more reaction in the press than government taxation did, partially because the same groups that were involved in these situations may have been more likely to buy the pamphlets produced to comment on the situation. The Church of England clergyman John Gauden and dissenting minister Cornelius Burges engaged in a small printed debate over the moral and social implications over selling and purchasing church lands. Although Burges and the anonymous pamphleteer made better arguments, sentiment was not on their side and the Parliament reinforced Gauden's concept of the church ownership of property.[376]

Perhaps surprisingly, royalists did not publish pamphlets defending their right to resume the private estates that had been sequestered from them or sold under pressure. The two royalist pieces on this subject that did appear accepted the reality of the situation and asked the former owners to rationalize what had happened as far less important than the Restoration, implying that citizens that clamored after their former possessions were not as loyal as those who did not.

Many of the expectations Englishmen had at the outset of Charles' return were not fulfilled, a situation that should have added layers of tension to the early 1660s. In *Restoration*, Hutton has argued that four problems arose at the end of the second Restoration settlement. First, there was a general "decline in public morals" with the king in the forefront. Second, the government's sale of England's only outpost in France, Dunkirk, to the French for much needed money was not popular with the people. Third, the balance of power in the king's council had begun to shift away from Lord Chancellor Clarendon and toward the earl of Bristol, whose circle grew to include Sir Henry Bennet, the future earl of Arlington. Fourth, the kingdom's financial problems were worsened by the government's inability to establish a satisfactory revenue and a king who was not frugal.[377] Hutton's assessment of the problems at the end of the second Restoration settlement should be revised to include the fact that many of the problems he mentions resulted in governmental inability to address the expectations of the people.

With the underlying tensions outlined in Chapters Two and Three, the government church administrators needed to ensure the loyalty of the people for the sake of peace and possibly Charles' throne. Chapter Four will discuss questions of basic loyalty, such as a royalists' definition of obedience, the Solemn League and Covenant debate, and the dissenters' reaction to

---

[376] During this exchange with Burges, Gauden also engaged in a serious debate over the legitimacy and viability of the Solemn League and Covenant. See Chapter Four for this controversy.

[377] Hutton, *Restoration*, 186-96.

the narrow Church of England through farewell sermons and collections of prodigies.

CHAPTER FOUR
THE ISSUE OF OBEDIENCE IN CHURCH AND STATE

For the government and Church of England, the subjects' obedience to the traditional order lay at the heart of the Restoration settlement. This chapter will discuss three hitherto neglected aspects of this period: a Restoration theory of obedience, the Solemn League and Covenant debate, and nonconformist reactions to the Act of Uniformity. These analyses will reinforce the argument developed by Hill, Greaves, and Harris that the early Restoration was not as strong as previously thought and help flesh out the zealous royalist and radical ends of the Restoration spectrum, contributing to the overall picture that this dissertation has suggested, that reactions to the Restoration settlement were more complex and varied in their approaches than has been previously recognized.

The first section will examine the efforts of a few established church clergymen to preach submission. In developing this zealous royalist Restoration theory of obedience, these authors were very careful to delineate the people's obligations in cases of princes who did not rule well. This emphasis reflected the ministers' concerns about the past with Charles I and the current problem of an unknown and untested Charles II.

The ramifications of the Presbyterian minister Zachary Crofton's vigorous defense of the Solemn League and Covenant will be discussed in the second section. Crofton became the major spokesman for rigid Presbyterians who believed that Englishmen were obligated to uphold the Covenant, an Interregnum agreement between the Scots and the English Parliament and later between the Scots and Charles II. The Covenant called for major alterations in the established church with the destruction of episcopacy and the implementation of a Presbyterian synod system. In his strong advocacy of the country's responsibility to carry out the terms of the Covenant Crofton espoused two doctrines that negated the king's importance in the secular and church governments. Crofton's writing and preaching lead to his imprisonment and hardened crown attitudes toward the church settlement.

Although the ejections resulting from the Act of Uniformity did not occasion a violent reaction to the church settlement,[378] they did prompt nonconformists to resist the settlement in the press. The third section will examine two genres produced as reactions to the narrow church definition, that were critical of the government and spoke to fledgling nonconformists throughout England. The farewell sermon collections that appeared in the months after the ejections

[378] Spurr, 42.

intended to comfort former parishioners and guide fellow believers toward a different sense of community and greater personal responsibility for their own spiritual welfare. The second part of this section will analyze the *Mirabilis Annus* tracts, a series reporting miracles, prodigies, strange accidents, and unusual deaths from all over the country that might imply God's displeasure with the church settlement. These pieces attempted to reaffirm dissenters in their decision to reject the established church and even to scare them into maintaining this position.

Preaching Obedience to the (Potentially Bad) Ruler

Not surprisingly, royalists were interested in reestablishing what they felt were the appropriate governmental and social hierarchies. The Anglican minister Thomas Reeve explained the proper social order by arguing that "it is one thing to be a good Monarch, another thing to be a good Minstrel, vulgar spirits are not fit for publick Government."[379] Everyone had his or her proper place in society and knew the role he or she should play. Laurence Womock stressed to his readers that God had established an "Order of Rule" for England, without which "all the bands of *Society* are dissolved."[380] From their pulpits and writing desks, ministers across England sought to tell their congregations and readers why monarchy was the best form of government and how their fellow subjects should behave toward the divinely constituted ruler and his administration. However, the past three decades had deeply scarred England and made the burden of explaining why Englishmen should be obedient to the state far more difficult, given the national memory of the regicide, the government's inability to convince Englishmen to accept its limited version of the past, and the circulation of subversive radical tracts such as *Mene Tekel* which argued Englishmen had the right to resist their king.[381] In defining a royalist theory of obedience, these authors could not simply demand that their countrymen obey the monarch; they had to convince their readers by explaining why following the prince was the best course of action. Ministers generally took one or a combination of the following approaches. First, royalists explained why monarchy was the best form of government for the country and denigrated other ideas that had developed during the past three decades. Second, they enunciated how Englishmen should behave toward the government. Third, they explained carefully Englishmen's obligations to the state and specifically their duty to and how to cope with bad royal commands or a wicked ruler.

The first method of demonstrating why Englishmen owed allegiance to the monarchy involved explaining how hereditary one man rule was superior to other types of rule. John

---

[379] Reeve, *England's Beauty*, 29.

[380] Womock, sig. A4r.

[381] *Mene Tekel* (London, 1663). For more on resistance theories that influenced English radicals and worried government officials, see Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).

Copleston, the vicar of Broad Clyste in Devonshire, lamented the evils of democracy, complaining that it was "the worst and basest of Governments."[382] In his sermon for Charles' coronation, Bishop John Morley presented an extensive argument for defining why hereditary monarchy was the best government for England through an extensive critique of other forms of rule. The bishop achieved two goals with this discussion: using this important pulpit to remind Englishmen why the Restoration was the correct path for the kingdom and admonishing the prince to rule well. Following the course of recent English history, Morley outlined why republicanism, military rule, and all forms of non-hereditary monarchy were flawed, not relying solely on biblical precedent to make his arguments. Republican government was "unnatural" and "unreasonable;" military rule, which he labeled "stratocracy" was worse than democracy. Once he had disposed of non-monarchical forms, Morley examined rule by usurpation and election. Usurpers would not last long for three reasons. First, usurpers would not have their titles from God, but from their own illegal actions. Second, these supplanters would have to rule as tyrants to maintain their titles. Third, any government without the appropriate title to the position could not survive long. For elective monarchy, Morley needed to employ more sophisticated reasoning to explain how the mechanics of electing a ruler were seriously flawed. These "Conditional Kings" could not have the power that a hereditary monarch possessed; the people who elected this sovereign did not have the ability to give the prince the power over life and death, a requirement for Morley's idea of a proper prince. The process of electing this ruler would create serious political faction problems and put a man on the throne who was more concerned with his own agenda and helping his friends than the business of the country.[383]

For Morley, however, the king was obligated to the people just as they were bound to him. As discussed in previous chapters, Morley used his pulpit to tell the prince how he should rule his kingdom. He explained that there were two types of hereditary monarchy: despotical and political. A despotical monarch did not rule by the country's laws and treated the people however he wanted; a political monarch "governs his Subjects as a *Father* doth his *Children*, by Equal and Just Lawes, made with their *own consent* to them." He assured his readers that he was confident that the Stuart monarchy was a political and not despotical one.[384] Here the author attempted to obligate Charles to rule well by assuring the people that the prince abided by the principles of a political monarch; thus his readers would now watch the king to see evidence of Morley's assurances. If Charles did not live up to these standards, then he must be ruling as a despotical monarch. For Morley, hereditary monarchy was the best form of government when the king played his role appropriately.

In a sermon preached on 26 November 1661 in Stafford, the Anglican clergyman Matthew Fowler held forth upon Proverbs 24:21, "My Son fear thou the LORD and the King: *and* meddle not with them that are given to change," and explained to his listeners and readers

---

[382] John Copleston, *Moses Next to God, and Aaron Next to Moses Subordinate and Subservient* (London, 1661), 13.

[383] Morley, 16-35.

[384] Ibid., 36.

their duty to show the proper reverence and obedience to the monarch. As the foundation of his submission argument, Fowler explained that duty to the prince was intrinsically connected to man's relationship with God; refusing God's choice for earthly rulers was tantamount to rejecting God himself:

> For all obedience to Magistrates, supreme or subordinate, is to be performed *propter Deum*, for Gods sake, 1 *Pet*. 2.13. So that not to reverence that Authority which God hath set over us, is not only an act of incivility and disloyalty, but of irreligion and Atheism; because in the contempt of that Authority, there is included a contempt of God, who did establish it.[385]

Fowler's message was clear; serious critique or renunciation of the monarchy was an attack on God. More importantly, he suggested that anyone not behaving toward the king in the appropriate manner also rejected God; Englishmen had to accept Fowler's view and act in the ways the author thought correct or they would be committing a grave sin. The implications of this idea put all moderate critics in the same group as those subversive and rebellious radicals who denied Charles' sovereignty and sought to remove the monarchy.

In enunciating what constituted this proper behavior, Fowler sought to present his readers with a comprehensive guide to how they should think, speak, and behave concerning the prince. Englishmen should demonstrate their reverence by using the proper language to discuss the king and his government: "It's fit that free Citizens should have their Tongues free to speak their pleasure: But God, before whom we must give account for every vain word, and much more for irreverent and reproachful speeches uttered against Magistrates, doth expresly forbid this liberty."[386] Here Fowler warned the disaffected pamphleteers who published against the crown and those who did not agree with the government's plans fully. Englishmen should watch their actions carefully, making sure they performed the correct reverential gestures, particularly bowing, ensured the king's safety, payed their taxes, and showed a general "obedience to his commands."[387]

Fowler argued that Englishmen should show their king proper reverence and obedience for two main reasons. First, Charles' position demanded this kind of respect because princes were second only to God:

> Within his own Dominions he is next unto God, and no man, or Order of men [is] above him. This every man knowes to be the language of our Lawes; and is it not the language of Gods Word also?

---

[385] Fowler, 10.

[386] Ibid., 14.

[387] Ibid., 14-16.

In his second reason, Fowler described Charles as the linchpin that held England together, saying: "The benefits of his Government are so great, that the welfare of Church and Kingdome depends (next under God) upon his pious and prudent administration."[388] Without the king's leadership, England would not function; therefore the "benefit" Fowler promised was monarchical government, a reason calculated to reinforce the significance of the Restoration and the importance of the Stuart monarchy.

Other ministers agreed with Fowler that Englishmen should monitor their behavior and public personas. The conforming minister John Spencer warned his listeners and readers that there were three kinds of treason they could commit against kings and authority in general. First, subjects could commit treason with their hearts by thinking evil thoughts against the government. Second, citizens could commit treason with their tongues by speaking against the administration. Third, people could commit treason with their hands by acting against the crown.[389] The minister Francis Gregory echoed Spencer's three part analysis of how Englishmen could offend against their sovereign. However, his section on speaking negatively about the crown suggested that Gregory felt that some of the criticisms against kings were warranted but should not be expressed. He reminded his readers that princes were human and made mistakes, but that it was not the populace's place to point out these problems:

> Its true, David *King* of *Israel* had his *sins*, and David *King* of *England* had his *miscarriages* too; but yet remember, the *spots* of Princes are *magnified* by the person that wears them. That which looks but like an *Infirmity* in the *Subject*, in the *King* would look like a *crime*; a *freckle* in the *face* is more visible then a *scar* in the *foot*. [390]

In this political body analogy, Gregory referenced both Charles I and Charles II; he attacked Englishmen for criticizing Charles I and warned them not to treat the son the same way. He argued that the only reason these sins were so visible came from the fact of the prince's position as the head of the political body; had Charles I not been the prince, his flaws would have gone unnoticed. The underlying message told everyone to regard the king's faults as if he were a regular citizen but not discuss them because he was the sovereign, thus reinforcing the country's hierarchy. However, had Charles not been the king, he would not have been in the position to conduct his life and kingdom the way he did; so the argument was facetious.

In the third part of the royalist theory of obedience, ministers asserted that subjects owed all legitimate sovereigns respect and obedience regardless of how the prince chose to rule and that resistance to any legitimate ruler was against the law of God. In this regard, harmful and beneficial sovereigns were no different and should not be treated as if they were. "It is a truth,"

---

[388] Ibid., 11-12.

[389] Spencer, 16-19.

[390] Gregory, *David's Returne from His Banishment*, 9-11.

Boteler proclaimed, "that *Nero* as *King* is exalted as much above the common rate of men, and hath as much right to obedience from his Subjects, as *Augustus*: *Domitian*, as *Vespasian*: *Julian* as *Constantine*."[391] The author established three sets of opposites and argued that the worse rulers deserved as much respect as the better ones. The implication of his argument was that if Charles turned out to be a malicious ruler, perhaps as malevolent as Nero, England still owed him their loyalty and that Boteler was not willing to proclaim that Charles would be the perfect ruler; although Englishmen may have wanted an Augustus or a Constantine, they could have gotten a Nero or a Julian. His choice of Julian was interesting; Boteler suggested that kings of different religious beliefs who attempted to suppress a faith that they did not profess should be as well respected and obeyed as the monarchs who shared the beliefs of their subjects. Using Julian here was a warning to dissenters and Roman Catholics that they owed Charles obedience despite their religious differences.

Everyone had to obey wicked monarchs when they make sound laws and requests; the princes' moral condition did not affect his subjects' compulsion to obey him in lawful things. A monarch's power came directly from God and did not depend on what kind of person the prince was. Winter commented that:

> God owns the Power even of wicked Kings, requiring our due obedience and peaceable submission. Godliness is not essential to Soveraignty, though Piety is the greatest glory of Soveraigns. ... Kings no Saints are lawfull Soveraignes as well as the best; their authority is from God, the abuse of it from themselves. Nor are Kings within the Church, less regal than those without.

As proof, Winter cited the Persian king Cyrus and the Babylonian ruler of the Daniel story as biblical examples of non-Hebrew kings that God had supported and cited Matthew 6 to say that Christ also enunciated this position.[392] The implications of this argument suggested that God sanctioned unsound rulers to govern their countries poorly. Winter attempted to disassociate God from the sovereigns' actions by saying that "the abuse of it [their power, was] from themselves;" God merely provided these princes with the authority to rule. In a sermon preached before the Restoration, the minister Benjamin Bruning enunciated a similar argument about the irrelevance of the ruler's moral condition to his right to rule, saying "but now to hold that no person can have a civil right to rule and government, unless he be a godly Person, 'tis a principle (notwithstanding the plausible sound of it) hot enough to set all the world on fire."[393]

---

[391] Boteler, 52.

[392] John Winter, *A Sermon Preached at East Dearham in Norf. May 29. 1661* (London, 1662), 18-19. In light of Winter's 30 January sermon discussed in Chapter Two, his strenuous defense of the office of monarchy regardless of the occupant added an interesting layer to his portrait of Charles I.

[393] Bruning, 17-18.

As examples for following the good requests of a bad ruler, Fowler chose Diocletian and Julian, two Roman Emperors known for their persecution of Christians.[394] His choices worked on two levels. First, Christians under the two emperors were supposed to bear their persecution without revolting against this burden. Second, the use of these men spoke to English dissenters by explaining that although they did not share religious beliefs with the crown, they still had an obligation to obey. However, Fowler probably did not intend to give dissenters such appropriate symbols; although they did not suffer as severe a persecution as Christians under the two Roman emperors, dissenters did hold a similar position in society. Fowler's metaphor was more apt than he probably intended.

The theory of obedience that Fowler enunciated did not argue that Englishmen should follow their monarch in everything he asked; instead, Fowler suggested in his interpretation than everyone should evaluate the prince's commands and decide if they concur with God's law before following them:

> 'Tis true indeed, we must not obey an Evil Magistrate, nor a good one neither, in his evil and unrighteous decrees. There are *Qua Dei*, as well as *Quae Caesaris*, Things to be rendered to God, as well as to *Caesar*; and our Allegiance to *Caesar* must not be stretched beyond the due bounds of that Allegiance which in Baptisme we have sworn to the Prince and Captain of our salvation, Christ Jesus: Whilst the Commands of God and the King stand in subordination, we must obey both: but when they stand in opposition, then the Apostles Maxime is good, *Deo potius quam hominubus*, *Acts* 4.19.[395]

Citing Acts, Fowler asserted that a Christian's first duty was to God, not any to temporal power; Christians were to weigh royal commands and decide if they accorded with God's directions. If the earthly law contradicted the divine law, good Christians should obey their Lord, not their prince.

However, subjects did not have the right to resist a malicious monarch because all legitimate rulers had a direct connection with God and opposing these rulers was a direct affront to God. Glossing St. Paul, the author argued that all power, used for good or evil, was sanctioned by God: "the maleadministration of Power is from God permitting it, but the Power itself from God Ordaining it."[396] In his sermon on 1 Peter 2:4-5, the minister George Masterson echoed these sentiments, citing Augustine, a different verse of Acts along the same lines as the piece Fowler used, and Exodus 1:17, praising the midwives for disobeying Herod's command to

---

[394] Fowler, 16.

[395] Ibid., 17-18.

[396] Ibid., 18.

kill all male babies, knowing this directive to be against the word of God.[397]

If kings were so connected to God, even the bad ones, then defying these princes was an offence to God as well. Winter argued that resisting such princes was a worse offence in God's eyes than the rulers' original mistakes: "such remedies are worse than the disease." The biblical rivalry between David and Saul provided the perfect example to illustrate this situation of a bad monarch and how a good man should act toward his legitimate king. Despite Saul's behavior, David restrained himself from killing his sovereign, understanding his duty to God and his legitimate prince.[398]

In his "Christian Theory of Government," Seth Ward mounted a two part defense against this resistance principle based on practicality and biblical precedent. First, he argued for the necessity of unity within the country; allowing everyone to criticize the monarch would cause the country to fall apart because every person would have a different opinion about the king's religious behavior:

> What shall be done, when, at the same time, a *Prince* shall be judged, by *one* part of his *Subjects*, *Heretical*, and *prophane*, for departing from *Superstition*, and vindicating his power from *unjust Usurpations* over it: while *another* part shall judge him to be *Superstitious*, and will never believe him to *abhor Idols*, so long as he will not *commit Sacrilege*? What shall be done, while some conclude him to be *irreligious*, because he will not *worship Images*: others *Idolatrous*, because he *kneels* at the *Communion*? and both esteem him an *Oppressour*; because he *restrains* their *Zeal*, and *hinders* them from that *excess* of Riot, which they *pant* after, to the devouring of one another?[399]

In this passage, Ward portrayed Charles caught between Roman Catholics and dissenting Protestants, unable to satisfy anyone about his devotional practices. In the last line quoted above, the bishop tried to frighten his listeners and readers by explaining that without the king to bring peace and moderation, these two rival groups would cause havoc and attempt to destroy each other. If the kingdom allowed citizens to criticize the monarch, he would no longer be an effective control for the simmering religious tension just underneath the surface of English

---

[397] George Masterson, *The Spiritual House In Its Foundations, Materials, Officers, and Discipline Describ'd* ([London,] 1661), 54-56.

[398] Fowler, 17; Winter, *A Sermon Preached in East Dearham in Norf. May 29. 1661*, 22, 26. This analogy represented a different perspective on how Restoration ministers found David to be highly useful for providing their readers with a good example of how good people and monarchs should behave. See Chapter One for a discussion of David as a prominent analogy for Charles II.

[399] Ward, 13.

society. Without Charles, therefore, order would disintegrate.

Second, Ward cited biblical precedent for the people's submission to bad monarchs. Asking his audience to examine Moses, the prophets, Jesus, and the apostles, he asserted that these men had not advocated resisting bad rulers and had obeyed their sovereigns because obedience was their duty. They had not deferred because they had no other choice; they yielded because it was the right thing to do to please God. For example, he asserted that Jesus could have asked God for help as he hung on the cross and that the apostles could have "*rescued* themselves" from their predicaments.[400] Therefore Englishmen should follow these illustrations and refrain from resisting bad rulers because God would be pleased with their choices.

According to royalists, there was only one acceptable course of action in case of an ineffective ruler; Englishmen could pray that God would help them by changing their sovereign's heart. Praying for rulers was part of the idea that God was the foundation for every prince's power and that men should not try to alter on their own the arrangements God had made for the kingdom. Praying could encourage God to protect a dependable monarch or transform a bad one. The Anglican minister Nathaniel Hardy reminded everyone that they should pray for all kings because they bore heavy responsibilities and had very dangerous jobs; good sovereigns "deserved" Englishmen's prayers because they treated their subjects well; malevolent princes needed Englishmen's prayers to help them become better rulers. Winter instructed his readers to appeal to God, saying "they that have evill Princes, let them send up Prayers and tears to Heaven for them, beseeching him, who hath the rule of the hearts of Kings, to turn their hearts, and not to take his mercy utterly from them, as he took it from *Saul*."[401]

The implications of the royalist theory of obedience were clear; if Charles began to rule inappropriately, Englishmen did not have the right to resist this man primarily because God would support his right to rule despite his behavior. This reasoning suggested that Fowler felt English kings had greater licence to do as they pleased; if Charles chose to rule as a tyrant, Englishmen had to allow that God legitimized this course of action and that the country had to follow the sound laws this king made. It was their duty to accept that the crown had the right to punish them if they disobeyed an inappropriate command and suffer the consequences without resisting the law or the punishment.

Conclusion

The numerous plots that Greaves has detailed and the tracts examined in this study suggested that royalist clergymen had reason to be concerned; Fowler, Winter, Ward and others matched their call for obedience to an untested king against subversive radical tracts and uprisings. Royalist ministers hoped that their message spoke louder than reports of Venner's Rising and other rumors of designs against the crown. Given recent English history, these authors needed to explain obedience and how subjects should behave toward their sovereign, not

---

[400] Ibid., 14-16.

[401] Hardy, *The Apostolic Liturgy Revived*, 20-22; Winter, *A Sermon Preached at East Dearham in Norf. May 29. 1661,* 24.

just demand these things. They could not rely on the country's sentiment for Charles; the country did not know him. Therefore, the ministers had to argue for obedience to a king, not necessarily Charles; they could not guarantee that he would be a good prince. Perhaps this circumstance explained the concentration on the subject's duty to a harmful monarch and specifically Englishmen's inability to resist. Stability for the country was more important than the individual ruler.

Zachary Crofton and the Restoration Church Settlement

Perhaps the least appreciated threats to the Restoration government came from those intent on holding Charles to his commitment to the Solemn League and Covenant and their loudest spokesman, the Presbyterian minister Zachary Crofton. In the spring of 1661 crown officials felt Crofton to be a large enough danger to the establishment to arrest and incarcerate him for about a year. Crofton became the center of a large debate in the press over the validity of the Covenant and Englishmen's responsibility, if any, to uphold this Interregnum agreement.

Fundamentally, a covenant (sometimes called a band or a league) was the special reciprocal relationship between a group of people and God. In return for their exclusive worship and obedience to His laws, God provided for their spiritual needs, protected them from their enemies, and prevented their final damnation. John Knox was the major Scottish proponent of covenant theology and combined a political sense of a covenant with the religious bond between God and his people, citing Josiah's covenant in 2 Kings 23 and Asa's covenant in 2 Chronicles 15.[402]

Covenanting in Scotland had been used since the sixteenth century, when Protestant nobles combined the Scottish tradition of forming bands for mutual benefit with the biblical concept of the Covenant to form the Band of the Lords of the Congregation in 1557. As a reaction to Charles I's religious policies in the country, Scotsmen formulated the National Covenant to protect their political interests and Presbyterian system.[403]

The Solemn League and Covenant had its origins in the English Parliament's need for Scottish military support against the king in the first English Civil War. The two sides had different goals; the English wanted at least 10,000 soldiers for their war effort and the Scots wanted to transform the Church of England into a Presbyterian system. The Scots were immovable; they would not make any alliance that did not include religious provisions aligning the two countries together. Approved in Scotland on 17 April 1643, the Solemn League and Covenant then traveled south with the English commissioners sent to negotiate the treaty. After a few changes, the Covenant was accepted by the Parliament and sworn by the Commons and the Assembly of Divines on 25 September 1643. The Kirk and the English Parliament then required

---

[402] Richard L. Greaves, *Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Christian University Press, 1980), 116-19.

[403] Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, 99-101.

all adult males in their kingdoms to take the Covenant.[404]

As a condition of his proclamation and coronation by the Scots, Charles had to take the Solemn League and Covenant in June 1650. The newly-covenanted King never promised his Scottish subjects that he believed in their cause and several times resisted the pressure to swear the Covenant. His coronation on 1 January 1651 had dramatically revised ceremonies which included abandoning the anointing and inserting places for Charles to reaffirm his commitment to the Covenant. Probably much to Charles' horror, Robert Douglass, the moderator of the Assembly of the Kirk, preached on the benefits of the Covenant and attacked Charles' ancestors for their malevolent deeds.[405]

This section will examine Crofton's dissident critic approach to authority and its impact on the developing Restoration settlement. In his tracts touting the Covenant he made two important dissident critic arguments about the nature of English government that deflated the role of the monarchy: the validity of the Covenant and the issue of co-ordination, first introduced in Chapter One. Frightened by the unfavorable London election results, crown officials turned their attentions to Crofton, whose anti-episcopal preaching and advocation of the Covenant marked him as a dangerous figure with the rhetorical skills and personal draw to spread his rigid Presbyterian opinions. Although he was not the only pro-Covenant author, he was the most significant and the easiest to identify because he put his name on his works, unlike his fellow pamphleteers.[406] Concerned that he might influence more people through the press and the pulpit, administrators arrested and imprisoned Crofton, making an example of him for other Covenant supporters to contemplate. Shortly after the elections and his arrest the Savoy Conference started and the era of compromise characterized by the Worcester House Declaration began to end.

The issues Crofton raised were threats posed to the crown in three main ways. First, those promoting the Covenant directly challenged the government's policy of limited acknowledgment of the past by reminding Charles of darker times and the promises he had made to regain his Scottish and potentially his English throne but had not fulfilled. Second, it called for the destruction of episcopacy and the institution of a Presbyterian synod system in its place, therefore radically changing the Church of England by altering the traditional administrative power structure in the church. Third, accepting the Covenant signaled an approval of the co-ordination theory of government whose proponents argued that the prince shared power equally with the two houses of Parliament and that his explicit consent was not necessary for lawmaking. The last two threats removed Charles from any major role in the church and state, calling for a major overhaul in the English system. The crown and its supporters could not accept such a

---

[404] Ibid., 171.

[405] Hutton, *Charles II*, 48-49, 59-60. Douglass' sermon was reprinted with the *Phenix* collection.

[406] The pro-covenant literature included *The Anatomy of Dr. Gauden's Idolized Non-sense and Blasphemy, in His Pretended Analysis* (London, 1660); [Hugh Griffith,] *Mr. Croftons Case Soberly Considered* (London, 1661).

theory and strenuously defended the English monarchy from these dangerous aspersions.

The Covenant at the Restoration

At the Restoration, Englishmen had ready access to the text of the Covenant. At least two editions were published in Scotland and one in England. A few other tracts included the Covenant in order to refute it, including the reprinted *Reasons of the Present Judgement of the University of Oxford* and Daniel Featley's *The League Illegal*.[407] The best collection of pro-Covenant materials was *The Phenix*, one of the radical tracts mentioned in Chapter One. *The Phenix* contained the Covenant, Robert Douglass' sermon for Charles' Scottish coronation in 1651, Charles' declaration to Scotland of the same year, and Edmund Calamy's sermon on the dangers of Covenant-breaking. The epistle to the reader sounded ominous tones, explaining that the Covenant could not be silenced, and ignoring it may bring serious consequences:

> Thou mayst expect some Reasons (by way of Preface) why these things thus collected are presented to thy consideration, the principall part thereof having been the occasion of so much contest and trouble in these Nations, and therefore desired by many it should have been buried in its own ashes. But for that things of such publique concernment, have been acted by the Heads of these Nations, and in so solemn a manner, in the presence of Almighty God, it cannot so soon be forgotten, but ought to be weighed and layd to heart, with the good or evil consequences that have or shall accrew thereby, it is therefore left to thy serious consideration.[408]

In this paragraph, the author presented two reasons for the Covenant's acceptance and used them to stress to the reader why the three kingdoms should take the Covenant seriously. First, the Covenant had had the most important supporters: the "Heads of these Nations" had been involved in establishing the Covenant. The choice of words was significant; ensuring plausible deniability, the author did not identify who claimed to hold power in each realm: a parliament, a monarch, or a synod. Second, all three kingdoms were obligated to the vow because God had been a witness to the proceedings and would hold everyone responsible for this commitment.

With Charles' return, the Covenant became an important political issue. Some people felt expressing their rejection of this agreement would repair old reputations or garner them more political clout. So concerned about his earlier acceptance of the Covenant, Richard Lee, the

---

[407] *A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation, and Defence of Religion* (Edinburgh, 1660); *The National Covenant of the Kirk of Scotland, and the Solemn League and Covenant of the Three Kingdoms* (Edinburgh, 1660); *England Uniting to Her Soveraign* (London, 1660); *Reasons of the Present Judgement of the University of Oxford, Concerning the Solemn League and Covenant* (London, 1660); Daniel Featley, *The League Illegal* (London, 1660).

[408] *The Phenix*, sig. A2r-v.

chaplain to the duke of Ablemarle and rector of Kings-Hatfield, Hertfordshire, preached an apology sermon for his earlier actions, implying that all those that repented their earlier acceptance of the Covenant should be treated as the church's prodigal sons and accepted back with open arms. After asking for God's forgiveness, Lee used this opportunity to encourage Covenant supporters to give up their cause, saying that he "admonish[ed] all that are involved in the guilt with my self, no longer to add impenitency unto their sin, upon pretense of conscience for that which ought to be renounced (as we tender our own and others souls safety) for conscience sake."[409] Several ministers cited their rejection of the Solemn League and Covenant in their petitions to recover the places they had lost for their loyalty or to receive other compensatory properties or positions. In October 1660, several members of Queens' College, Cambridge, petitioned the king to reinstate one of their own, Ambrose Appleby, who had been expelled for his refusal to take the Covenant. The Scottish minister Dr. Andrew Lamont cited his refusal of the Covenant as the reason he lost his living at Markinch, Fife, and did not neglect to mention that afterward he served the English garrison at Dumbarton, "at that time kept against the Covenanters." For his actions the Scottish Parliament banished him from the country and decreed that Lamont should never again hold a benefice in his homeland. He asked Charles to give him the rectory of Stanhope, Durham, which was in the king's gift.[410] The minister Ralph Ironside doggedly pursued a position through three petitions asking the king to allow him to become the minister for the chapel of Braminster in Dorset. His first petition in January 1661 was fairly standard, pointing out what a good and loyal subject he had been to both kings and begged Charles' favor in this matter. Despite an endorsement from Gilbert Sheldon, the bishop of London, Ironside was unable to move this business forward to his satisfaction. Ironside's second petition was more aggressive. After thanking the prince for the actions already taken, he complained about the illegal incumbent who would not vacate the post, Joseph Crabb. According to Ironside, Crabb was wholly unqualified for this employment in such an important market town; Crabb had not taken holy orders, did not agree with the beliefs and discipline of the Church of England, and considered himself still bound by the Solemn League and Covenant, the implication being that he believed the Covenant still in force for the whole country. Despite the crown's position on the Covenant, Ironside's appeal was not enough to move the process any faster. He petitioned a third time, asking for the king to issue another order allowing the patron to grant him the position and remove Crabb.[411]

However, the most important attack on the viability of the Covenant came from John Gauden in *Analysis* (printed before 25 August 1660) in which he sought to transform the Covenant from a political bond into a spiritual relationship, denying the ability of the agreement to alter the state church. Furious at Gauden's breezy dismissal of the Covenant, Crofton fired back with *Analepsis*, which had three editions in 1660, and began the paper war that erupted over Crofton, the rigid Presbyterian complaints against the established church, the validity of the

---

[409] Richard Lee, *Cor Humiliatum & Contritum* ([London], 1663), 13, 40.

[410] PRO, SP 29/5/24; 29/18/32; 29/12/121.

[411] PRO, SP 29/49/10; 29/49/115; 29/49/116.

Covenant, and the theory of co-ordination that Crofton insisted governed English government. Although Crofton kept the presses busy with new additions to the debate, most of the pamphlets produced in this controversy supported Gauden and the established church.[412]

In *Analysis*, Gauden tried to relieve any Englishmen who had taken the Covenant from the burden of supporting the agreement now by explaining the major problems with its constitution and imposition. This short pamphlet was the more coherent of the two pieces Gauden published on the subject and set the pattern for most attacks on the Solemn League and Covenant.[413] The basis for Gauden's attack primarily rested on two ideas: the lack of proper authority to impose the Covenant on the country and the absence of biblical and historical precedents for this type of covenant. First, Gauden argued that the Covenant was invalid because it had been imposed without the king's consent, citing Numbers 30 as proof that the prince has the right to break oaths his subjects had made without his permission. Second, he argued that there were no examples in the Old Testament or the early church of covenant relationships like the one in the Solemn League and Covenant.[414]

The Dangerous Doctrines in Crofton's Defense of the Covenant

Zachary Crofton offered systematic and well thought out responses to Gauden's main charges. Crofton's primary explanation of why the Solemn League and Covenant was obligatory for everyone claimed that the agreement had been enacted by the proper authority, introduced a dangerous element into the debate, and probably attracted the attention of more readers than his anti-episcopacy tract. He asserted that the Covenant was obligatory because the Parliament had taken it and thereby it bound all of England:

> But again Sir, the *capacity* of the Covenanters, is more considerable than *the number*; and will make it a question well worth consideration, Whether it be not obligatory to the whole Nation? When I consider the Lords and Commons in *Parliament assembled*, and under that notion and capacity swearing the Covenant, as the collective body of the Nation, though not near *a fourth part in number*, I am apt to think it looks very like *a National Obligation*.[415]

---

[412] John Gauden, *Analysis. The Loosing of St. Peters Bands* (London, 1660); Zachary Crofton, *Analepsis, or Saint Peters Bonds Abide* (London, 1660); *Analepsis, or Saint Peters Bonds Abide*, 2nd ed. (London, 1660); *Analepsis, or Saint Peters Bonds Abide*, 3rd ed. (London, 1660).

[413] John Gauden, *Anti Baal-Berith* (London, 1661).

[414] Gauden, *Analysis*, 4-10 (mspr. 6-12).

[415] Crofton, *Analepsis*, 27.

According to Crofton, Englishmen were bound to uphold the Covenant because their representatives in the Commons and the traditional ruling class in the Lords, fighting a war against the king and his supporters, made this commitment to Scotland. Even Englishmen who had supported the royalists were obligated to fulfill the Covenant because the Parliament, the major ruling body in the country, made this commitment to a foreign power to aid in the war against the royalist cause.

In his explanation of why Restoration Englishmen could accept the Solemn League and Covenant as continually binding, Crofton enunciated one of the most pernicious radical doctrines for royalists of the period; he brought up the specter of co-ordinated government as the reason the Parliament could have acted as the rulers in establishing the Covenant. Crofton ensured the legitimacy of the relationship by explaining that the necessary people had been involved. First, the Parliament had the ability to make these decisions for the country because it shared power with the king, "*the two Houses of Parliament* (and those two had more than ordinary power) *are co-ordinate*, *and sharers in the Legislation* of England; and so a *constant, lawful authority*." In Crofton's use of co-ordination, the king's assent was inherent in any decision the two houses made and therefore his actual presence or explicit consent was not required nor was he able to object to their actions. Second, the Parliament was in session, thereby implying that this decision was encompassed by both houses and not a small radical faction trying to hijack the lawmaking capacity. Crofton confidently explained to his readers that "an *Oath* is in it self, *naturâ Rei*, a permanent bond; once laid it ever binds; a Parliament are a power sufficiently compleat to impose and enjoyn it."[416]

As if Crofton had not offended royalist sympathies enough, he proposed that the major defect the royalists had been trumpeting, the lack of the king's presence in the Covenant, had been solved with Charles II's Scottish coronation.[417] The sense of the explanation was not that Crofton needed this reason to make his argument complete or that he felt his Parliament solution was not strong enough but that he wanted to boast. He did not relay the information simply; instead he chose to make much of the king's acceptance of the Covenant, using a refutation of the Numbers 30 argument to illustrate his triumph: "if the *Father, Master, Husband, in the day that he heareth the vow of the Wife, Child, or Servant, and hold his peace*, (contradict it not) much more He *justifie, allow, and commendit*, as His most Sacred Majesty, hath done, on most serious and deliberate though in a most publique and solemn Declaration, it shall stand, and be established."[418] Of course, Charles I had not been in the position to overthrow this vow when the Commons agreed to the Covenant; but Crofton overlooked this minor detail.

Crofton tried two different approaches to defending his appeals to the past. He argued that the Solemn League and Covenant was "justified" by the many examples of covenants throughout the Old Testament beginning with the first covenant on Mt. Sinai and including ones concluded during the reigns of Joshua, Jehoiadah, and Nehemiah. Crofton challenged Gauden

---

[416] Ibid., 12.

[417] Ibid., 12-13.

[418] Ibid., 13.

(and by extension everyone else who argued that he could not use the past as precedent) to explain how they knew the exact form of the original covenant taking, saying:

> We must desire the Doctor to demonstrate, That the Law of Moses or Covenant in *Horeb* was not only the Rule and Dictate of what matter they should Covenant, but the *express Covenant* which was, or did consist in the exact recital, and Repetition of that Law of the ten Commandments, as the very form thereof.[419]

Crofton contended that the idea was far more significant than the actual form of the inspiration for the contemporary Covenant.

Crofton countered the attack on the lack of specific and detailed scriptural precedents by declaring the process of covenanting irrelevant. Saying that it did not matter how the covenant was imposed, he argued that it was still valid and binding in England because the circumstances surrounding the situation were inconsequential:

> If an Oath, Vow, or Covenant, containing in it matter *good and lawful* (though not necessary and positive duty) be imposed by *fraude* (as it was that of the *Gibeonites*) or *force*, and *factions*, *Army*, *and tumults* (as that of *Zedekiah* to *Nebuchadnezzar*) without any *formal authority*, other than a mans or peoples own voluntary Act and submission, which is new unto, and *unacquainted* with the Laws and Constitutions accustomed in the place, and to the people, be by reason of any, or all these miscarried Circumstances, *void and null?*[420]

Crofton here contradicted himself by saying that a people could be tricked or forced into a covenant but also insisting that the people he named made this covenant of their own free will. Relying on the argument that these people did have a choice to take the covenant or face the consequences, he could present the covenant as a voluntary act of the people. The second major point in this passage posited the idea that the people, without their ruler's permission, could agree to change any laws they felt were unfit for the times. This idea obviously contradicted what the Restoration government wanted Englishmen to believe, and gave serious support to the trial, conviction, and execution of Charles I. Continuing the thought of the second idea, the third idea that "miscarried circumstances" did not void any actions taken suggested that even though the downfall of Charles I had occurred in "miscarried circumstances," the intent behind reforming the government was still sound.

Both major arguments Crofton put forward denied the significance and role of the king in the English government and church. In a co-ordinated government, Charles did not have any real

---

[419] Ibid, 20-21.

[420] Ibid., 11.

power. The implications of his second argument suggested that the people did not need the prince to make spiritual bonds; his role as the head of the Church in England was insignificant. If the citizens could covenant without the sovereign, they could covenant against the prince. Crofton had not argued that Englishmen should ignore the monarch, but the logical conclusion from his work suggested that they could if so desired.

The flood of printed responses to Crofton took a two pronged approach to their subject. First, they expounded and expanded on the arguments Gauden had first laid out.[421] Second, almost all royalist authors who tackled the Covenant addressed the claim of co-ordination in government, denying the basic arguments and attacking Crofton for his rash arrogation to the Parliament of control over the monarch and the national church.

The primary royalist counterattack to the co-ordination claim centered on their denial that the king's assent was implicit in the two houses of Parliament and their assertion of the king's negative voice in the lawmaking process. The Oxford divines who produced the *Reasons of the Present Judgement of the University of Oxford* and the anonymous author of the *Answer to the Solemn League and Covenant* argued that the king's assent was not implicit in the two houses: "We have been brought up in a belief that for the making of Laws the actuall Royal assent was simply necessary, and not onely a virtual assent supposed to be included in the Votes of the two Houses: otherwise, what use can be made of his Negative voice?"[422] John Rowland concurred, saying that lawmaking must have the king's consent; he did have the ability to say no to bills that he did not like:

> Parliaments indeed may, and do well to advise and consult, vote and pass things before they offer them to the King, but what is that unless it be confirmed by his Royal Consent with *Le Roy veult*. What he did condescend to, is Lawfully Enacted, but all the rest is of no force; for it is the Kings Prerogative to consider of it *Le Roy*

---

[421] The anti-covenant tracts included William Collinne, *The Spirit of the Phanatiques Dissected* (London, 1660); Daniel Featley, *The League Illegal* (London, 1660); *The Scotch Covenant Condemned* (London, 1660); *The Funeral of the Good Old Cause* (London, 1661); *Reasons of the Present Judgement of the University of Oxford Concerning the Solemne League and Covenant, the Negative Oath, the Ordinances Concerning Discipline and Worship* (London, 1660); John Rowland, *A Reply to the Answer of Anonymous to Doctor Gauden's Analysis of the Sense of the Covenant* (London, 1660); Gerard Langbaine, *A Review of the Covenant Wherein the Original, Grounds, Means, Matter, and Ends of It Are Examined* (London, 1661); Thomas Tomkins, *Short Strictures or Animadversions on so Much of Mr. Croftons Fastning St Peters Bonds* (London, 1661); Laurence Womock, *The Solemn League and Covenant Arraigned and Condemned by the Sentence of the Divines of London and Cheshire* (London, 1661); Robert Cressener, *Anti-Baal-Berith Justified* (London, 1662); Matthew Wren, *An Abandoning of the Scotish Covenant* (London, 1662).

[422] *Reasons of the Present Judgement of the University of Oxford*, 26; *An Answer to the Solemn League and Covenant*.

> *s'advisera*. What the king opposed not, may imply his tacite consent, but if there were the violence or fear upon him, as at that time, that he must do it *volens nolens*, as King *Charles* the II. condescended to your Covenant when He was crowned in *Scotland*, I know not how the Laws do interpret Oathes of that nature that are forced.[423]

In this explanation, Rowland appealed to the past to convince his readers that the king's consent had always been necessary for making law. Everyone should remember that they had been taught that lawmaking functioned this way, and anyone promoting different views was bringing dangerous and unnecessary change to England. Although he admitted that Charles had taken the Covenant, the author argued that the prince had not had a choice; to gain the rightful recognition of his place, Charles had been forced to swear the Covenant. Rowland argued that individuals should not be obliged to keep oaths they had been compelled to take out of necessity.

Perhaps the most complete royalist responses to co-ordination was Thomas Tomkins' *Short Strictures*.[424] In his *Short Strictures*, Tomkins attacked Crofton for his use of co-ordination and further suggestion that the Parliament retained a jurisdiction over the king and church. Crofton had made a highly controversial statement about the nature of political power. In *Analepsis Analepthene*, Crofton argued that "the power given to the King, is *such a power* as Bishops, Cardinals, or Popes had used; not such as Parliaments (who ever retained a Jursidiction in themselves over both Church and Crown) enjoyed and exercised."[425] Tomkins railed against Crofton for this expropriation of all power to the Parliament and declared Crofton's formulation to be "High Treason," suggesting that under Crofton's scheme Charles would be no more than a "*Tenant at Will* at best." He labeled Crofton's usage "Doctrine of *Jurisdiction over the King,*" "*English Monarchy of the two Houses of Parliament*," and "*Jurisdiction of the two Houses*."[426]

For Tomkins, the two Houses and convocation needed the prince's consent to make law or changes in the church. Power flowed from the king to the other government parts, much like a landlord shared his property with his renters. The landlord did not give up ownership or control

---

[423] Rowland, *A Reply to the Answer of Anonymous to Doctor Gauden's Analysis of the Sense of the Covenant*, 41.

[424] In *The King's Supremacy Asserted*, Robert Sheringham presented a comprehensive explanation of the king's supremacy over the Parliament but did not address co-ordination directly. Instead of acknowledging Crofton's advocation of the principle, the author chose instead to respond to the original tract that began the controversy, Philip Hunton's *Treatise of Monarchy*. Robert Sheringham, *The Kings Supremacy Asserted* (London, 1661).

[425] Crofton, *Analepsis Anelephthe*, 67.

[426] Tomkins, *Short Strictures*, 69-73.

of the lands, but shared their use with others.[427]

Crofton's Impact

Crofton's impact on the church settlement could be seen in the shift from the relative broadness of the church that the Worcester House Declaration envisioned and the reduced willingness of Anglican divines to listen to moderate Presbyterian plans for the church beginning with the Savoy Conference in the spring of 1661. His vigorous assertions of the Covenant and denigration of the royal power frightened crown officials, who saw the anti-episcopal successes in the London parliamentary elections as a sign of greater support for the Presbyterians, which could lead to more voices supporting the validity of the Covenant. Crofton was arrested and imprisoned to prevent him from influencing more people.

Before March 1661, there had been the possibility of a wider comprehension in the state church. The Worcester House Declaration, the fruit of intense talks in September and October 1660, indicated that the crown was interested in a reduced episcopacy and a serious review of the Prayer Book. During the fall, the monarch began filling many of the vacant sees with men who the crown felt might be willing to agree to changes in church structure such as the Presbyterian Edward Reynolds, and the moderate Church of England ministers Accepted Frewen, John Gauden, and Humphrey Henchman.[428]

Moderate Presbyterian dreams of influencing the church settlement began to fade in late 1660 when they were unable to push their religious agenda any further. The bill for making the Worcester House Declaration law failed to pass the Commons by a vote of 183 to 157, partially thanks to crown supporters and Independents who worried that accepting this bill would endanger their hopes for future toleration. Frustrated, the Presbyterians then debated how they should react to Charles II's Declaration but could not come to any agreement on thanking the sovereign.[429]

By the spring of 1661, several developments in London gave government officials reason for concern about the power of the Presbyterians in the capital. First, Crofton had made a strong case for the acceptance of the Solemn League and Covenant, proving to be a better literary combatant than John Gauden. The flood of episcopal responses to Crofton suggested that many took this issue very seriously. Second, Crofton was fast becoming the most notorious preacher in the capitol, attracting huge crowds every time he preached and using his pulpit to declaim against episcopacy. One admirer explained that Crofton had a wide following, saying that when the minister preached during the Sunday lectures he had "an infinite Auditory, with infinit itching &

---

[427] Ibid. Tomkins' understanding had similarities to the medieval concept of usufruct rights.

[428] Spurr, 34-38.

[429] Ibid., 37-38.

Applaus."[430] Third, the local elections for the new Parliament had not benefitted the Church of England; Londoners chose two Presbyterians and two Independents.[431]

Considering his arguments dangerous enough to arrest, question, and imprison him, the crown reacted to Crofton by silencing him. The Solicitor-General, Heneage Finch, felt that the crown could hold him simply on an admission of authorship, giving them time to prepare specific charges once another copy of the tract could be secured and investigated. Apparently Finch had corroborating confirmation from Crofton's printer, Ralph Smyth, who was willing to testify, probably on the promise of more lenient treatment. Finch singled out four major points which warranted further investigation for charges against Crofton. First, he thought he remembered that Crofton had urged the imposition of the Covenant by force if necessary. Second, he highlighted Crofton's argument that the Parliament did not need the king's consent to impose an oath on the people and expect the oath to bind everyone. Third, he slightly misconstrued Crofton's definition of power in the government; he did not correctly identify Crofton's use of the co-ordination principle and instead thought he meant that the people were superior to the king, saying Crofton claimed it was *jure divino* and that he could prove it from scripture. Fourth, he remarked that Crofton had made much of Charles' swearing to the Covenant for his Scottish coronation.[432]

Crofton's examination on 23 March 1661 was very short and rehearsed his authorship of pro-Covenant materials. During the session, the Secretary of State Sir Edward Nicholas asked him if he had written *Analepsis Anelephthe* printed by Ralph Smyth, a London bookseller who had been one of the publishers of the Directory in 1644. Crofton acknowledged that he had been the author. Nicholas then asked him if he was the author of *Berith Anti-Baal*, which Crofton owned as well. Crofton had not tried to hide his authorship of these two pieces; their title pages bore his name as the author. Concerned about laxness in the Company of Stationers, Nicholas also questioned Andrew Crooke, the warden of the Company. Crooke told Nicholas that he usually read drafts of everything submitted for a license and noted his approval on the manuscript. However, the warden told Nicholas that he did not license Crofton's works. Crofton had found a printer who had been willing to circumvent official processes for the potential profit, not unusual in any age, especially the Restoration. The government also arrested Crofton's bookseller Smyth, who petitioned for his release, claiming that he had not done anything wrong, only that "had the ill fortune to publish a booke written by one Zachary Crofton." Proclaiming his ignorance of the substance of Crofton's work, he claimed that he had not been able to proofread the work and implied therefore should not be held responsible for the content.[433]

During his stay in the Tower, Crofton petitioned the king for a pardon but did not give up

---

[430] PRO, SP 29/32/104; 29/32/116.

[431] Hutton, *Restoration*, 152.

[432] PRO, SP 29/33/21.

[433] PRO, SP 29/33/22; 29/34/64; *Analepsis Anelephthe*; *Berith Anti-Baal*; Plomer, *s.v.* Ralph Smyth.

any ground on his argument, instead calling his recent works "inconsiderate expressions about matter out of his Spheare" and declaring that he "hath nott spoken or written anything of a malicious mind or intent to obviate or disturbe the peace and settlement of these your Kingdomes under your Royall Government."[434] From Crofton's perspective, the fulfillment of the Covenant would preserve the peace and settlement of the realm, as it had been the will of the Parliament and later the promise of the king. Crown officials saw his writings in the opposite light, for obligating the king to transform the Church of England from episcopacy to presbytery and admitting that the government was co-ordinate would radically alter England and overthrow two of the monarchy's main principles.

Crofton's crusade against the episcopal system and for the Solemn League and Covenant was detrimental to the moderate Presbyterian interest in the church settlement, an idea which should be incorporated into Spurr's definition of the tensions in late 1660 and early 1661. Spurr has cited the failure of the crown to turn the Worcester House Declaration into law in November 1660, Venner's Rising in January 1661, and the London elections in March as responsible for the concern and atmosphere.[435] Concerned about Crofton's ability to influence Londoners as evidenced by the elections, crown officials may have worried that other rigid Presbyterians, heartened by Crofton, would push for the Covenant to be enacted. The religious conference at the Savoy on 15 March 1661 was strongly weighted in the Anglicans' favor. The time for negotiations about the nature of the church had passed and Crofton and his advocacy of the Solemn League and Covenant was a hitherto unrecognized part of this shift toward a stronger episcopal system.[436]

Government reaction to the memory and threat of the Solemn League and Covenant figured into several important early Restoration statutes. The Act for the Safety and Preservation of His Majesties Person and Government declared the Covenant unlawful and invalid. In the Corporation Act, parliamentarians required all officials of towns and cities to take a new oath against the Covenant in which the swearer stated that he believed that "there lyes no Obligation upon me or any other person from the Oath commonly called The Solemn League and Covenant and that the same was it itself an unlawfull Oath and imposed upon the Subjects of this Realm against the knowne Laws and Liberties of the Kingdome."[437] With the Act of Uniformity in 1662 anyone wishing to maintain or gain positions in the church or be licensed to teach were required to abjure the Covenant as part of their oaths supporting the crown and church settlement. The revised oath recognized that the Covenant intended to change English government: "And I do declare that I do hold there lies no Obligacõn upon me or on any other person from the Oath commonly called the Solemn League and Covenant to endeavour any change or alteration of

---

[434] PRO, SP 29/33/23.

[435] Spurr, 37-38.

[436] Ibid, 38-39.

[437] 13 Car. II. c. 1; 13 Car. II. Stat. 2. c. 1.

Government either in Church or State."[438]

Conclusion

Crofton's command of language and argument probably won him few admirers in the court, the established church, and moderate Presbyterian circles. Moderate Presbyterians had good reason to resent his public voice; his advocation of the Covenant was not designed to encourage a broad church settlement that decreased the power of episcopacy. Charles, who could have been the moderates greatest ally, may have become offended at Crofton's insistence on the co-ordination of government; in the latter's formulation, the king did not have any real power to help dissenters by exercising a negative voice. After the unsatisfactory returns in the London parliamentary elections, administrators realized the threat Crofton posed to the English acceptance of episcopacy and negotiations with the moderates. Officials silenced him with a lengthy jail term and began to close the doors on serious cooperation with the moderate Presbyterians.

Dissenting Reactions to the Act of Uniformity

Many Anglican ministers tried to convince their audiences that unity in the church was an essential element in the operation of the country. The minister Richard Carpenter proclaimed "how good and how pleasant it is, for Brethren to dwell together in Unity!" This unity, he implied, would help the Protestant Church of England fight the Roman Catholics.[439] Samuel Brunsell, the rector of Bingham, Nottinghamshire, argued that Christianity was a social religion, and anyone not conforming to that community's standards could not be a Christian, saying "the self-deified Enthusiast is but one by himself, above Church-Society, and so above Church-work, and so cannot be of the body, and so no Christian." Richard Henchman, the rector of St. James Garlick-Hyth, London, urged England to unite in the established church so the country could glorify God better.[440]

Despite the best efforts of the royalist polemicists, calls for unity, logic, and duty did not convince all Englishmen to submit to the monarchy and the established church. The previous three chapters have examined various radical pieces which proclaimed in varying degrees their distrust of and disgust with the current government. This section will focus on two major dissenting reactions to the Act of Uniformity, passed in the spring of 1662 and put into force on St. Bartholomew's Day, 24 August 1662. The resulting church settlement provided a narrow

---

[438] 14 Car. II. c. 4.

[439] Richard Carpenter, *Rome in Her Fruits* (London, 1663), sig. A2r-v.

[440] Samuel Brunsell, *Solomons Blessed Land* (London, 1660), 9; Richard Henchman, *A Peace-Offering in the Temple* (London, 1661), 12-17.

definition for what was acceptable in the established church. Centered on the revised Book of Common Prayer, the Restoration Church of England effectively excluded many who could not agree with the strong episcopacy and the revised Prayer Book and established a Protestant fringe of those who would not conform to the rules on adiaphora and church government. Over a thousand ministers lost their positions between 1660 and 1663 and untold numbers of Englishmen were left with religious services they felt were spiritually unsatisfying and wrong in God's eyes.[441] The first group of reactions to the settlement consisted of the numerous dissident critic farewell sermons the radical press published following the mass ejections in August 1662. The ministers preaching and publishing these sermons critiqued the government for its church settlement, provided their readers with comfort in trying times, and prepared them for spiritual life beyond the established church once the dissenting ministers left office. The second category, the subversive radical *Mirabilis Annus* series, took a more aggressive approach than the farewell sermon collections, using prodigies to frighten readers into remaining vigilant against the established church and attacking the king himself. Both genres served to reaffirm the nonconformist communities' commitment to dissent from the Church of England.

These early nonconformist genres illustrated Neil Keeble's argument about the importance of print in the survival of these communities. In *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England*, Keeble has argued that the significance of nonconformist writings in this period should be reevaluated. Instead of this literature reflecting a defeated and declining people, he has claimed that the material instead represented the survival and important change in the dissenting communities. After the St. Bartholomew's Day ejections, dissenters preserved nonconformity through the press. Emphasis turned away from the community and toward the individual, highlighting the importance of an emotional commitment to and expression of faith.[442] This section will reaffirm Keeble's thesis and suggest that the beginnings of his argument can be placed earlier in the Restoration than he has supposed.

Farewell Sermons

With the Act of Uniformity, a little over 950 ministers were ejected from their livings, leaving thousands of Englishmen without their customary spiritual guides.[443] Many ministers preached their last sermons in the weeks before St. Bartholomew's Day, registering their disavowal of the government's narrow interpretation of the state church and saying goodbye to their congregations. In the ensuing months, the underground press produced several collections of these farewell sermons, many of which were simply repackaged materials from other

---

[441] Spurr, 43-45. Spurr refers to the ejected clergy as a "puritan penumbra" around the established clergy. Ibid., 45.

[442] Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity*, 18-24, 82, 206-15.

[443] Spurr, 43.

collections.[444] Greaves' "confederates" were likely the printers and distributers of these texts, given their involvement in the regicide tracts discussed in Chapter Two and the prodigies discussed below. The producers of these texts had two main goals: to critique the government for the religious settlement and to prepare dissenters for their spiritual lives after their ministers left office. Although Spurr mentions the farewell sermons, he does not present in-depth analysis and misses these two themes.[445] Examining how these sermons relate to the producers' main goals will be the best way to approach this large collection of sources. In general, these authors were not preaching total rejection of Restoration society but partial commitment to it; dissenters should make good use of what they could in the established church but were now more responsible for their own spiritual welfare.

The major rhetorical device these ministers employed to decry the religious settlement involved lamenting their fates.[446] Hoping to draw their reader's sympathies, these authors described themselves in pitiful terms and argued that they could not conform because the church had asked them to agree to conditions they could not accept and that would endanger their souls. Those preaching farewell sermons chose various scriptural examples to explain their situation to their congregations and readers. Job, the innocent man whom God tested with several personal tragedies before restoring to him what he had lost, was an apt metaphor according to Thomas Lye, the ejected minister of Allhallows, Lombard Street, London. William Beerman, the former chaplain of St. Thomas' Hospital in Southwark, likened himself to Paul about to leave the small Christian community at Ephesus. George Ewbank, the ejected curate of Great Ayton, Yorkshire, made larger claims for the ejected ministers, relating their situations to Jesus' unwillingness to die on the cross and Jesus' realization that his death was God's will. Ewbank's choice of text, Matthew 26:39, allowed him to express his concerns, demonstrate his obedience to God, and mimic Jesus in asking God to forgive those who had removed him from his post. He also dug deeper into scripture and history for other men whose love and obedience God had tested in Abraham, David, and Socrates. In his sermon on Hebrews 30:20-21, Henry Osland, the former

---

[444] *The Farewel Sermons of the Late London Ministers* (London, 1662); *An Exact Collection of Farewel Sermons* (London, 1662); *The Second Volume of the Farewel Sermons* (London, 1663); *A Compleat Collection of Farewel Sermons* (London, 1663); *The Third Volume of Farewel Sermons* (London, 1663); *The Second and Last Collection of the Late London Ministers Farewel Sermons* (London, 1663). For citation purposes, I have chosen *A Compleat Collection of Farewel Sermons* because this collection is the most complete and easiest to read, despite serious pagination problems. Not only are these collections not paginated consistently, the signature marks are often wrong as well. I have supplied the correct signature numbers. The only set of farewell sermons that did not print the authors' names and that did not repeat materials from the collections above was *England's Remembrancer. England's Remembrancer* (London, 1663).

[445] Spurr, 44.

[446] The ritual and liturgical differences that these ministers discussed fall outside the scope of this study focusing on obedience.

minister of Bewdly Chapel, tried to encourage his parishioners that the dissenting ministers had not been permanently disabled; just as Jesus rose from the dead so would the ejected ministers.[447]

Many of these ministers could not conform because their consciences would not allow them and they were quick to defend themselves from charges of becoming "humerous [sic] perverse *Phanatick*[s]." The Presbyterian Dr. William Bates, the former minister of St. Dunstan's in the West, London, defended his actions by saying that it was "neither fancy, faction, nor humour, that makes me not to comply, but meerly [sic] for fear of offending God."[448] The Somerset minister John Gaspine was more direct, arguing that he did not agree with the precepts that the Church of England had chosen to enforce and that he in good conscience could not continue to preach if to do so meant joining the established church: "being therefore enforced to lay down my Ministry, I thought good to let you know that it is neither out of singularity nor stubborness in opinion, which many it may be conjecture [sic], but because the things required are such as my conscience cannot close withal."[449] Lye used this opportunity to attack those who had chosen to conform, saying,

> though I am not satisfied my selfe, yet I condemn no man; I believe there be many of them do as conscientiously subscribe as deny to subscribe. I protest in the fear of God I cannot subscribe, perhaps it is because I have not that light as others have; *for he that doubts*, saith the Apostle, *is Damned*.[450]

The sarcastic anger hiding behind the cattiness was palpable and Lye probably expected his congregation to laugh at his word play with "light." The resulting implications from these admissions were clear; those who had conformed to the established church offended God, a sin those who refused to conform avoided. Lye simply enunciated this conclusion inherent in the nonconformists' plea to conscience.

---

[447] Thomas Lye, "Mr. Lye's First Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sig. V3r; William Beerman, "Mr. Beerman's Farewell Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sigs. Mm4v-Nn3v; George Evanke [Ewbank], *A Farewell Sermon Preached at Great Ayton in the County of Yorkshire* (London?, 1663), 1-2, 5, 7; Henry Osland, *The Living, Dead Pastor yet Speaking* (London, 1663), 10; Old *DNB, s.v.* Thomas Lye; *BDBR, s.v.v.* William Beerman and George Ewbank.

[448] William Bates, "Dr. Bates's Afternoon Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sig. R1v; Old *DNB, s.v.*, William Bates; George Thorne, "Mr. George Thorne of Weymouth, His Farewell Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sig. Cccc4r.

[449] John Gaspine, "The Farewel Sermons of John Gaspine Minister of the Gospel, Preached at Ashpriors in the Count of Somerset, the two last Lords days before Bartholomew-day, 1662," in *Compleat Collection*, sig. Lll4v.

[450] Lye, "Mr. Lye's First Sermon," in, *Compleat Collection*, sig. V4v.

Although some of the ejected clergymen were adamant that they were not preaching sedition, those ministers did not offer adequate explanations for what they were attempting to accomplish by preaching and publishing their sermons. An anonymous author answered the charge that the ejected ministers had been preaching sedition; he challenged the accusers to read the sermons and attempt to provide proof that the dissenters intended harm to the government. Instead, he argued that his colleagues' only motivation arose from their concern for their souls: "What other motive I pray you can be rationally imagined, should enduce us to this severity, but fear of sinning against God, and of wronging your and our own souls?"[451]

The second major motive behind publishing these sermons involved comforting and caring for the congregations orphaned by the ejections, constant themes throughout most of the sermons. By accomplishing this goal, these ministers shaped post St. Bartholomew's Day dissent by encouraging a culture that did not rely on the minister as the major scriptural interpreter and spiritual leader. Instead, believers had to look elsewhere, and the farewell sermons plotted a course for the dissenters to follow. "It shows how to act, to thy God Fidelity, in thy self Humility, and to thy Prince Loyalty," the anonymous editor of the *Farewel Sermons of the Late London Ministers* informed readers; "it will also keep thee from future falls, and guard thee from present fears; it may be a Glass for thine Eye, a Lanthorne for thy Foot, a Curb for thy Tongue, and a President for thy Pen."[452] The anonymous editor of the *England's Remembrancer* collection enunciated this shift in the nonconformist community, saying "if we are kept shorter in respect of Publick means, the greater should be our care to improve all private helps."[453] The ejected ministers recommended four main places for their congregations to find strength: in God's presence, in careful use of the Church of England, in the company of other godly persons, and in godly texts.

Several pastors tried to comfort their listeners and readers by explaining that although the ministers were leaving them God would not; nothing could separate Christ from his flock. In his farewell sermon the former minister of St. Olave's, Southwark, William Cooper, defined the situation well; God did not prevent calamities and dangerous times but he sustained his people when negative things happened: "Though God will not always deliver his people out of trouble, yet he will still be present with them, supporting them, that they may not despond, nor sink under the burden."[454] One anonymous author compared the dissenters' plight to David's woes related

---

[451] "Sermon XI," in *England's Remembrancer*, 256.

[452] "To the Reader," in *Farewel Sermons of the Late London Ministers*, sig. A2v (mspr. sig A4v).

[453] "The Preface to the Reader," in *England's Remembrancer*, sig. A2v.

[454] William Cooper, "Mr. Cooper's Farewel-Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sig. Rrr4r-v; Pledger, "Mr. Pledger's Farewel Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sig. Zz3; Osland, 7; G.N., "Mr. G.N. His Farewel-Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sigs. Vvv1r-Vvv2r; Philip Lamb, "Mr. Philip Lamb's Farewel Sermon, Preached at Beer-Regis in the County of Dorset, Aug. 17. 1661," in *Compleat Collection*, sigs. Bbb2v-Ccc1v; Brooks, "Mr. Brooks His Farewel

in 1 Samuel 30 when upon entering Ziklag after the Amalekites had sacked the city and enslaved the women, including two of his wives. His troops were furious, and some talked of stoning their leader for not protecting their families. David bore his pain and his soldiers' resentment calmly and looked to God for strength. Encouraging everyone to follow David's example and trust that God would support them, the writer sought to explain the many ways God would take care of his people in their times of need. Thomas Jacomb, the ejected rector of St. Martin's, Ludgate, London, explained that God would take care of those in need, much as people take care of the sick, especially children. People payed better attention to others when the latter were in need, and God would do the same: "God gives the best of comforts in the worst of times." These "best of comforts" included spiritual guidance, sympathy, and protection from enemies.[455]

Second, several ministers stressed to their congregations that they should not separate from the Church of England and that they could find some good in attending services there. They were not asking dissenters to accept the liturgy and ritual without question but to examine the situation and benefit from the parts that suited their beliefs. Those attending official church services needed to be vigilant, noting the beneficial parts and rejecting the harmful ones. Osland reassured his listeners and readers that their participation would not be unlawful if they secretly objected to the parts that offended their consciences: "But in things that are inconvenient, or in an imperfect mode of Worship; where there is a liberty of closing or refusing: the Joyners are not guilty of the sin, especially if there is a secret protest entered against every defiling thing."[456] One anonymous minister declared that the Church of England was a true church which lacked full reformation but that these "adjudged defects" did not give anyone enough reason to leave the church. He exhorted dissenters to stay with the state church but complain in private about those things they could not change in public.[457]

However, this attitude toward the Church of England was not universal; several ministers had bitter words for the clergy that would take their posts in the months after St. Bartholomew's Day. The ejected rector of St. Stephen, Walbrook, London, Thomas Watson, had sharp words for the ministers that would replace him and his colleagues:

> Oh! how [sic] sad is it to have such in the Ministry, that can neither labour nor love, that are such as are without bowels, that look more at Tyths [sic] than at souls, [.] [I]t must needs be sad with a people

---

Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sigs. Gg4v-Hh1r.

[455] 1 Samuel 30; "Sermon VII," in *England's Remembrancer*, 161-66; Thomas Jacomb, "Mr. Jacomb's Forenoon Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sigs. N1v-N3v; Old *DNB*, s.v.v. William Cooper, Thomas Jacomb; *BDBR, s.v.* Thomas Jacomb.

[456] Osland, 44-45; Edward Hancock, *The Pastors Last Legacy and Counsel* (London, 1663), sig. A4r.

[457] "Sermon IV," in *England's Remembrancer*, 94; "Sermon XVI," in *England's Remembrancer*, 453-56.

> in any part of the world, to have such Ministers set over them, as either poisons them with error, or do what in them lies to damn them by their wicked example.[458]

Watson's venom was unusual for the printed farewell sermons; either many of his fellow dissenting ministers did not agree with him, or perhaps more likely for some, were afraid to express such negative sentiments. Samuel Cradock, the ejected rector of North Cadbury, Somerset, painted a gloomy picture for his congregation, explaining the different kinds of bad clergymen that might take his place and how these men would adversely affect the people. Unlike the preachers who felt that their flocks could receive some benefit from the Church of England, Cradock disagreed, positing the opposite argument that unacceptable ministers could not do any good because their undesirable lives outweighed anything beneficial they might teach. The implication was clear; conforming clergymen could not benefit a congregation, who should pray for the right kind of minister. Thomas Wadsworth, the former curate of St. Lawrence Poultney, London, made one of the most unusual arguments in these farewell sermon collections. Although he did not advocate withdrawing from the church and establishing new congregations, he did suggest that Englishmen could stop attending their parish churches if the ministers placed over them were entirely inadequate. More concerned about dissenters' souls than their finances, Wadsworth suggested that paying the fines for not attending was not as bad as having to listen to "wicked and profane" preachers. The quality of a unworthy minister's message did not matter; his preaching was tainted by his behavior: "The water that is drawn out of a sweet Well, if it be put into a stinking cask, it will smell of that cask."[459]

Third, ministers encouraged a sense of community among dissenters by reminding people to look to and look out for each other. An anonymous preacher exhorted his listeners and readers to live in harmony with others of the same beliefs:

> To live in love amongst our selves; the very term bespeaketh [sic] affection, and the affection should never cease, so long as the relation endures. Who should love more than those who are united in the same Head and Hope, and cemented with the same blood of Christ?[460]

"*Be united amongst your selves*," exhorted one anonymous author who declared that divisions among the dissenters were counterproductive:

---

[458] Thomas Watson, "Mr. Watson's Afternoon-Sermon, Aug. 17. 1662," in *Compleat Collection*, sig. S2v.

[459] Samuel Cradock, "Mr. Craddacott's Farewel Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sigs. Uu2v-Vv1r; Thomas Wadsworth, "Mr. Wadsworths Farewel-Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sig. Uuu4v; *BDBR, s.v.v.* Thomas Watson, Samuel Cradock, Thomas Wadsworth.

[460] "Sermon XIII," in *England's Remembrancer*, 295.

> And however you may have too much pleased your selves to be known and distinguished by other names and titles, yet now, if you agree in the common appellation of *men fearing God*, I charge you in the Lord, that ye *speak often one to another*, converse familiarly and freely each with other; watch no longer for each others halting, but watch over each other to prevent and heal all haltings.[461]

Watson illustrated this point with an analogy to building a fire: "one *Christian* will help to heat another: a single coal of Juniper will soon die, but many coals put together will keep life in one another." To this end, he suggested that discussing religion with fellow believers would be almost as beneficial as listening to a reformed minister.[462]

The fourth central element in this community development was the broadening use of texts to instruct and transmit community values. Bibles and good Christian pieces could provide the spiritual guidance that the ministers' ejection removed from these congregations, as Watson illustrated by comparing cisterns with religious reading materials: "when you have not the Spring near to you, then get water into your Cisterns: So when you have not that wholesom [sic] Preaching that you desire, good Books are Cisterns that holds [sic] the waters of life in them to refresh you."[463] When public preaching was not available, the godly should turn to reading sermons: "If we have less plain and practical Preaching, the more need to give attendance to Reading."[464] For Lye, reading sermons provided two benefits: either presenting new material to contemplate or reminding the reader of the sermon when it was preached, causing him or her to reflect upon the scripture and lessons of the pieces: "if nothing new, let the word repeated and meditated call to mind what you have heard." The former lecturer at Dedham, Essex, Matthew Newcomen suggested other godly works, such as John Foxe's famous Protestant martyrology, *Acts and Monuments*, which the Company of Stationers had reissued in 1641.[465] One anonymous preacher illustrated to his listeners and readers that reading was an intense process that required one's full attention: "I speak not of transient, cursory viewing of Books, but of a serious, solemn, reverent, deliberate, religious exercise of Reading." The minister continued:

---

[461] "Sermon VIII," in *England's Remembrancer*, 191-92.

[462] Watson, "Mr. Watson's Afternoon-Sermon, Aug. 17. 1662," in *Compleat Collection*, sig.S4v.

[463] Ibid., sig. S3v.

[464] Preface, in *England's Remembrancer*, sig. A2v.

[465] Lye, "Mr. Lye's Second Sermon, Aug. 17. 1662," in *Compleat Collection*, sig. X3v; Matthew Newcomen, "Mr. Matthew Newcomen His Farewel-Sermon," in *Compleat Collection*, sig. Gg2v; John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments of Matters Most Speciall and Memorable Happening in the Church, with an Universal Historie of the Same* (London: Company of Stationers, 1641); *BDBR, s.v.* Matthew Newcomen.

> And now let good, savory, practical Divinity find some room, more room than sometimes in your houses, hands, heads, hearts you have professed a great while; it's time to begin to know somewhat now: And this is a way of getting knowledge, which will maintain zeal and affection. If it be not the only way, I am sure it is one of the best means that we have left us, to preserve our selves from the corrupt Doctrines, and false Opinions, by which we shall be strongly assaulted, and the minds of many sorely shaken. A well-read Scholar is but a jejune commendation indeed; but a well-read Christian is a noble character; *Acts* 17.11 – *These were more noble, &c*.[466]

For this author, the transformation of the dissenting community changed the role of the individual in his or her own religious journey; now everyone would be responsible for learning more of the scriptures and the beliefs of their groups because the state had removed their principal interpreters from their midst. The threat implied in the last lines quoted above was a serious one; without reading and learning, some would not be able to defend themselves against the onslaught of incorrect doctrines and practices, and may conform to the established church.

Despite the ministers' protestations that they were not preaching against the government, officials had reasons to be very concerned about the proliferation of these sermon collections. Printers had to circumvent the usual publishing channels to get these materials to the consumers; concerned about reprisals, the printers and sellers did not put their names on the title pages of these works. Although most of these preachers did not suggest that their congregations withdraw from the official church, they encouraged their readers to look elsewhere for spiritual enlightenment and to maintain an identity outside of the church. People satisfying their religious needs outside of the established church might eventually clamor for more religious freedoms. The threat was not immediate, but potential; these authors could be seen as encouraging future criticism and resistance to the state.

The farewell sermon collections fit into Keeble's thesis because they encouraged the development of a different kind of community after the St. Bartholomew's Day ejections, one connected to texts and the printing industry. Several ministers represented in the collection encouraged their listeners and readers to use texts to supplement their religious study. The collections themselves were texts for the godly to read and relish with their instructions on living post St. Bartholomew's Day and reminders of why the nature of the dissenting community changed.

---

[466] "Sermon VIII," in *England's Remembrancer*, 192-93.

The *Mirabilis Annus* Series

In 1661 and 1662 three *Mirabilis Annus* collections appeared purporting to be faithful records of miraculous events and strange prodigies seen across England.[467] These tracts were part of a long tradition of Englishmen's belief in God's active involvement in everyday life as manifested in natural disasters, strange prodigies, and often disastrous accidents occurring to friends and neighbors.[468] Subversive radical authors relied on the basic assumption of their readership's acceptance of providentialism to critique and protest the government's definition of the state church. Government officials were not able to determine who constructed these collections; their investigations suggested that Thomas Brewster, Thomas Creake, and Nathan Brooks were central to their printing and distribution.[469] These reports conveyed two kinds of stories: tales of mysterious natural and sometimes grotesque phenomena and cautionary tales about the harm to anyone who had tried to hurt both the dissenters' cause and their persons or who had doubted the dissenters' beliefs and conformed. The publishers had two main goals for these pieces: to attack the government and to remind nonconformists why they should not conform to the Church of England. Instead of nurturing the community like the farewell sermons, these publications sought to frighten the godly into maintaining their beliefs. Although Keith Thomas and Richard Greaves have discussed this series, they do not identify the implied attack on the monarchy or the central feature of the two last publications in the series: the reaction to the Act of Uniformity. William Burns offers a more in-depth description of the series, including the implied attack on the monarchy and the focus on dissenters who conformed; however he does not take the next logical step and connect the last tract with the settlement.[470]

Attempting to proclaim their innocence and attract extra attention to their message, the authors disingenuously claimed that they did not intend their readers to draw any specific conclusions from these reports or emphasize any pro-dissenter and anti-establishment views. In the first collection, the editors proclaimed that "we shall not dare to be possitive [sic] in a particular application of all, or any of the portents mentioned in the following History, knowing it

---

[467] *Mirabilis Annus* (London?, 1661) (henceforth *MA*); *Mirabilis Annus Secundus* (London?, 1662) (henceforth *MAS*); *Mirabilis Annus Secundus: Or, the Second Part of the Second Years Prodigies* (London?, 1662) (henceforth *MAS II*).

[468] Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 2-3.

[469] PRO, SP 29/38/56; 29/38/57; 29/38/58; 29/43/7; 29/43/8; 29/43/9; 29/43/22. See Greaves for a fuller description of the evidence and his speculation about the authorship. Greaves, *DUFE*, 213-215.

[470] Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1974; reprint, London: Penguin Books, 1991), 111; Greaves, *DUFE*, 213-16; William E. Burns, *An Age of Wonders: Prodigies, Politics and Providence in England, 1657-1727* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), 32-33.

would relish of too much boldness and presumption to peep into the Ark of Divine Secrets." With this statement, the writers argued that they were not responsible for whatever the reader took from the materials. After the publication of the first collection, the authors felt it necessary to defend themselves in the preface to the second set, arguing that they were not preaching against the government or the Church of England; instead these works were intended as warnings to admonish sinning Englishmen: "*And truly, we can appeal to the* all-knowing God, *that our design is not to stir up any to* Sedition, *but* seasonable Repentance; *not* to Treason *against* man, *but* Loyalty *and* Subjection to JESUS CHRIST the King of kings and Lord of lords."[471] If questioned, the authors could claim that they meant no harm to the Church of England, instead desiring to show one and all the errors of their ways. However, the texts themselves belied this interpretation and implied that everyone that did not agree with the beliefs of the authors had and would continue to incur God's wrath. The authors demonstrated God's hatred of episcopacy with three major types of stories: strange prodigies happening in nature, sometimes fatal accidents befalling supporters of the Church of England and those who attacked dissenters, and mental distress of clergymen who had conformed against their better judgements.

Using stories of unusual phenomena allowed the authors to demonstrate how God was displeased with the current state of the church and foreshadow changes to come. The collections dramatized bizarre natural occurrences such as flora and fauna flourishing out of season and the appearance of more than one sun in the sky. Astronomical events such as meteors, comets, and blazing stars figured into this developing pattern of heavenly signs. Englishmen also reported strange events in the skies, such as two armies engaged in battle.[472] Perhaps the most disturbing of these prodigies were of stories humans distorted in some fashion. In August 1661, *Mirabilis Annus Secundus* reported that a Sussex woman suddenly became pregnant with what she swore was the Devil's baby shortly after attending the house of the scandalous Church of England clergyman who had replaced the sober dissenting but intruded minister. Upon returning home, she bore a monster:

> The head of it was like the head of a Colt, the ears were long, and behind them little stumps of horns; the eyes were exceedingly great, and stood somewhat higher than the usual place: It had a main which reached from the head to the back; the arms and hands were like the fore-legs and feet of a Colt: from the middle downwards it was like a Man-child, but only hairy, and the legs and feet were like the hinde-legs and feet of a Colt. The Midwife was so affrighted at this birth that she fell ill immediately, and was not recovered in some weeks after.[473]

---

[471] *MA*, sig. A3r; *MAS*, sig. A4v.

[472] *MAS*, 7-8, 10-13; *MAS II*, 6, 8.

[473] *MAS*, 29 (mspr. 43). The tracts gave no indication of what happened to the devil baby.

Readers could have interpreted the abnormal birth as the direct consequence of the woman's conversations with an Anglican clergyman. The implications of this story were clear; both the woman, "of a very ill fame in respect of her conversation," and the minister, "one also of a very scandalous life," were sinners and the woman paid for her opinions and patronage of this clergyman with the birth of this horse-child monster.[474]

The radical authors envisioned a world where God began to help his benighted people by aiding them in their fight against the Church of England. God not only punished those who supported the state church, but also prevented some from complaining about dissenters. For example, God struck down a young man after he declaimed against the Solemn League and Covenant. A drunken established church minister died after falling from his horse. A group of church supporters in Leeds, who had tried to prevent the arrival of an important dissenting divine, an Edward Bowles, died within several days of swearing against the minister. One man died during his interview with the bishop of Chester where the former intended to discuss some nonconformists in the diocese: "but before he could finish his story, the Lord finished his dayes; for while the Accusation was yet in his Mouth, he fell down before the Bishop, and died immediately."[475] Even ministers in their pulpits were not safe; one Mr. Steer, a minister in Derbyshire, began a sermon on the death and rebirth of episcopacy. Before he could proceed into the body of the sermon, "death arrested him."[476]

Unlike rebellious radical tracts such as *A Treatise of the Execution of Justice*, the subversive radical *Mirabilis Annus* series did not attack the king directly, preferring instead to defame those who had cursed and belittled the regicides as the latter traveled to their executions. These stories expressed compassion for the these men and by implication their cause. Although not a direct statement of anti-monarchical sentiment, the intended message was clear. The first *Mirabilis Annus* portrayed the regicides sympathetically, reporting that men who verbally abused Major General Thomas Harrison and the minister Hugh Peter en route to their executions earned God's wrath and suffered for their insolence. The "Pantaloon Ruffainly [sic] Gentleman" who cursed at Harrison experienced an unidentifiable attack right after he spotted him. The local poulterer who targeted Peter endured a more gruesome fate; after he swore at the prisoner, a huge dog lunged from his hiding place under his master's butcher counter and attacked the man, dragging him under the table and biting him several times all over his body. Although the man survived, his recovery took several weeks. To explain why this dog attack had been a sign from God and not a random occurrence, the authors demonstrated how the dog and victim had been acquainted: "This Providence was the more remarkable because the dog was alwaies wont to be very gentle, and never observed either before or since to fly at any one, especially in the day time and in the Street; and besides this Poulterer using daily almost to come over to the Butchers

---

[474] Ibid.

[475] *MAS*, 76-77, 82; *MA*, 62-87.

[476] *MAS II*, 41-42.

Shop, was as familiar with the dog, and the dog with him as if he had been his Master."[477] Apparently the two had been on friendly terms before the poulterer attacked Peter, and God motivated the dog to express His displeasure. However, the best story appeared in the last *Mirabilis Annus* tract and focused on two men who rejoiced at the death of Colonel John Barkstead, one of the three regicides executed in the second round of treason trials in 1662. Two friends attended the execution, obtained part of his liver from the executioner, and took it with them to their local tavern. After celebrating and drinking heavily, the men decided to cook the organ and eat it. Becoming seriously ill, one man died shortly after and the other was not expected to live long.[478] Although grotesque, this cannibalism story made a powerful statement about the treatment of dissenters and the desire for the ultimate success of the regicides' ideals. Royalists and the Church of England had been trying to undermine the dissenters and bring them back into obedience to the state church; the two men's consumption of the liver made for a graphic analogy for what the dissenters feared. Nonetheless, these Englishmen could not triumph over the regicides and hence their cause, signified by the ability of Barkstead's liver to kill one of the men and wound the other seriously.

At the end of the second collection, the series underwent an important change in tone. Whereas the first and most of the second edition focused on natural phenomenon and defaming those that had attacked dissenters, part of the second and most of the third edition added an extensive attack on people who had recently conformed to the Church of England. Attempting to scare every wavering clergyman from following the "rest of the Herd, and to save his Living, lost [lose] his Principles," the authors recounted stories of newly conformed ministers being struck down, going crazy, or committing suicide. The second part of *Mirabilis Annus Secundus* reported that six or seven clergymen who had recently conformed in Suffolk and five others in Dorset dropped dead.[479]

However, the more detailed stories of insanity and suicide leaned heavily on the idea that conforming would disturb the individual's conscience to the point of "the very depth of despondency and despair." One Allen of Surrey who conformed in the early Restoration experienced severe mental distress stemming from his decision, as "his Conscience began to fly in his face, and he lay under very great trouble and anguish of Soul, and grew exceeding melancholly [sic], which ended in perfect Distraction, and according to our best information, he continues raving mad to this day, and is become a burden to himself, and a sad spectacle to all his Friends and Acquaintance [sic]." Other depressed ministers begged God for release or chose to end their lives; one dissenting parson Mr. Knight made a promise to give the whole parish communion at the next Easter service but began to worry about his decision, "he was much perplexed in his mind, and expressed a great deal of trouble, that he should so far wrong his Conscience as for fear of a little outward loss, to do a thing so vastely [sic] disagreeing to his present Light and former Practice." Apparently Knight did not feel that the entire parish was

---

[477] *MA*, 78 (mspr. 76), 81 (mspr. 79).

[478] *MAS II*, 35-36. Please see Chapter Two for further discussion of the regicide trials.

[479] *MAS II*, 27, 49.

worthy of receiving the Lord's Supper and had withheld this sacrament from those he deemed unfit, a practice other Protestant ministers had engaged in during the Interregnum. Unable or unwilling to break the promise he had made, the distraught clergyman asked God to kill him lest he have to perform the Anglican service. God obliged. Another deeply troubled minister hung himself with a portion of his church-mandated uniform. To compound the effect of this story, the authors explained that the theme resonated with other former dissenters who had entered the Church of England: "This sad story is publickly known throughout the Country, and hath much affrighted and astonished many of our late New Conformists in those parts." This melancholy was not limited to the men themselves; a minister's wife in Dorset a Mrs. Oake drowned herself sometime after her husband conformed.[480]

The *Mirabilis Annus* tracts may have troubled government and church officials for three reasons. First, these radicals presumed to be able to interpret signs from God, seeming to commandeer providence for their own purposes. Second, many of their stories attacked the Church of England and ministers who had chosen to conform, implying that the church was in direct violation of God's ordinance and that those participating would be punished. If anything, the authors' approach to the previously dissenting clergymen who chose to join the Church of England would have been seen as disruptive, as the authors tried to convince the recently conformed or those considering it to reject the established church. Third, the tracts made subtle attacks on the monarchy itself.

These tracts fit into Keeble's thesis because they helped dissenters define themselves outside of the Church of England and sought to reinforce this identity, albeit through fear. Nonconformists understood from these stories that they were following what God really wanted by not conforming, reading the gruesome fortunes of those who disobeyed God and joined the established church. Knowing that if they maintained their beliefs, these horrible fates would not await them; the godly could take comfort in their preservation from these disasters. These prodigies certainly did not portray the dissenters as the defeated and declining adversaries Keeble argues that Restoration literature depicted.[481] Instead, they were the winners, doing what was right in God's eyes. They could feel justified in their choices by observing God's wrath against the ungodly.

Conclusion

These two genres helped the nonconformists maintain their identity and strengthen their resolves to stay loyal to the convictions that led to their exclusion from comprehension in the state church. In their farewell sermons, the ejected ministers voiced their objections to the church settlement and tried to prepare their congregations for their spiritual lives post St. Bartholomew's Day. The *Mirabilis Annus* authors sought to reinforce dissenters' convictions by spinning gruesome tales of God's punishments for those who attacked nonconformists, supported the established church, or conformed against their better judgements. These texts are good

---

[480]Ibid., 27-28, 30-31, 40, 43-44, 47.

[481] Keeble, 18-20.

evidence that Keeble's theory of the maintenance of the dissenting community through print should be moved back into the early Restoration.

Conclusions

With the return of Charles II and the reconstruction of the Stuart monarchy, obedience was a very important issue for government officials and English subjects to negotiate. As this chapter has demonstrated, the printed materials available to the general public deserve greater attention as threats to the stability of the Restoration settlement than has been previously given.

Clerical authors discussed in the first section presented a zealous royalist definition of how Englishmen should obey their monarch. Concerned about the past turmoil and the unknown future with an untested monarch returning to a country which had not had a proper monarchy since the 1640s, these clergymen concentrated on the subject's duty to God-sanctioned bad monarchs. By providing the theoretical framework to protect the monarchy from paper arguments against the sovereign these authors gave the impression that they were not sure of Charles II, but were more concerned with stability for the country than Charles himself.

During this period, moderate English Presbyterians were in a delicate situation, as the dissenting Presbyterian minister Henry Newcome explained in a diary entry for Wednesday, 11 June 1662:

> Ye royalists throw us am: [among] ye phanaticks bec: [because] of piety. Ye fanaticks throw us to ym [them] bec:[because] of our loyalty. These 2 extreames harden one another & hate us. But God knowes us & will owne us.[482]

For Newcome, neither side could trust the Presbyterians; suspicious of their doctrinal and liturgical beliefs, royalists could not trust that they were really loyal. More radical puritans were unwilling to accept them because they professed loyalty to the king. Zachary Crofton should be added to the general assessment of why the Restoration church settlement moved away from a larger comprehension to a more narrow church definition. His anti-episcopal preaching and strong affirmation of the Solemn League and Covenant worried crown officials and hurt the moderate Presbyterian attempts at a broader Church of England. Crofton's arguments supporting the Covenant struck at the heart of the monarchical role in church and state, suggesting that the king's presence was not necessary for government to function and that he did not possess any authority beyond the Parliament. His print campaign against the episcopal system violated the boundaries of acceptable behavior and denied the king an active role in his own government, thereby challenging the obedient role subjects should play in this monarchy.

The genres discussed in section three presented serious dissident critic challenges to the established church's right and ability to direct how Englishmen should worship. Although the

---

[482] Thomas Heywood, ed., *The Diary of the Rev. Henry Newcome, from September 30, 1661, to September 29, 1663* (Manchester, UK: Chetham Society, 1849), 95.

ejected clergy accepted the government's ability to remove them from office for their refusal to accede to the revised Prayer Book, they did resist the church by not retiring quietly. The dissident critic farewell sermon collections repeated the nonconformist ministers' objections to the narrow settlement and sought to prepare readers for their spiritual lives beyond the St. Bartholomew's Day ejections. Although some of the ministers preached a partial commitment to the Church of England, they also encouraged everyone to look elsewhere for spiritual guidance, particularly to God, each other, and the printed word, which became more important when preaching became less available. The subversive radical *Mirabilis Annus* prodigy tracts took a more dangerous approach, attempting to frighten dissenters into maintaining their dissent to the Church of England by explaining the horrors that could befall them if they chose to conform. The subtle attack on the monarchy elevated these pieces from reaction to the Act of Uniformity to an assault on the relationship between monarchy and episcopacy. Both genres reaffirmed Keeble's thesis about the survival of the dissenting community in the period, but suggest that the beginning of this transformation should be placed in 1662-1663 rather than the late 1660s.

CONCLUSIONS

There has long been a need to look more closely at public opinion upon the occasion of the Restoration of the old order in Britain in 1660. This study has done so, using a neglected source base, and has demonstrated that reactions to Charles' return were more rich and varied than had been previously supposed. This investigation has provided a new approach for interpreting the Restoration, one that incorporates a wide range of opinions about the reestablishment of the monarchy. It does not attempt to define popular opinion, but reveals what the press offered readers, which probably spurred discussion of many of the issues the government preferred Englishmen not to worry about or consider.[483] Thus this study has offered an examination of some of the contentious issues during this period, ones that authors, printers, and booksellers either knew or hoped would interest readers.

Disagreement about the Restoration was inherent in the ways various authors chose to represent the event. Interested in demonstrating Charles' fundamental importance in English government and life, royalist authors chose analogies that reflected this desire. The revolution and renewal motifs indicated that Charles' return took England back to an original state of health and prosperity. Sun imagery suggested that the prince was one of the most important driving forces for English national health and growth. Recasting the monarch as the biblical King David, some authors tried to give their readers some insight into Charles' experiences in exile and the significance of his return; however, the analogy also demonstrated that Charles was human and would make mistakes. Phoenix imagery was highly appropriate for the situation except that radical authors turned the image on its head by associating this rebirth symbolism with the Solemn League and Covenant, which Charles had accepted as a requirement for his Scottish coronation.

While royalists rushed to support the Restoration, radicals sought to cast doubt on the sagacity of reinstating the Stuart monarchy for political and religious reasons. *Plain English*, *The Valley of Achor*, and William Drake's *The Long Parliament Revived* all provided readers with

---

[483] In *Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700*, Adam Fox argues that the spoken, scribal, and printed mediums were necessarily connected; stories and ideas moved back and forth through these modes of communication. Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 5, 9, 40, 43, 50. Finding the evidence to bear out Fox's argument beyond general support and extreme radical positions for the early Restoration would be extremely difficult.

alternate ways to view Charles' arrival in England, all suggesting that the monarchy and the Convention Parliament were in fact illegal. The first two subversive radical tracts asked readers to examine the man returning as king, to consider the Stuarts' crimes against the country, and to reject the reestablishment of the monarchy. Drake's dissident critic challenge to the Convention Parliament and the legality of the Restoration was a more subtle, sophisticated, and dangerous attack that was guaranteed to raise parliamentarians' desire to root out the author of this piece. The bases of his argument, the continued existence of the Long Parliament and co-ordinated government, were ideas that might appeal to Englishmen unsure of monarchy, especially those concerned about the reimplementation of Charles I's vision of kingship. Religious reactions to the Restoration were broader in range and appealed to Englishmen's concerns over their souls, implying that bringing Charles II back would endanger Englishmen's salvation, a potentially greater threat than problems in the temporal realm.

Despite the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, poets, pamphleteers, and preachers discussed the past in their poems, almanacs, tracts, and sermons; without explaining what happened before the Restoration Charles' return did not have any context. Although the crown wanted to ignore the controversial period between Charles I's early reign and the accession of Charles II, authors could not expect their readers to accept the crown's desired version of events. Some ministers felt the need to defend their discussions of the past and to explain why using the past was beneficial for the present. In an analogy to the Jewish Passover meal, Morley argued that the Jews ate sour herbs at the Passover meal to remind them of what their ancestors had escaped and to make them more thankful for what they have now. Therefore, Englishmen should hear about the Civil Wars and Interregnum to remind them of what happened before and why they should be thankful for the Restoration.[484] Taking a different approach, Henry King said that he intended to lay out a list of crimes in the interest of being helpful, by claiming that he was not trying to remind the guilty of the crimes that the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion "buried." Instead, he was trying to show that he had

> no purpose to refresh the Memory either of Those Persons, or the Mischiefs by them Acted, which the Grace and Mercy of Him who was the greatest sufferer would have buried in An *Act of Perpetual Oblivion*; but in thankful duty to God to commemorate the defeat of Their late unpardonable practices, who by Fraud *Abjured*, and by *Force* did all they could to keep *Him who was to Come*, from possessing his undoubted *Right*.[485]

King's claims were disingenuous, particularly given that his whole sermon was based on Ezekiel 21:27, a verse that specifically discusses the transition between an unlawful and lawful government: "I will Overturn, Overturn, Overturn it, and it shall be no more, until he come

---

[484] Morley, 6.

[485] King, *A Sermon Preached at White-hall on the 29th. of May*, 5.

whose Right it is, and I will give it him."[486] King has every intention of reminding the guilty and everyone else of their crimes.

The regicide tracts that appeared after the first and second round of regicide executions in 1660 and 1662 provided a good example of an issue where royalists and radicals tried to make their arguments about Charles I's death. Royalists saw the event as a martyrdom and the extreme radicals as a rightful execution; their interpretations of the last speeches of the regicides reflected these diametrically opposed opinions. The radicals published first, presenting pamphlets claiming to contain the last words and actions of the regicides and portraying these men as righteous and godly men whose deaths would confirm the correctness of their cause. Unfortunately for the printers of the royalist versions, they did not take the time to edit the radical versions carefully and reused most of the opposition's text without sufficiently counteracting the pro-regicide sentiments. The radicals continued to make their argument through the royalists' text.

Part of this desire to control Englishmen's interpretations of the past led to reforming the English national calendar; the Parliament instituted 30 January as a national day of mourning for Charles' father. However, some of the ministers preaching that day used the opportunity to investigate Charles I rather than simply glorify him, giving a voice to reservations about Charles II's vision of England and trustworthiness of the Stuarts. Almanac authors whose works shaped Englishmen's understanding of time and history also responded to the Restoration with some changes in the national calendar. Not all of the writers made their publications more appealing to the government. In fact, the same parts of the almanac that could be used to glorify the king could also attack the government and monarchy as an institution. The republican almanac author John Tanner took a great chance when he manipulated his publications to express his political beliefs and the republican dismay over the Restoration. As discussed in the last section of Chapter Two, Tanner altered his almanac for 1662 by switching the columns on the right-hand page of his monthly observations to fool the censors into thinking that he no longer included historical information that reminded readers of the past.[487]

The peoples' expectations of Charles and his own promises from Breda added another dimension to the complexity of reactions to his return, one that left many in the country unsatisfied. The religious settlement has been and should be considered fundamental to understanding the period, but it was not the only issue that concerned Englishmen. For instance, Miller highlights the Cavaliers' discontent over their perceived neglect and lack of enthusiastic royal reception and treatment.[488] Chapter Three has explained other ways the Restoration directly affected average Englishmen, as they dealt with former soldiers in their families or communities and felt the effects of the excise and hearth taxes. The Restoration was more than a simple regime change; it affected all levels of society in varying degrees.

---

[486] Ezekiel 21:27.

[487] Tanner, 1659, sigs. A4v-B8r; Tanner, 1660, sigs. A4v-C2r (three months are printed twice); Tanner, 1661, sigs. A4v-B84; Tanner, 1662, sigs. A5r-B8r.

[488] Miller, *Charles II*, 41.

Although Charles may have assumed that once he returned to England his subjects would fall into their natural obedience without questions or complaints, the issue of obedience was a highly important one and the answer would determine the stability of the restored regime. Government officials had to hope that Englishmen, desiring peace and order, would be willing to accept the general structure of government and society present before the Civil Wars and forget ideas like the supremacy of the Parliament and the people's ability to hold monarchs accountable and punish the princes.

The administration found support among the Church of England ministers across the country who used their pulpits to preach the subjects' duty. However, as the first section of Chapter Four has demonstrated, some preachers did not speak for Charles II specifically, preferring instead to praise the institution as fundamental to English order and peace. This significant omission suggested that these ministers were unsure of a sovereign that had not lived on English soil since his childhood, and may have raised concerns among listeners and readers who expected them to mention him.

As the second section of that Chapter explained, Zachary Crofton presented a serious threat to the reestablishment of the Church of England along antebellum episcopal lines. Crown officials worried that Crofton's oratorical and literary skills would spread support for the Solemn League and Covenant wide enough to cause serious problems for the government's desire to implement an episcopalian system. Their fears were confirmed with the London parliamentary elections that returned four non-Church of England supporters. Despite their number, the anti-covenant writings had not been able to defeat Crofton's arguments or wit, and Bishop John Gauden did not acquit himself well in this literary battle. To silence him, crown officials arrested and imprisoned Crofton, thus ending his ability to produce more material supporting his positions.

Resistance to the narrow church settlement could be found in two major genres that spoke to the developing nonconformist community: farewell sermons and prodigy collections. Although the Act of Uniformity may have removed a large number of dissenting ministers from influence within the church, it did not silence them or prevent them from caring for their congregations. Several of the ejected ministers published their farewell sermons together in large collections for their communities to use as spiritual guides after the Bartholomew ejections. The prodigy collections told stories of God's wrath against Anglican ministers and dissenters who conformed to save their careers.

The Importance of the Restoration

Finally, a word about the importance of the Restoration in late seventeenth-century English historiography needs to be said. In particular, I suggest that Charles' return and attempt at settlement should be considered more significant than two prominent scholars interested in examining larger patterns have indicated.

In his examination of the Revolution of 1688, J. G. A. Pocock argued that the period from the Civil Wars through the Revolution can be understood as experiencing the same problems

throughout the period. He commented that "England in 1688 had not emerged from the conditions which had produced one such series of civil wars between forty and fifty years previously, and had nearly renewed them on two occasions in the most recent decade."[489] Tim Harris draws a similar conclusion about the significance of the Restoration but approaches the issue from a different angle, arguing that a change in the country's leadership is not always the best way to define a period and that marking "watersheds" in English history is highly problematic because other changes in English life came at different intervals than the government.[490] Although Harris' assessment is a needed corrective for periodization based strictly on politics, he comes close to denying that the Restoration had important effects on England.

The significance of the Restoration in the late seventeenth century can be demonstrated with three major points: its importance to contemporaries, its failure, and its contribution to the development of politics and political culture. First, the Restoration was significant because contemporaries thought that it was. This dissertation has demonstrated the deep involvement of the press in spreading materials that discussed the important issues of the day and the wide range of opinions available to the English people.

Second, this period was also significant because it was an attempt to settle the country that did not work; the awkwardness of the government's efforts to reestablish the church and state had lasting effects. The failure of the religious settlement played a fundamental role in English politics through the early years of William and Mary. Harris argues that the party system had its roots in the failure of the Restoration settlement.[491]

Richard Greaves has suggested that 1660 to 1664 was the first major Restoration crisis and that the late Stuart period could be divided into five such periods: "The period 1660-1715 is best seen as a time of recurring crises—in 1660-64, 1667-73, 1678-83, 1685, and 1712." He continued that "in each of these crises, religion and authority were seen—from differing perspectives—as keys to an orderly society."[492] Unfortunately, this categorization does not account for the problems before 1660 and suggests that Charles' return was the event that caused the major change. Certainly, from the perspective of those who did not adhere to the Church of England's liturgy and episcopacy the Restoration began a crisis because the government reestablished the state church along traditional liturgical and organizational lines. However, political instability began with Oliver Cromwell's death, not Charles' return. From the royalist perspective, the lack of a strong and well-defined national church was a serious problem in an age where many Englishmen still felt that there was only one true church and that fellow citizens

---

[489] J. G. A. Pocock, "The Significance of 1688: Some Reflections on Whig History," in Robert Beddard, ed., *The Revolutions of 1688* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 272.

[490] Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 238.

[491] Ibid., 6-7, 234-35.

[492] Richard L. Greaves, "Great Scott! The Restoration in Turmoil, or, Restoration Crises and the Emergence of Party," *Albion* 25.4 (Winter 1993): 618.

should be made to attend it or suffer temporal consequences. The restoration of the monarchy was an attempt to solve these problems and thereby should be considered part of the crisis. Therefore Greaves' assessment should be modified to argue that the first Restoration crisis began in the fall of 1658 and ended in 1664.

Third, the ferment of ideas manifested in debate in political tracts, poems, sermons, almanacs, and other forms contributed toward the eventual maturation of public opinion and expanded the number of people interested in, and informed about, political and religious issues. This development was a necessary prerequisite for the emergence of the first political parties during the Exclusion Crisis. The Restoration provided authors with the opportunity to test the boundaries of their ability to criticize the government without appearing to agree with dangerous radical opinions. This period was necessary for the beginning of an opposition that did not want the downfall of the government or a radical change in the Church of England.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Much of the printed materials can be found through the Proquest Early English Books Online database as PDF files generated from mircofilmed copies of the original tracts. For the sake of space, shortened titles have been given for most of the tracts and the printer and bookseller information has been removed. Adjustments in the publication year have been made for the year beginning in January. Information provided in brackets has been gathered from another source. For the almanacs, I am using a modified version of Bernard Capp's citation method. For secondary materials, the full titles have been supplied.

Primary Sources

Manuscript Sources

Balliol College Library, Cambridge
MSS 670 a.6[9]

Bodlian Library, Cambridge
Rawlinson Poetry MSS 66.
Rawlinson. Poetry MSS 80.

British Library
Leicester, Add. MSS 4457.
Add. MSS 10116, Thomas Rugge, "Mercurius Politicus Redivius"

Public Records Office
State Papers. Charles II.

Printed Primary Sources

A., R. *The Godly Mans Portion and Sanctuary.* London, [1662?]

A., T. *Humble Praise, Offered up in the Publick Solemnity, June the 28th 1660.* London, 1660.

A., T. *Rump Rampant; or the Sweet Old Cause in Sippits*. [London?, 1660?]

Adams, Jack. *Jack Adams His Perpetual Almanack.* 2nd ed. London, 1663.

Adams, Jack. *Jack Adams, His Perpetual Almanack.* London, [1662].

Adis, Henry. *A Fannaticks Mite Cast into the Kings Treasury.* 2nd ed. London, 1660.

Aeternitati Sacrum. London, 1662.

The Age of Wonders, or Miracles Are not Ceased. London, 1660.

Allestree, Richard. *A Sermon Preached at Hampton-Court on the 29th of May 1662*. London, 1662.

———. *A Sermon Preached before the King at White-hall, October the 12th 1662*. London, 1663.

——— . *A Sermon Preached in St. Peter's Westminster on Sunday, Jan. 6, 1660 at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Fathers in God, Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Bristoll, Edward, Lord Bishop of Norwich, Nicholas, Lord Bishop of Hereford, William, Lord Bishop of Glocester*. London, 1660.

The Anabaptists Faith and Belief, Opened. London, 1659.

An Anagram and Acrostick on Charles Stuart King. London?, [1660].

The Anatomy of Dr. Gauden's Idolized Non-sense and Blasphemy, in His Pretended Analysis. London, 1660.

An Ancient and True Prophesie of All Those Transactions That Have Already Happened. London, [1659].

Andrews, William. *Anglia Rediviva*. London, 1660.

——— . *De Rebus Coelestibus 1658*. London, 1658.

——— . *De Rebus Coelestibus 1659.* London, 1659.

——— . *De Rebus Coelestibus 1662*. London, 1662.

——— . *De Rebus Coelestibus 1663*. London, 1663.

——— . *Newes from the Stars 1660*. London, 1660.

——— . *Newes from the Stars 1661*. London, 1661.

An Antheme Sung at the Consecration of the Arch-bishops and Bishops of Ireland, on Sunday the 27. of January 1660. London?, 1661?

An Apology for Purchases of Lands Late of Bishops Deans and Chapters. London?, 1660?

The Apprentices Hue-and-cry after Their Petition. London?, 1660?

Argyles Arraignment. London?, 1660?

Arsy Versy. London?, 1660?

The Arraignment of the Divel, for Stealing Away President Bradshaw. London?, 1660?

[Ashmole, Elias.] *Sol in Ascendente*. London, 1660.

Austin, Samuel. *A Panegyrick on His Sacred Majesties Royal Person, Charles the IId, by the Grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c. and Corronation*. London, 1661.

———. *Triumphus Hymenæus*. London, 1662.

Away with't Quoth Washington. London, 1660.

Ayleway, William. *Euasmos Basilikos, e, Stephagos Thriambichos*. London, 1662.

B., H. H. *A Poem to His Maiestie on His Landing*. London?, 1660?

B., J. *The Divine and Spiritual Ambassadour Described in a Sermon Preached at the Visitation at Alisbury, Com. Bucks. Octob.14, 1662*. London, 1663.

B., J. G. *Royall Poems Presented to His Sacred Majesty Charles the II.* London, 1660.

(B., T.) *The Muses Congratulatory Address to His Excellency the Lord General Monck.* London?, 1660?

B., T. *The President of Presidents*. London?, 1659.

Bacchus Festival. London?, 1660?

Baker, Colonel. *The Blazing-star*. London, 1660.

[Baker, Daniel]. *The Prophet Approved, by the Words of His Prophesie Coming to Passe*. London, 1659.

Barker, Edmund. *Votum pro Caesare*. London, 1660.

Barksdale, Clement. *The Kings Return*. London, 1660.

Bartholomew, William. *The Strong Man Ejected by a Stronger Man than He.* London, 1660.

Baston, James. *Mercurij Hermetici Ephemeris 1659*. London, 1659.

Bates, William. *The Peace-maker.* London?, 1662.

Baxter, Benjamin. *A Posing Question, Put by the Wise Man, viz. Solomon, to the Wisest Men*. London, 1662.

Baxter, Richard. *The Life of Faith, as It Is the Evidence of Things Unseen.* [London], 1660.

———. *The Mischiefs of Self-ignorance and the Benefits of Self-acquaintance.* London, 1662.

———. *Right Rejoycing*. London, 1660.

———. *A Sermon of Repentance*. London, 1660.

———. *The Vain Religion of the Formal Hypocrite, and the Mischief of an Unbridled Tongue (as Against Religion, Rulers, or Dissenters)*. London, 1660.

Beaton, Nehemiah. *No Treason to Say, Kings Are Gods Subjects, or, the Supremacy of God*. London, 1661.

Beaumont, Francis, and John Fletcher. *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Flecther Canon*. Gen. ed. Fredson Bowers. 6 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966-85.

Beaumont, Francis, and John Fletcher. *The Maid's Tragedy*. Ed. T. W. Craik. *The Revels Plays*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.

Beesley, Henry. *Psychomachia*. London, 1661.

Beeston, H. *A Poem to His Most Excellent Majesty Charles the Second.* London, 1660.

Bell, William. *City Security Stated in a Sermon Preached at St. Pauls August 11th, 1661*. London, 1661.

Bentall, Edward. *Basileus Basileon.* Oxford, 1660.

Bernard, James. *A Poem upon His Sacred Majesties Distresses, and Late Happy Restauration*. London, 1660.

Bird, Thomas. *Speculum Anni 1661*. London, 1661.

———. *Speculum Anni 1662*. London, [1662].

Bishop, George. *To Thee Charls Stuart King of England*. London?, 1660.

Blackwel, James. *The Nativity of Mr. Will. Lilly Astrologically Performed.* London, 1660.

Blagrave, Joseph. *Blagrave 1659*. London, [1658].

———. *Blagrave 1660*. London, 1660.

Blake, Martin. *An Earnest Plea for Peace and Moderation.* London, 1661.

Bloody Newes from Chelmsford. Oxford, 1663.

Blount, Thomas. *Calendarium Catholicum 1661*. [London], 1661.

———. *Calendarium Catholicum 1662.* London?, 1662.

———. *A New Almanack, after the Old Fashion.* London, 1663.

Bold, Henry. *Anniversary to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty Charles the II.* London, 1661.

———. *Elegy on the Death of Her Highness Mary Princess Dowager of Aurange, Daughter to Charles the First, King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, &c.* London, 1660.

———. *On the Thunder, Happening after the Solemnity of the Coronation of Charles the II. On St. George's Day. 1661.* London, 1661.

———. *St. Georges Day Sacred to the Coronation of His Most Excellent Majesty Charles the II.* London, 1661.

Booker, John. *An Old Almanack after a New Fashion*. London, 1658.

———. *Telescopium Uranicum 1659*. London, 1659.

———. *Telescopium Uranicum 1660.* London, 1660.

———. *Telescopium Uranicum 1661.* London, 1661.

———. *Telescopium Uranicum 1662.* London, 1662.

———. *Telescopium Uranicum 1663.* London, 1663.

Bo-Peep. London?, 1660?

Boteler, Edward. *Gods Goodnesse in Crowning the King.* London, 1662.

Borfet, Abiel. *Postliminia Caroli II.* London, 1660.

Bradley, Thomas. *Appello Caesarem.* York, 1661.

———. *Caesar's Due and the Subjects Duty.* York, 1663.

———. *A Present for Caesar.* London, [1658].

———. *A Sermon ad Clerum.* York, 1663.

———. *A Sermon Preached at the Minster in Yorke.* York, 1663.

Bradshaw's Ghost. London?, 1660.

Braithwait, R. *To His Majesty Upon His Happy Arrivall.* London, 1660.

Bramhall, John. *A Sermon Preached at Dublin upon the 23 of Aprill, 1661.* Dublin, 1661.

———. *The Right Way to Safety after Ship-wrack.* Dublin, 1661.

The Breech Wash'd by a Friend to the Rump. Oxford, 1660?

Brethren in Iniquity. London?, 1660.

Brett, Arthur. *The Restauration.* London, 1660.

Breviter, Richard. *The Mighty Christ the Saints Help.* London, 1662.

Briggs, Katherine M., ed. *The Last of the Astrologers: Mr. William Lilly's History of His Life and Times from the Year 1602 to 1681.* London: The Folklore Society, 1974.

Brinsley, John. *Prayer and Praise.* London, 1661.

Brokeman, J. *The Tradesmans Lamentation*. London, 1663.

Brome, Alexander. *A Congratulatory Poem, on the Miraculous, and Glorious Return of That Unparallel'd King Charles the II.* London, 1660.

———. *Poems*. Ed. Roman R. Dubinsji. 2 vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Brome, Richard. *A Jovial Crew*. Ed. Ann Haaker. *Regents Renaissance Drama Series*. General ed. Cyrus Hoy. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1968.

Brooks, Thomas. *The Crown & Glory of Christianity*. London?, 1662.

———. *The Unsearchable Riches of Christ*. 3rd ed. corrected and amended. London, 1661.

Brownrig, Ralph. *A Sermon Preach'd on the Coronation Day of K. Charles I: March 27, 1644, in S. Mary's in Cambridge*. London, 1661.

Bruning, Benjamin. *Vlastema ex Hypsous, or The Best Wisdom.* London, 1660.

Brunsell, Samuel. *Solomons Blessed Land*. London, 1660.

Bucks, James. *St. Paul's Thanksgiving*. London, 1660.

Burges, Cornelius. *Prudent Silence.* London, 1660?

Burnet, Gilbert. *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time*. 2 vols. London: Thomas Ward, 1724-34.

Bury, Arthur. *The Bow*. London, 1662.

Butler, Samuel. *Hudibras*. Ed. John Wilders. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

C., J. *The Two Merry Milk-Maids*. Ed. G. Harold Metz. *Renaissance Drama*. General ed. Stephen Orgel. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1979.

C., J. *A Word in Season to All in Authority*. London, 1660?

Cade, Anthony. *Conscience It's Nature and Corruption, with It's Repairs and Means to Inform It Aright*. London, 1661.

Calamy, Edmund. *A Sermon Preached at Aldermanberry Church, Dec. 28, 1662 in the Fore-noon*. Oxford, 1663.

———. *Eli Trembling for Fear of the Ark.* Oxford, 1663.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic. Charles II.

Calendar of State Papers, Venetian.

Carles, Thomas. *A Sermon Preached at the Cathedral Church in Gloucester, upon St. Georges Day*. London, 1661.

Carpenter, Richard. *Rome in Her Fruits.* London, 1663.

Carter, R. *Life & Death Offered to the Choice of the Sons and Daughters of Adam*. London, 1662.

Cartwright, Thomas. *The Danger of Riches*. London, 1662.

Caryl, Joseph. *An Exposition with Practicall Observations Continued upon the Thirty Second, the Thirty Third, and the Thirty Fourth Chapters of the Booke of Job*. London, 1661.

———. *The White Robe.* [London], 1662.

Casaubon, Meric. *A King and His Subjects Unhappily Fallen Out, and Happily Reconciled.* London, 1660.

Castell, Edmund. *Sol Angliae Oriens Auspicious Caroli II Regnum*. London, 1660.

The Cavaleers Complaint. London, 1661?

The Cavaleers Letany. London, 1661?

The Cavalier's Genius. [London, 1663].

Cavendish, William. *Ideology and Politics on the Eve of Restoration: Newcastle's Advice to Charles II*. Transcribed by Thomas P. Slaughter. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1984.

Chamberlain, Rob[ert]. *Balaams Asse Cudgeld*. London, 1661.

Chamberlayne, William. *Englands Jubile.* [London], 1660.

Chappell, W. and S. W. Ebsworth, eds. *The Roxburghe Ballads*. 14 vols. London, 1869-95.

A Character of Charles the Second. London, 1660.

Charles II. *By the King. A Proclamation Concerning His Majesties Coronation Pardon*. London, 1661.

———. *By the King. A Proclamation Concering His Majesties Gracious Pardon*. London, 1660.

———. *By the King. A Proclamation for Payment of the Duty of Excise, Together with the Arrears Thereof*. London, 1660.

———. *By the King. A Proclamation for Restoring and Discovering His Majesties Goods*. London, 1660.

———. *By the King. A Proclamation for Speeding the Payment of the Arrears of Seventy Thousand Pounds for Three Moneths Assessments, Due and Payable the First of August Last Past*. London, 1660.

———. *By the King. A Proclamation, for Observation of the Thirtieth Day of January as a Day of Fast and Humiliation according to the Late Act of Parliament for That Purpose*. London, 1661.

———. *By the King. A Proclamation Touching the Speedy Calling to Accompt of All Such Persons Whose Accompts Are Excepted in the Act of Oblivion*. London, 1661?

———. *By the King. A Proclamation To Summon the Persons Therein Named, Who Sat, Gave Judgement, and Assisted in That Horrid and Detestable Murder of His Majesties Royal Father of Blessed Memory*. London, 1660.

———. *C. R*. London, 1660?

———. *Charles R*. London?, 1660.

———. *His Majesties Declaration to All His Loving Subjects, December 26. 1662*. London, 1662.

———. *His Majesties Gracious Message to the House of Commons*. London, 1660.

———. *His Majesties Gracious Speech to Both Houses of Parliament*. London, 1660.

———. *His Majesties Gracious Speech to the House of Peers, the 27th of July, 1660.* London, 1660.

———. *King Charles II. His Declaration to All His Loving Subjects of the Kingdome of England*. London, 1660.

———. *A Proclamation Against Vicious, Debauch'd and Prophane Persons*. London, 1660.

———. *Two Letters from His Majesty*. London, 1660.

Cheesman, A. *The Dove, with an Olive-branch in Its Mouth.* London, 1663.

Cheesman, Thomas. *Via Lactea.* London, 1663.

Chesick, William. *Chesick 1661.* [London], 1661.

The Chimneys Scuffle. London, 1662.

Chipps of the Old Block. The Hague, 1660?

Clerke, William. *Marciano*. Edinburgh, 1663.

Cole, William. *Noah's Dove with Her Olive-branch.* London, 1661.

A Collection of His Majestie's Gracious Letters, Speeches, Messages, and Declarations Since April 4 / 14, 1660. London, 1660.

Collinne, William. *The Spirit of the Phanatiques Dissected*. London, 1660

Colonel John Okie's Lamentation. London, 1660.

A Compleat Collection of Farewel Sermons. London, 1663.

A Conference betweene the Old Lord Protector and the New Lord General Truly Reported by Hugh Peters. London, 1660.

A Conference Held in the Tower of London. London, 1660.

Cook, William. *A Dose of Chamberlain, and a Pill for the Doctor*. London?, 1661?

Conyers, Tobias. *A Pattern of Mercy*. London, 1660.

The Copies of Several Letters Which Were Delivered to the King. London, 1660.

Copleston, John. *Moses Next to God, and Aaron Next to Moses Subordinate and Subservient.* London, 1661.

Corss, James. *Mercurius Coelicus 1663*. Edinburgh, 1663.

———. *Ouranoskopia*. Edinburgh, 1662.

A Countrey Song, Intituled, *The Restoration*. London?, 1661?

Cowley, Abraham. *The Collected Works of Abraham Cowley*. Ed. by Thomas O. Calhoun, Laurence Heyworth, Robert B. Hinman, William B. Hunter, and Allan Pritchard. 2 vols. Newark, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 1989.

———. *The Visions and Prophecies Concerning England, Scotland, and Ireland, of Ezekiel Grebner, Son of Obadiah Grebner, Son of Paul Grebner, Who Presented the Famous Book of Prophecies to Queen Elisabeth*. London, 1661 [1660].

Creed, William. *Judah's Purging in the Melting Pot.* London, [1660].

———. *Judah's Return to their Allegiance*. London, 1660.

Crofton, Zachary. *Analepsis*. London, 1660.

———. *Analepsis*. 2nd ed. London, 1660.

———. *Analepsis*. 3rd ed. London, 1660.

———. *Analepsis Anelephthe*. London, 1660.

———. *Analepsis Anelephthe*. 2nd ed. London, 1660.

———. *Berith Anti-Baal*. London, 1661.

The Hard Way to Heaven Explained and Applyed in a Sermon. London, 1662.

Cromwell's Conspiracy. London, 1660.

Crouch, John. *Flowers Strovved by the Muses, against the Coming of the Most Illustrious Infanta of Portugal Catharina Queen of England*. London, 1662.

———. *The Muses Joy for the Recovery of That Weeping Vine, Henretta Maria, the Most Illustrious Queen-Mother, and Her Royal Branches*. London, 1661.

———. *Portugallia in Portu, Portugal in Harbour*. London, 1662.

———. *To His Sacred Majestie*. London?, 1661?

———. *His Majesties Miraculous Preservation by the Oak, Maid, and Ship*. London?, 1660?

Crown, S. *The Loyal Remembrancer*. London, 1650. [Published in 1660.]

A Cure for the State. London?, 1659.

D., M. *The Subjects Desire to See Our Gracious King Charles the Second, His Safe Arrival*. London, 1660.

Dade, William. *Dade 1659*. London, 1659.

———. *Dade 1661*. London?, 1661.

Dauncy, John. *Work for a Cooper, or a Bone for the Doctour to Pick.* London?, 1661?

Davenant, William. *A Panegyrick to His Excellency, the Lord Generall Monck*. London, 1660.

Davenant, William. *The Shorter Poems, and Songs from the Plays and Masques*. Ed. A. M. Gibbs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Davenport, Robert. *The Works of Robert Davenport.* Ed. A. H. Bullen. *Old English Plays*. N.s., vol. 3. Reprint. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1964.

Denham, John . *A Panegyrick on His Excellency the Lord General George Monck.* London, 1660.

Denham, John. *The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham.* Ed. Theodore Howard Banks. 2nd ed. N.p.: Archon Books, 1969.

———. *The Prologue to His Majesty as the First Play Presented at the Cock-pit in Whitehall.* London, 1660.

———. *The True Presbyterian without Disguise.* London, 1661.

A Dialogue betwixt an Excise-man and Death. London, 1659.

A Dialogue Between the two Giants in Guildhall, Colebrond and Brandamore. London, 1661.

A Divine Poem of Christs Fulness and A Christians Happiness. London, 1660.

Douch, John. *England's Jubilee*. London, 1660.

Dove, Jonathan. *Dove 1658*. Cambridge, 1658.

———. *Dove 1659*. Cambridge, 1659.

———. *Dove 1660.* Cambridge, 1660.

———. *Dove 1661*. Cambridge, 1661.

———. *Dove 1662*. Cambridge, 1662.

———. *Dove 1663*. Cambridge, 1663.

The Downfall of Mercurius Britannicus, Pragmaticus, Politicus. London?, 1660.

The Downfall of the Rump. London?, 1660?

The Dragons Forces Totally Routed by the Royal Shepherd. London?, 1660.

Dregs of Drollery. London, 1660.

Dryden, John. *The Poems of John Dryden*. Ed. James Kinsley. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Duport, James. *Evangelical Politie*. Cambridge, 1660.

Durant, John. *Sips of Sweetnesse.* 3rd ed. corrected and amended. London, 1662.

Durel, John. *The Liturgy of the Church of England Asserted in a Sermon.* London, 1662.

(Drummond, W.) *Anagram of His Excellency the Lord Generall George Monck, King Come Ore*. London?, 1660?

Dryden, John. *Astræa Redux*. London, 1660.

———. *To His Sacred Maiesty, A Panegyrick on His Coronation*. London, 1661.

Duncombe, Giles. *A Counter-Blast to the Phanaticks, Those Prodigious Catter-pillers Hatcht by the Jesuits, whose Father Is the Devil, and God-Father the Pope.* London, 1660.

Edwards, Thomas. *To His Sacred Majesty, Charles the Second, on His Happy Return*. London?, 1660?

Eedes, Richard. *Great Britains Resurrection*. London, 1660.

Eeds, Judith. *A Warning to All the Inhabitants of the Earth Where This Shall Come*. [London, 1659.]

The Eighth Day. London, 1661.

An Elegy, Consecrated to the Inestimable Memory of Our Late Most Famous Monarch, Charles the First, by the Grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland. London, 1660.

Ellis, Clement. *A Sermon Preached on the 29th of May 1661*. Oxford, 1661.

———. *To the King's Most Excellent Majesty*. London, 1660.

Elys, Edumud. *Anglia Rediviva.* [London], 1660.

———. *The Quiet Soule*. Oxford, 1659.

England and Wales. *Instructions Lately Agreed on by the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, for the Commissioners Sent by Them to the Hague, unto the Kings Most Excellent Majesty.* London, 1660.

England Uniting to Her Soveraign. London, 1660.

Englands Day of Joy and Rejoycing. London, 1660.

Englands Directions for Members Elections. London?, 1660?

Englands Genius Pleading for King Charles to the Right Honorable the Lords and Commons in Parliament, &c. London, 1660.

Englands Joy. London 1660.

Englands Joy for the Coming in of Our Gratious Soveraign King Charles the II. London, 1660.

England's Joy. London, 1660. In *The Harleian Miscellany: A Collection of Scarce, Curious, and Entertaining Pamphlets and Tracts, as Well in Manuscript as in Print*. Ed. William Oldys. Vol. 3. London, 1809.

Englands Murthering Monsters. London?, 1660?

England's Remembrancer: Being a Collection of Farewel-sermons Preached by Divers Non-conformists in the Country. London, 1663.

Englands Triumph. London, 1660?

Englands Vote for a Free Election of a Free Parliament. London?, 1660?

England's Warning-piece. London, 1661.

Eniaytos Terastios Mirabilis Annus, or the Year of Prodigies and Wonders. [London], 1661.

The Execution of the Covenant, Burnt by the Common-hang-man. London, 1661.

An Excellent Receipt to Make a Compleat Parliament. [London], 1659?

An Exit to the Exit Tyrannus. London?, 1660.

Evanke [Ewbank], George. *A Farewell Sermon Preached at Great Ayton in the County of Yorkshire*. London?, 1663.

Evelyn, John. *The Diary of John Evelyn*. Ed. E. S. de Beer. 6 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

An Exact Collection of Farewel Sermons. London, 1662.

Eye-Salve for the English Armie, and Their Assistants. London, 1660.

F., E. *Fair Play in the Lottery*. London?, 1660?

F., G. *A Word in the Behalf of the King*. London, 1660.

F, M. *An Almanack for the Yeare of Our Lord God 1660*. [Cambridge, 1660].

———. *An Almanack for the Yeare of Our Lord God 1661*. [Cambridge, 1661].

(F., T.) *A Panegyrick to His Renowned Majestie, Charles the Second, King of Great Britaine, &c.* London, 1660.

Fairebrother, William. *Essay of a Loyal Brest*. London, 1660.

The Famous Tragedie of the Life and Death of Mris. Rump. London, 1660.

Fane, Francis. *A Panegyrick to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty, upon His Happy Accession to the Crown, and His More Fortunate Marriage*. London, 1662.

The Farewel Sermons of the Late London Ministers. London, 1662..

Farmer, Ralph. *A Plain-dealing, and Plain-meaning Sermon*. London, 1660.

Farrar, Richard. *A Panegyrick to His Excellency, the Lord General Monck*. London, 1660.

Featley, Daniel. *Dr. Daniel Featley Revived.* Reprint. London, 1661.

———. *The League Illegal*. London, 1660.

Feltwell, R. *Davids Recognition*. London, 1660.

Ferus, John. *Festa Georgiana*. London, 1661.

The Five Strange Wonders, in the North and West of England. London, 1659.

(Flecknoe, R.) *The Portrait of William Marquis of New-Castle to His Lady the Lady Marchionesse*. London, 1660.

Flecknoe, Richard. *Erminia.* London?, 1661.

———. *The Mariage of Ocieanus and Brittania*. [London?], 1659.

Fly. *Fly 1658.* London, 1658.

——— . *Fly 1659*. London, 1659.

———. *Fly 1660*. London, 1660.

——— . *Fly 1661*. London, 1661.

———. *Fly 1662*. London, 1662.

Ford, John. *A Narrative of the Manner of Celebrating His Majesties Most Glorious and Joyfull Coronation in the City of Bath. April 23, 1661*. London, 1661.

Ford, Simon. *Parallela.* London, 1660.

———. *Parallela Duaogzallela.* London, 1661.

F(orde), T(homas). *Virtus Rediviva*. London, 1661.

Forraign and Domestick Prophesies. London, 1659.

Fortunate Rising. London, 1660?

[Foster, William]. *An Ephemeris of the Celestial Motions, for the Year of Our Redemption, 1662*. London, 1662.

Fowler, Matthew. *Totum Hominis*. London, 1662.

Fox, George. *A Noble Salutation, and a Faithful Greeting unto Thee Charles Stuart.* London, 1660.

———. *To Those That Have Been Formerly in Authority*. London, 1660?.

A Free-parliament-letany. London?, 1660?

Fried, Harvey, ed. *A Critical Edition of Brome's* The Northern Lasse. *Reniassance Drama*. Gen. ed. Stephen Orgel. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1980.

A Full Relation or Dialogue between a Loyallist and a Converted Phanattick since the Time of the Late Rebellion. [London], 1661.

Fuller, Thomas. *Andronicus*. London, 1661.

———. *A Panegyrick to His Majesty, on His Happy Return.* London, 1660.

The Funeral of the Good Old Cause. London, 1661.

G., H. *Cur Percussisti*. London, 1661.

G., O. *England Joyfull Holiday*. London, 1661.

Gadbury, John. *Britains Royal Star.* London, 1661.?

———. *Ephemeris 1659*. London, [1659].

———. *Ephemeris 1660*. London, [1660].

———. *Ephemeris 1661*. London, 1661.

———. *Ephemeris 1662.* London, 1662.

———. *Ephemeris 1663*. London, [1663].

———. *Genethlialogia 1658*. London, 1658.

———. *Genethlialogia 1661.* London, 1661.

———. *Merlinus Gallicus.* London, 1660 [1659].

———. *The Nativity of that Most Illustrious and Magnanimous Prince, Carolus Gustavus, King of Sweden, Astrologically Handled*. London, 1659.

———. *The Nativity of the Late King Charls Astrologically and Faithfully Performed*. London, 1659.

———. *Natura Prodigiorum*. London, 1660.

———. *Nuncius Astrologicus.* London, 1660.

———. *Pseudo-astrologos*. London, 1660.

Gallen, Thomas. *Gallen 1662*. London, [1662].

———. *Gallen 1663*. London, [1663].

The Gang or the Nine Worthies and Champions, Lambert, &c. London, 1660?

Gauden, John. *Analysis.* London, 1660.

———. *Anti Baal-Berith*. London, 1661.

———. *Antisacreligeus*. London, 1660.

———. *The Tears, Sighs, Complaints, and Prayers of the Church of England*. London, 1660.

———. *Megaleia theou, Gods Great Demonstrations and Demands of Justice, Mercy, and Humility.* London, 1660.

———. *A Sermon Preached in St. Pauls Church London*. London, 1660.

A Glimpse of Joy for the Happy Restoring of the Kings Most Excellent Majesty. London, 1660?

Gloria Britanica. London, 1661.

Glory of the West. London, 1659.

Glover, Henry. *An Exhortation to Prayer for Jerusalems Peace.* London, 1663.

Goad, J. *He Hemera Ekeine.* London, 1663.

Godman, William. *Ben Horim, Filius Heroum, the Son of Nobles*. London, 1660.

Goldisborough, John. *Goldisborough 1662.* London, 1662.

Gravett, Darlene Johnson, ed. *A Critical Edition of Abraham Cowley's* Cutter of Coleman Street. *The Reniassance Imagination*. Vol. 21. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1987.

Great Britain. *Statutes of the Realm*. 11 Vols. London: G. Eyre & A. Strahan, 1810-1828.

The Great Memorial. London, 1660.

The Great and Wonderfull Miracle Wrought on Thursday Last, by Mr. Cheesman, Mr. Best, and Others, upon One George Brokingham, Living near the Three Cranes in Thames-street, Who Had Sold His Soul to the Devil for XXII. Years. London, [1663].

Grebner, Paul. *Europes Wvonder.* The Hague, 1661.

———. *The Prophecy of Gretnerus Concerning These Times.* [London, 1660?]

Greene, Alexander. *The Politician Cheated.* London, 1663.

Greenfield, Thomas. *The Fast.* 2nd impression. London, 1661.

Greenway, Richard. *An Alarm from the Holy Mountain of the Lord to the Inhabitants of the Earth, and the Word of the Lord Sounding Out of Sion*. [London, 1662.]

Gregory, Francis. *David's Returne from His Banishment*. Oxford, 1660.

———. *Teares and Bloud.* Oxford, 1660.

Griffin, Lewis. *The Asses Complaint against Baalam*. London?, 1661.

———. *The Doctrine of the Asse.* London?, 1661.

———. *A Supplement to the Asses Complaint Against Balaam*. London?, 1661?.

[Griffith, Hugh.] *Mr. Croftons Case Soberly Considered*. London, 1661.

Griffith, Matthew. *The Catholique Doctor and His Spiritual Catholicon to Cure Our Sinfull Soules.* London, 1661.

———. *Christian Concord.* London, 1661.

———. *The Fear of God and the King*. London, 1660.

———. *The Spiritual Antidoes to Cure Our Sinful Souls*. London, 1662.

A Guild-hall Elegie, upon the Funerals of the Infernal Saint John Bradshaw President of the High Court of Justice. London?, 1660?

H., E. *An Epitaph upon the Solemn League and Covenant*. London, 1661.

(H., S.) *A Triumphant Panegyrick in Honour and Memory of King Charles the Second His Coronation*. London, 1661.

H., T. *Haslerig & Vain*. London, [1660].

H., T. *The Cavaliers Thanks-giving*. London, 1661.

H., W. *A Congratulation to Our Newly Restored Parliament of the Common-wealth of England*. London, 1659.

Hacket, John. *A Sermon Preached before the Kings Majesty at Whitehall on Friday the 22 of March Anno 1660 [1661]*. London, 1661.

Hancock, Edward. *The Pastors Last Legacy and Counsel.* London, 1663.

The Hang-mans Lamenration for the Losse of Sir Arthur Haslerigge, Dying in the Tower. [London], 1660.

The Hang-mans Last Will and Testament. London, 1660?

The Happy Prodigy. London, 1663.

Harcourt, Daniel. *A Hymne Called Englands Hosanna to God, for the Restoration, and Coronation of Charls the Second*. London?, 1661?

Hardy, Nathaniel. *The Apostolical Liturgy Revived.* London, 1661.

———. *The Choicest Fruit of Peace Gathered from the Tree of Life*. London, 1660.

———. *The Hierarchy Exalted and Its Enemies Humbled*. London, 1661.

———. *A Loud Call to Great Mourning*. London, 1662.

Haywood, William. *A Sermon Disswading Obloquie against Governours*. London, 1663.

Healy, Richard. *Ephemeris 1658*. London, 1658.

Heath, James. *The Glories and Magnificent Triumphs of the Blessed Restitution of His Sacred Majesty K. Charles II*. London, 1662.

Hell's Higher Court of Justice. London, 1661.

Helme, C. *Life in Death.* London, 1661?

Hemings, William. *The Fatal Contract*. London, 1661.

_____. *The Jews Tragedy*. London, 1662.

Henchman, Richard. *A Peace-offering in the Temple*. London, 1661.

Herbert, William. *Poems Written by the Right Honourable William Earl of Pembroke*. 1660. Reprint, Los Angeles: Augustan Reprint Society, 1959.

An Heroical Song on the Atchievements of His Most Excellent Highnesse James Duke of York, Admiral of Castile. London, 1660?

Henshaw, Thomas. *On the Most Triumphant Ceremony of His Most Sacred Maiesties Coronation, Charles II.* London?, 1662?

Heylyn, Peter. *A Sermon Preached in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter in Westminster, on Wednesday May 29th, 1661.* London, 1661.

Heywood, Thomas, ed. *The Diary of the Rev. Henry Newcome, from September 30, 1661, to September 29, 1663*. Manchester, UK: Chetham Society, 1849.

Hibbert, Henry. *Regina Diervm, or, the Joyful Day*. London, 1661.

Hinde, Samuel. *England Prospective-glasse.* London, 1660.

———. *Iter Lusitanicum*. London, 1662.

Higgons, Thomas. *A Panegyrick to the King*. London, 1660.

The History of the Second Death of the Rump. London?, 1660?

Holland, Samuel. *The Muses Holocaust*. London, 1662.

———. *A Panegyrick on the Coronation of His Most Sacred Majesty Charles II.* London,

1661.

———. *To the Best of Monarchs His Maiesty of Great Brittain, &c. Charles the Second.* London?, 1660.

Holyday, Barten. *Against Disloyalty.* Oxford, 1661.

Homes, Nathanael. *A Sermon Preached before the Parliament, the Council of State, the Lord Major, Alderman, and Common Councill of the City of London and the Officers of the Army*. London, 1660.

Howe, Obadiah. *Eloheem, or God and the Magistrate.* London, 1663.

Howell, James. *A Cordial for the Cavaliers.* London?, 1661.

———. *Som Sober Inspections Made into Those Ingredients That Went to the Composition of a Late Cordial, Call'd a Cordial for the Cavaliers.* London, 1661.

Howell, Thomas Bayly. *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials*. 33 vols. London: R. Bagshaw, 1809-1863.

Hudibras on Calamy's Imprisonment, and Wild's Poetry. [London, 1663].

Hugh Peters Last Will and Testament. London?, 1660?

Hulsius, Anthony. *The Royal Joy*. London, 1660.

Hunter, Josiah. *Judah's Restitution*. York, 1661.

A Hymne to the Gentle-craft. London, 1660?

Ironsyde, Gilbert. *A Sermon Preached at Dorchester in the County of Dorcet, at the Proclaiming of His Sacred Majesty Charles the II.* London, 1660.

It is Humbly Proposed on the Behalf of the Purchasers of Bishop, and Deans and Chapters Lands. London?, 1660?.

Jenkyn, William. *The Burning Yet Un-consumed Bush.* London, 1662.

Jessey, Henry. *The Lord's Loud Call to England*. London, 1660.

———. *The Scripture Kalendar 1660*. 16th ed. London, 1660.

———. *The Scripture Kalendar 1661*. 17th ed. London, 1661.

Jevon, Rachel. *Exultationis Carmen to the Kings Most Excellent Magesty upon His Most Desired Return*. London, 1660.

Jinner, Sarah. *Almanack 1658*. London, [1658].

———. *Almanack 1659*. London, [1659].

———. *The Womans Almanack*. London, 1659.

Jones, Henry. *The Patient Royal Traveller*. [London,] 1660.

Jordan, Thomas. *A New Droll: Or, the Counter-Scuffle*. London, 1663.

———. *A Royal Arbor of Loyal Poesie, Consisting of Poems and Songs*. London, [1663].

———. *A Speech Made to His Excellency the Lord General Monck, and the Council of State, Goldsmiths Hall in London, the Tenth Day of April, 1660*. London, 1660.

Journals of the House of Commons.

Journals of the House of Lords.

Joyful News for All Christendom. London, 1661.

Justa Sive Inferiæ Regicidarum: or, Tyburns Revels. London, 1660.

Keme, Samuel. *King Solomon's Infallible Expedient for Three Kingdoms Settlement*. London, 1660.

Kilcopp, Thomas. *The Pathway to Justification Plainly Proved*. London, 1660.

The King Advancing. London, 1660.

King Charles his Glory, and Rebels Shame. London?, 1660?

The King Enjoys His Own Again. London?, 1660?

King, Henry. *A Sermon Preached at White-hall On the 29th. of May*. London, 1661.

———. *A Sermon Preached at Lewis in the Diocess of Chichester*. London, 1663.

King, John. *A Sermon on the 30th of January, Being the Day on Which That Sacred Martyr, King Charles the First, Was Murdered*. London, 1661.

Langbaine, Gerard. *A Review of the Covenant Wherein the Original, Grounds, Means, Matter, and Ends of It Are Examined*. London, 1661.

L., G. *Eubulus. Or a Free and Loyal Discourse.* London?, 1660.

L., W. *Good Newes from the Netherlands*. [London, 1660].

The Ladies Loss at the Adventures of Five Hours. London?, 1663.

The Lamentation of a Bad Market. London, 1660.

The Lamentation of the Safe Committee. London, 1660.

Laney, Benjamin. *A Sermon Preached before His Majesty at Whitehal, April 5, 1663*. London, 1663.

———. *A Sermon Preached before His Majesty at Whitehall March 9th, 1661* [1662]. London, 1662.

Lawrie, Robert. *God Save the King*. Edinburgh, 1660.

Lawson, Johannes. *Upon the Blessed Return of Our Gracious Sovereign King Charles the Second*. London, 1660.

Lee, Richard. *Cor Humiliatum & Contritum.* [London,] 1663.

Lent-Preachers at Court. London?, 1661.

L'Estrange, Roger. *A Caveat to the Cavaliers*. London, 1661.

———. *A Caveat to the Cavaliers*. 2nd impression somewhat enlarged. London, 1661.

———. *A Caveat to the Cavaliers*. 3rd impression. London, 1661.

———. *A Modest Plea Both for the Caveat, and the Author of It.* London, 1661.

———. *A Modest Plea Both for the Caveat, and the Author of It.* 2nd impression. London, 1661.

Leslie, Henry. *A Discourse of Praying with the Spirit, and with Understanding*. London, 1660.

A Letany for the New-Year, with a Description of the New State. London?, 1660?

Lilly Lash't with His Own Rod. London?, 1660.

Lilly, William. *Merlini Anglici Ephemeris 1658*. London, 1658.

———. *Merlini Anglici Ephemeris 1659*. London, 1659.

———. *Merlini Anglici Ephemeris 1660*. London, 1660.

———. *Merlini Anglici Ephemeris 1661*. London, 1661.

———. *Merlini Anglici Ephemeris 1662*. London, 1662.

———. *Merlini Anglici Ephemeris 1663*. London, 1663.

———. *William Lilly Student in Astrologie, His Past and Present Opinion Touching Monarchy in These Nations*. London, 1660.

A List of His Late Majesties Unjust Judges, and Others. London, 1660.

Lloyd, Owen. *The Panther-prophesy*. [London], 1662.

Lluelyn, Martin. *To the Kings Most Excellent Majesty*. London?, 1660?

Londons Out-cry to Her Sister-cities of England. London?, 1659.

A Looking-Glass for Traytors. London, 1660.

Lord, George deF, ed., *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714*. Vol. 1. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963-1975.

The Loyall Subjects Lamentation for Londons Perversenesse. London, 1660.

Lucifers Life-Guard. London, 1660.

M., G. *The Citizens Complaint for Want of Trade.* London, 1663.

Mardike: Or, the Soldiers Sonnet of His Sword. London, 1660.

Martin, Henry. *A Bloody Almanack and Prognostication for the Year, 1662*. London, 1661.

Marvell, Andrew. *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell.* Ed. H. M. Margoliouth. 3rd

ed. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Mascal, William. *A New and True Mercurius*. London, 1661.

Massinger, Philip. *The City Madam*. Ed. Cyrus Hoy. *Regents Renaissance Drama Series*. Gen. ed. Cyrus Hoy. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.

Massinger, Philip and Thomas Dekker. *The Virgin-martyr*. London, 1661.

Masterson, George. *The Spiritual House in Its Foundation, Materials, Officers, and Discipline Describ'd.* [London,] 1661.

May, George. *The White-powder Plot Discovered.* London, 1662.

Mayhew, Thomas. *Upon the Joyfull and Welcome Return of His Sacred Majestie, Charls the Second, of England, Scotland, France and Ireland King, Defender of the Faith, &c.* London, 1660.

Mayne, Jasper. *A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Father in God, Herbert, Lord Bishop of Hereford*. London, 1662.

Mead, Matthew. *En Oligo Christianos, the Almost Christian Discovered*. London, 1662.

———. *The Pastors Valediction, or, a Farewell Sermon*. London, 1662.

———. *Spiritual Wisdom Improved against Temptation*. London, 1660.

Meggott, Richard. *The New-cured Criple's Caveat*. London, 1662.

Mene Tekel. London, 1663.

Mercurius Benevolens. London, 1660.

Middleton, Thomas. *The Mayor of Quinborough*. London, 1661.

Miles, Abraham. *The Last Farewell of Three Bould Traytors.* London, 1661.

Milton, John. *Brief Notes upon a Late Sermon, Titl'd, the Fear of God and the King*. London, 1660.

———. *Complete Prose Works of John Milton.* General ed. Don M. Wolfe. 8 vols. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1962.

Mirabilis Annus Secundus; Or, the Second Year of Prodigies. [London], 1662.

Mirabilis Annus Secundus: Or, the Second Part of the Second Years Prodigies. [London], 1662.

Miraculum Signum Coeleste. [London], 1658.

Merry Drollery. London, 1661.

Moorehead, William. *The Teares of and Valediction of Scotland upon the Departing of Her Governour, the Lord Generall George Monck.* London, 1660.

Morley, George. *A Sermon Preached at the Magnificient Coronation of the Most High and Mighty King Charles the IId*. London, 1661.

Mossom, Robert. *England's Gratulation for the King and Subjects Happy Union*. London, 1660.

Mundy, Peter. *The Travels of Peter Mundy in Europe and Asia, 1608-1667*. Ed. Sir Richard Carnac Temple and Lavinia Mary Anstey. 5 vols. *The Hakluyt Society*, 2nd series, numbers 17, 35, 45-46, 55, 78. London: Hakluyt Society, 1936.

The Mystery of Prophesies Revealed. London, 1660.

The National Covenant of the Kirk of Scotland, and the Solemn League and Covenant of the Three Kingdoms. Edinburgh, 1660.

Nedham, Marchmont. *The Cities Feast to the Lord Protector*. London, 1661.

Nelme, John. *Englands Royal Stone at the Head of the Corner, through the Wonderful Working of Almighty God*. London, 1660.

Neve, John. *Neve 1658.* London?, 1658?

———. *Neve 1659*. London?, 1659.

———. *Neve 1661.* 61st edition. London, [1661].

———. *Neve 1662.* London, 1662.

A New Ballade, To an Old Tune. London?, 1660?

The New Projector; Or the Priviledged Cheat. London, [1662?]

News from the Royall Exchange. London, 1660.

A New-years-gift for Mercurius Politicus. London, 1659?

A New-years-gift for the Rump. Oxford, 1659?

News from Hell. London?, 1660?

The Noble English Worthies. London, 1659.

The Noble Monk. London, 1660?

The Noble Souldiers Advice to His Comrades. [London,] 1661.

Nye, Philip. *A Sermon Preached to the Honorable Citizens of London, September 29. 1659*. London, 1661.

An Ode on the Fair Weather That Attended His Maiesty on His Brith, to His Kingdom and His Crown. London, 1661.

Ogilby, John. *The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majestie Charles II in His Passage through the City of London to His Coronation*. London, 1662.

———. *The Relation of His Majestie's Entertainment Passing through the City of London, to His Coronation*. London, 1661.

On the Answer to Dr. Wilds Poem Upon Mr. Calamy's Imprisonment. London, 1663.

On the Death of That Grand Imposter Oliver Cromwell, Who Died September the 3. 1658. London?, 1661?

One and Thirty New Orders of Parliament, and the Parliaments Declaration. [London], 1659.

Osland, Henry. *The Living, Dead Pastor Yet Speaking*. London, 1663.

Ourania. London, 1660.

P., T. *A Poem on the Fall of the Southside of S. Paul's Cathedrall*. London, 1662.

P., T. *The Witty Combat*. London, 1663.

P., W. *England Still Freshly Lamenting the Losse of Her King, with Several of Her Dearest Children*. London, 1660.

A Pair of Prodigals Returned. London?, 1660.

Paradise, John. *Hadadrimmon, sive, Threnodia Anglicana ob Regicidium*. London, 1661.

Parliament. House of Commons. *A Letter to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty from the Commons of England Assembled in Parliament*. London, 1660.

The Parliament-Complement. London, 1660?

A Parly between the Ghosts of the Late Protector, and the King of Sweden, at Their Meeting in Hell. London, 1660.

Parr, Richard. *Christs Gracious Intentions of Peace and Mercy Towards Sinners, Freely Tendred*. London, 1661.

Pecke, Thomas. *To the Most High and Mighty Monarch Charles the II.* London, 1660.

Penington, Isaac. *Three Queries Propounded to the King and Parliament*. London?, 1660.

———. *A Weighty Question,Pproposed to the King, and both Houses of Parliament.* London, 1663.

———. *Where Is the Wise?* London, 1660.

Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*. Ed. R. C. Latham and W. Matthews. 11 vols. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970-1983.

A Perfect Catalogue of All the Arch-bishops & Bishops in England and Wales. London, 1660.

Perkins, F. *Perkins 1659*. London, 1659.

———. *Perkins 1662*. London, 1662.

[Perrot, John.] *To the Prince of Venice and All His Nobles*. London, 1661.

Pestell, Thomas. *Sermons Preach'd at Several Courts to King Charles the First, of Ever Blessed Memory, and to Our Most Gracious Sovereigne King Charles the Second, Then Prince.* London, 1660.

Pestell, William. *A Congratulation to His Sacred Majesty, upon His Safe Arrival and Happy Restauration to His Three Kingdoms, May 29th, Being His Birth-day, and Our Year of Jubile,1660*. London, 1661.

Phanatick Play. London, 1660.

The Phanatics Plot Discovered. London?, 1660.

Philips, John. *God and the King*. London, 1661.

Phillips, John. *Montelion 1660*. [London,] 1660.

———. *Montelion 1661*. London, [1661].

———. *Montelion 1662*. London, 1662.

Philpot, Thomas. *The Creples Complaint*. London, 1662.

The Picture of the Good Old Cause Drawn to Life. London, 1660.

Pierce, Thomas. *Englands Season for Reformation of Life*. London, 1660.

———. *A Sermon Preached at St. Margarets in Westminster before the Honourable the House of Commons in Parliament Assembled, upon the 29th Day of May, Being the Anniversary Day of the King's and Kingdomes Restauration*. London, 1661.

Pigot, Francis. *Pigot 1658*. London?, 1658?

———. *Pigot 1659*. London, 1659.

———. *Pigot 1660*. London, 1660.

———. *Pigot 1661*. London, 1661.

———. *Pigot 1662*. London, 1662.

Plain English to His Excellencie the Lord General Monck, and the Officers of His Army. London, 1660.

A Poem upon His Maiesties Coronation the 23. of April 1661. London, 1661.

Pond, Edward. *Pond 1659*. Cambridge, 1659.

———. *Pond 1660*. Cambridge, 1660.

———. *Pond 1661*. Cambridge, 1661.

———. *Pond 1662*. Cambridge, 1662.

———. *Pond 1663*. Cambridge, 1663.

Poole, Matthew. *Evangelical Worship is Spiritual Worship*. London, 1660.

Pordage, Samuel. *Heroick Stanzas on His Maiesties Coronation*. London, 1661.

Porter, Thomas. *The Character of a Formall Professor in Religion.* London, 1661.

Porter, T. *The Villian*. London, 1663.

Portrait of Hugh Peters. London?, 1660.

Powell, Edward. *The Danger of the Errors of the Rulers*. London, 1662.

The Prayer of Collonel John Lambert in Captivity. London, 1660.

Priaulx, John. *Confirmation Confirmed and Recommended from Scripture, Antiquity, and Reason*. London, 1662.

Price, John. *Four Sermons Preached in Oxford*. Oxford, 1661.

Price, William. *Gods Working and Brittains Wonder*. London, 1660.

The Prisoner Against the Prelate. London?, 1662.

A Proper New Ballad on the Old Parliament. London?, 1659?

A Prophecy, Lately Found amongst the Collections of Famous Mr. John Selden, Faithfully Rendred in the Originall Latine, and Translated for the English Reader. London, 1659.

A Psalme Sung by the People, before the Bone-fires, Made in and about the City of London, on the 11th. of February. London?, 1660?

The Purchasers of Bishops and Deans and Chapters Lands, by Their Petition Offered to This Honourable House Humbly Shew. London?, 1660.

The Purchasers Pound. London, 1660.

Quarles, John. *Regale Lectum Miserie*. [London], 1659.

R., J. *An Answer For Mr. Calamie to a Poem Congratulating His Imprisonment in Newgate*.

London, 1663.

Raunce, John. *A Few Words to All People Concerning the Present and Succeeding Times*. London?, 1662.

The Re-resurrection of the Rump. London?, 1659?

Reading, John. *A Sermon Lately Delivered in the Cathedral Church of Canterbury Concerning Church Musick*. London, 1663.

Reasons of the Present Judgement of the University of Oxford, Concerning the Solemn League and Covenant. London, 1660.

Reeve, Thomas. *A Dead Man Speaking, or, the Famous Memory of King Charles the I.* London, 1661.

———. *England's Backwardnesse.* London, 1661.

———. *England's Beauty in Seeing King Charles the Second Restored To Majesty.* London, 1661.

———. *England's Restitution*. London, 1660.

A Relation of a Quaker. London?, 1660?

The Religion of the Hypocritical Presbyterians in Meeter. London, 1661.

Reynell, Carew. *The Fortunate Change.* London, 1661.

Reynolds, Lancelot. *A Panegyrick on her Most Excellent Majestie, Katherine, Queen of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland*. London, 1661.

Rich, John. *Verses on the Blessed and Happy Coronation of Charles the II.* London, 1661.

Richards, Nathaniel. *Upon the Declaration of His Majesty King Charles of England the Second*. London, 1660.

Rider, Cardanus. *Riders 1658.* London?, 1658.

———. *Rider 1659*. London?, 1659.

———. *Rider 1660*. London, [1660].

———. *Riders 1661*. London , [1661].

———. *Riders 1664*. London, [1663].

Riland, John. *Confirmation Revived, and, Doom's-day Books Opened*. London, 1663.

———. *Elias the Second His Coming to Restore All Things* Oxford, 1662.

Rise, Augustin. *The Loyall Subjects Lamentation for Londons Perversenesse, in the Malignant Choice of Some Rotten Members, on Tuesday the 19. of March 1661*. London, 1661.

Robin Hood and His Crew of Souldiers. London, 1661.

Robinson, Ralph. *Christ All and in All*. 2nd ed. London, 1660.

Rollins, Hyder E., ed. *Cavalier and Puritan: Ballads and Broadsides Illustrating the Period of the Great Rebellion 1640-1660*. New York: New York University Press, 1923.

Roome for Cuckolds. London, 1660?

Roome for a Justice. London, 1660?

Rose, George. *Rose 1659*. London, 1659.

———. *Rose 1660*. London, 1660.

———. *Rose 1661*. London, 1661.

———. *Rose 1662*. London, 1662.

Rowland, John. *His Sacred Majesty Charles the II*. London, 1660.

———. *A Reply to the Answer of Anonymous to Doctor Gauden's Analysis of the Sense of the Covenant*. London, 1660.

———. *Saint Peters General Petition to our Saviour, for Himself and His Fellow Sufferers*. London, 1661.

The Rump Dock't. London?, 1660?

The Rumps Looking-Glasse. London, 1660.

Rump: Or an Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times.

London, 1662.

The Rump Roughly but Righteously Handled. London?, 1660?

The Rump Serv'd in with a Grand Sallet. London, 1660?

The Rump Ululant, or Penitence per Force. London?, 1660?

Russell, John. *Astrological Predictions on the Affairs of the English Commonwealth & of Most Kingdoms in Christendome for This Present Year 1659*. London, 1659.

———. *Astrological Predictions for the Year of our Lord, 1659*. London, 1659.

——— . *A Coelestiall Prospect 1660*. London, 1660.

———. *A Coelestiall Prospect 1661*. London, 1661.

S., A. *Miracles Not Ceas'd to His Grace George Duke of Buckingham of His Miraculous Cure.* London, 1663.

S., A. *The Reconciler of Religions*. [London], 1663.

(S., G.) *Britains Triumph, for Her Imparallel'd Deliverance, and Her Joyfull Celebrating the Proclamation of Her Most Gracious, Incomparable King Charles the Second, &c.* London, 1660.

S., S. *A Receipt for the State-palise*. London, 1660.

———. *Samuel in Sackcloth*. London, 1660.

S., W. *To the Present Authority of Heads of the Nation of England*. London, 1660.

Sadler, Anthony. *The Loyall Mourner, Shewing the Murdering of the King Charles the First, Fore-Shewing the Restoring of King Charles the Second*. London, 1660.

———. *Maiestie Irradiant*. London?, 1660?

———. *The Subjects Joy for the Kings Restoration, Cheerfully Made Known in a Sacred Masque*. London, 1660.

Saint George, and the Dragon, Anglice: Mercurius Poeticus. London?, 1660?

Sanderson, Thomas. *A Royal Loyall Poem*. London, 1660.

A Satyr Against Hypocrites. London, 1661.

Saunders, Richard. *Apollo Anglicanus 1658*. London, 1658.

———. *Apollo Anglicanus 1659*. London, 1659.

———. *Apollo Anglicanus 1660*. London, 1660.

———. *Apollo Anglicanus 1661*. London, 1661.

———. *Apollo Anglicanus 1662*. London, 1662.

———. *Apollo Anglicanus 1663*. London, 1663.

The Scotch Covenant Condemned. London, 1660.

The Second and Last Collection of the Late London Ministers Farewel Sermons. London, 1663.

Second Part of Merry Drollery. London, 1662?

The Second Part of Saint George for England. London?, 1660?

The Second Volume of the Farewel Sermons. London, 1663.

Shakespeare, William and William Rowley. *The Birth of Merlin: Or the Childe Hath Found His Father*. London, 1662. In Mark Dominik*, William Shakespeare and* The Birth of Merlin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1985.

Sheldon, Gilbert. *Davids Deliverance and Thanksgiving*. London, 1660.

Sheringham, Robert. *The Kings Supremacy Asserted*. London, 1661.

Sherley, William. *The Excellence of the Order of the Church of England, under Episcopal Government*. [London?], 1662.

Shirley, James. *Andromana*. London, 1660.

Short, Ames. *God Save the King*. London, 1660.

Shute, Christopher. *To Sophias Tropaion, or, Wisdom's Trophy*. London, 1662.

Sir Arthur Hesilrigs Lamentation, and Confession. London, 1660.

A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation, and Defence of Religion. Edinburgh, 1660.

South, Robert. *Interest Deposed, and Truth Restored*. Oxford, 1660.

———. *A Sermon Preached at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, Novemb. 9, 1662*. London, 1663.

Southaick, C. *Fames Genius.* London, 1660.

Southland, Thomas. *Love a la Mode*. London, 1663.

A Sovereign Remedy for the Presbyterian's Maladie, Infliced on Them by Those Lordly Bishops, Puritan Pride, and Zealous Self-will. 2nd ed. [London, 1663].

Spalding, Ruth, ed. *The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605-1675.* Records of Social and Economic History, n.s. 13. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

A Speech Made to the Lord General Monck, at Clotheworkers Hall in London the 13. of March, 1659 at Which Time He Was There Entertained by That Worthie Companie. London?, 1660?

A Speech Made to His Excellency George Monck General, &c. The Twelfth Day of April, M. DC. LX. London?, 1660?

A Speech Made to the Lord General Monck, and the Councell of State, at Drapers-Hall in London: the 28th of March, 1660. London, 1660.

A Speech Made to the Lord General Monck at Skinners-Hall April the Fourth 1660. London, 1660.

A Speech Spoken to His Excellency the General Monck, Representing the Genius of England at Drapers-Hall, Wednesday the 28. of March. London?, 1660?

Spencer, John. *The Righteous Ruler*. London, 1660.

Stapylton, Robert. *The Slighted Maid*. London, 1663.

The State-Scuffle. London, 1663.

Stella Meridiana Caroli Secundi Regis, &c. London, 1661.

Stephens, Thomas. *Ad Magistratum*. Cambridge, 1661.

Stone, Samuel. *Deceivers Deceiv'd.* London, 1661.

———. *A Sermon Against Rebellion*. London, 1662.

The Strange and Wonderfull Prophesie of David Cardinal of France, Touching His Sacred Majesty King Charles II. London, 1660.

The Subjects Desire to See Our Gracious King Charles the Second, His Safe Arrivall. London, 1660.

Swallow, John. *Swallow 1658*. Cambridge, 1658.

———. *Swallow 1659*. Cambridge, 1659.

———. *Swallow 1660*. Cambridge, 1660.

———. *Swallow 1661*. Cambridge, 1661.

———. *Swallow 1662*. Cambridge, 1662.

Swan, John. *An Ephemeris 1658*. Cambridge, 1658.

———. *An Ephemeris 1659*. Cambridge, 1659.

———. *An Ephemeris 1661*. Cambridge, 1661.

———. *An Ephemeris 1662*. Cambridge, 1662.

———. *An Ephemeris 1663*. Cambridge, 1663.

Swinnock, George. *The Pastors Farewell, and Wish of Welfare to His People.* London, 1662.

Swetnam, Joseph. *Davids Devotions Upon His Deliverances*. London, 1660.

Swinton, John. *A Testimony for the Lord*. [London?, 1663?]

Symson, Matthias. *Yehoveh ve Melek, or, God and the King.* London, 1661.

T., M. *The Cities New Poet's Mock-show*. London?, 1659?

Tanner, John. *Angelus Britannicus 1658*. London, 1658.

———. *Angelus Britannicus 1659*. London, 1659.

———. *Angelus Britannicus 1660*. London, 1660.

———. *Angelus Britannicus 1661*. London, 1661.

———. *Angelus Britannicus 1662*. London, 1662.

———. *Angelus Britannicus 1663*. London, 1663.

Tatham, John. *Aqua Triumphalis*. London, 1662.

———. *Londons Glory Represented by Time, Truth and Fame.* London, 1660.

———. *Neptune's Address to His Most Sacred Majesty Charles the Second.* London, 1661.

———. *The Royal Oake with Other Various and Delightfull Scenes Presented on the Water and the Land*. London, 1660.

———. *The Rump: or, the Mirrour of the Late Times.* London, 1660.

———. *The Rump: Or, the Mirrour of the Late Times.* 2nd impression, corrected, with additions. London, 1661.

Templer, John. *The Saints Duty in Contending for the Faith Delivered to Them*. London, 1659.

Three Royal Poems. London, 1660.

The Third Volume of Farewel Sermons. London, 1663.

Throckmorton, Raphael. *The Encouragement and Reward of Christian Charity*. London, 1659.

Tomkins, Thomas. *Short Strictures or Animadversions on so Much of Mr. Croftons Fastning St Peters Bonds*. London, 1661.

To the Kings Most Excellent Majesty, and the Lords and Commons Assembled in this Present Parliament. London, 1661.

To the King, upon His Majesties Happy Return. London, 1661.

To My Lady Morton on New-years-day, 1650. London, 1661?

To Robert Wilde, D.D. in the Words of His Own Poem, Concerning Mr. Edmond Calamy. 1662.

Towers, William. *Obedience Perpetually Due to Kings, Because the Kingly Power Is*

Inseperable from the One King's Person. London, 1660.

———. *A Thanksgiving Sermon*. London, 1660.

A Tragi-comedy Called, New-Market-Fayre. London, 1661.

Trigge, Thomas. *Calendarium Astrologicum 1661*. London, 1661.

———. *Calendarium Astrologicum 1662*. London, 1662.

———. *Speculum Astrologicum 1659*. London, 1659.

The Tryall of Traytors. London, 1660.

A True Copie of the List, or Roll, of the Kings Majesties Most Royall Proceedings from the Tower through London to White-Hall, as It Will Be Marshalled by the Lords Deputed for the Office of Earl Marshall. London, 1661.

True de Case. *Hudibras Answered*. London?, [1663].

A True Narration of the Two Wonderful Prophets at Rome, Presaging the End of the World to Be in the Year, 1670. London, 1660.

A True and Perfect Relation of the Grand Traytors Execution. London, 1660.

Two Most Strange Wonders. [London,] 1662.

Tuke, Sir Samuel. *The Adventures of Five Hours*. London, 1663.

The Unfortunate Usurper. London, 1663.

Upon the Declaration of His Majesty King Charles of England the Second. London, 1660.

Vanity of Vanities or Sir Harry Vane's Picture. London, 1660?

Vaux, John. *Vaux 1658*. London, [1658].

———. *Vaux 1659*. London, [1659].

———. *Vaux 1661*. London, [1661].

———. *Vaux 1662*. London, [1662].

Vines, Richard. *The Authours, Nature, and Danger of Heresie*. London, 1662.

———. *Gods Drawing, and Mans Coming to Christ.* London, 1662.

———. *A Treatise of the Institution, Right Administration, and Receiving of the Sacrament of the Lords-Supper*. 2nd ed. London, 1660.

Vox Populi Suprema Rex Carolus, or, the Voice of the People for King Charles. London, 1660.

W., D. *A Visitation of Heavenly Love unto the Seed of Jacob Yet in Captivity*. London, 1660.

W., S. *Epinicia Carolina, or an Essay upon the Return of His Sacred Majesty, Charles the Second*. London, 1660.

(W., T.) *Englands Glorious Change, by Calling Home of King Charles the Second*. London: 1660.

W., W. *Britannia Iterum Beata*. London, 1662.

Wall, John. *A Divine Theater.* Oxford, 1662.

Waller, Edmund. *To the King, upon His Majesties Happy Return*. London, 1660?

Walsall, Francis. *The Bowing Heart of the Subjects to Their Sovereign*. London, 1660.

Walwyn, William. *God and the King*. London, 1660.

Ward, Seth. *Against Resistance of Lawful Powers.* London, 1661.

Warwell, James. *Votiva Tabula*. London, 1660.

Warmstrey, Thomas. *An Humble Monitory to the Most Gloroius Majesty of the High and Mightly Monarch Charles the Second King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, the Great Representative of the Almighty in Majesty and Mercy.* London, 1661.

Washbourne, Thomas. *The Repairer of the Breach*. London, 1660.

[Watson, Richard.] *The Panegyricke and the Storme*. London?, 1659.

Watson, Thomas. *A Pastors Love Expressed to a Loving People*. London, 1662.

Watson, Thomas. *Paramuthion, or, a Word of Comfort for the Church of God*. London, 1662.

Watson, Thomas. *The Righteous Mans Weal and the Wicked Mans Woe.* London, 1662.

Webster, John and William Rowley. *The Thracian Wonder.* London, 1661.

The Welsh Hubub. London, 1660.

Wenlock, John. *Upon Our Royal Queens Majesties Most Happy Arrivall, the Most Illustrious Donna Catherina Sole Sister to the High and Mighty King of Portugall*. London?, 1662?

Wettenhall, Edward. *A Sermon Against Neutrality.* London, 1663.

What if the King Should Come to the City? [London], 1660.

White, John. *The Parallel between David, Christ, and K. Charls, in Their Humiliation and Exaltation*. London, 1660.

Whitehall, Robert. *Carmen Gratulatorium*. London?, 1660?

———. *The Coronation*. London, [1661].

White-halls Petition to the Parliament. London, 1659.

Wild, Robert. *An Essay to a Continuation of Iter Boreale.* London, 1660.

———. *Iter Boreale.* London, 1660.

———. *A Horrible, Terrible, Troublesome Historical Narration of a Duel*. London, 1660.

———. *A Poem upon the Imprisonment of Mr. Calamy in Newgate.* [London, 1662].

———. *The Tragedy of Christopher Love at Tower-Hill*. London, 1660.

Wilkins, W. Walter, ed. *Political Ballads of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. 2 vols. London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1860.

Willan, Edward. *Beatitas Britanniae*. London, 1661.

Willes, Samuel. *To the Kings Most Sacred Majesty, upon His Happy and Glorious Return.* London, 1660.

Winter, John. *A Sermon Preached at East Dearham in Norf. Jan. 30, 1661.* London, 1662.

———. *A Sermon Preached at East Dearham in Norf. May 29, 1661.* London, 1662.

Wit and Drollery, Joviall Poems. London, 1661.

The Wits: Or, Sport Upon Sport. Part I. London, 1662.

Wither, George. *Miscellaneous Works of George Wither*. 6 vols. New York: Burt Franklin, 1877; reprint, New York, 1967.

Womock, Laurence. *The Dressing Up of the Crown*. London, [1660?].

———. *The Solemn League and Covenant Arraigned and Condemned by the Sentence of the Divines of London and Cheshire.* London, 1661.

The Wonder of Wonders. London, 1659.

Wood, Anthony. *The Life and Times of Anthony á Wood*: *Abridged from Andrew Clark's Edition and with an Introduction by Llewelyn Powys*. London: Wishart & Co., 1932.

Wood, Thomas. *A Plot to Disseize God of His Right Defeated*. London, 1661.

Wren, Matthew. *An Abandoning of the Scotish Covenant*. London, 1662.

Y[eokney], W[alter]. *The Entertainment of the Lady Monck.* 1660.

Yolkney, Walter. *A Speech Spoken to the Lord General Monck at Goldsmiths-Hall April the Tenth, 1660*. London, 1660.

Secondary Sources

Books

Allen, J. W. *English Political Thought, 1603-1660.* Vol. 1. London: Methuen, 1938.

Ashley, Maurice. *General Monck.* Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1977.

Ashton, Robert. *Counter-Revolution: The Second Civil War and its Origins,* 1646-8. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994.

Aylmer, G. E. *Rebellion or Revolution: England from Civil War to Restoration.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Backshieder, Paula. *Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern England.* Baltimore, MD and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Bosher, R. S. *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.

Brown, Cedric C., ed. *Patronage, Politics, and Literary Traditions in England, 1558-1658*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1991.

Burgess, Glenn. *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996.

———. *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution: an Introduction to English Political Thought, 1603-1642*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993.

Burns, J. H. and Mark Goldie, eds. *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Burns, William E. *An Age of Wonders: Prodigies, Politics and Providence in England, 1657-1727*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Canfield, J. Douglas. *Heroes & States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000.

———. *Tricksters and Estates: On the Ideology of Restoration Comedy*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1979.

Canfield, J. Douglas and Deborah C. Payne, eds. *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theatre*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.

Capp, Bernard. *Astrology and the Popular Press*. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.

Chandaman, C. D. *The English Public Revenue, 1660-1688*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Chernaik, Warren L. *The Poetry of Limitation: A Study of Edmund Waller*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968.

Corns, Thomas N., ed. *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Corns, Thomas N. *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Cressy, David. *Bonfires and Bells*: *National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart Britain*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989.

———. *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Daly, James. *Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought*. Toronto and Buffalo, NY: University of Toronto Press, 1979.

Davies, Godfrey. *The Restoration of Charles II, 1658-1660*. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1955.

Doran, Susan. *Princes, Pastors, and People: The Church and Religion in England, 1529-1689*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

Eccleshall, Robert. *Order and Reason in Politics: Theories of Absolute and Limited Monarchy in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Erskine-Hill, Howard. *Poetry and the Realm of Politics: Shakespeare to Dryden.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Ferrell, Lori Anne. *Government by Polemic: James I, the King's Preachers, and the Rhetorics of Conformity, 1603-1625*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Fox, Adam. *Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Fox, Alistair. *Politics and Literature in the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Frank, Joseph. *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper, 1620-1660*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.

———. *Cromwell's Press Agent: A Critical Biography of Marchamont Nedham, 1620-1678*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1980.

Friedman, Jerome. *The Battle of the Frogs and Fairford's Flies: Miracles and the Pulp Press during the English Revolution*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Galdon, Joseph A. *Typology and Seventeenth-Century Literature.* The Hague: Mouton, 1975.

Garrison, James D. *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

Greaves, Richard L. *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663.* New York : Oxford University Press, 1986.

———. *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002.

———. *Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian University Press, 1980.

Gregory, Brad S. *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Green, I. M. *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Griffin, Dustin. *Literary Patronage in England, 1650-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Hamilton, Donna B. and Richard Strier, eds. *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-reformation England, 1540-1688*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Hammond, Gerald. *Fleeting Things: English Poets and Poems, 1616-1660*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Harris, Tim. *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

———. *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715*. London and New York: Longman, 1993.

Harris, Tim, Paul Seaward, and Mark Goldie, eds. *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.

Hill, Christopher. *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill*. 2 vols. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press, 1985.

———. *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries*. New York: Elizabeth Sifton Books, 1984.

———. *Milton and the English Revolution*. London: Faber and Faber, 1977.

———. *A Nation of Change and Novelty: Radical Politics, Religion and Literature in*

Seventeenth-century England. London: Routledge, 1990.

———. *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980.

———. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*. Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books, 1975.

Hutton, Ronald. *Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

———. *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Jagodzinski, Cecile M. *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-century England*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999.

Jamison, Ted R. Jr. *George Monck and the Restoration: Victor without Bloodshed*. Ft. Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1975.

Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Johnson, Odai. *Rehearsing the Revolution: Radical Performance, Radical Politics in the English Restoration*. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2000.

Jose, Nicholas. *Ideas of the Restoration in English Literature, 1660-1671*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Keeble, N. H. *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England*. Avon, UK: Leicester University Press, 1987.

———. *Restoration: England in the 1660s*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2002.

Keeler, Mary Frear. *The Long Parliament, 1640-1641*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1954.

Keller, Katherine Z. and Gerald J. Schofforst, eds. *The Witness of Times: Manifestations of Ideology in Seventeenth-century England*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1993.

Knoppers, Laura Lunger. *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print 1645-1661*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Korshin, Paul J. *Typologies in England, 1650-1820*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Loades, David. *Mary Tudor: A Life*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Lovejoy, Arthur. *The Great Chain of Being*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Lucow, Ben. *James Shirley*. TEAS 321. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981.

Maguire, Nancy Klein. *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-1671.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Maclean, Gerald. *Time's Witness: Historical Representation in English Poetry, 1603-1660.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.

Maclean, Gerald, ed. *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: Literature, Drama, History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Marotti, Arthur F. *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Masson, David. *The Life of John Milton: Narrated in Connection with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of His Time*. New and revised ed. 7 vols. New York: Smith, 1946.

McKeon, Michael. *Politics and Poetry in Restoration England: The Case of Dryden's "Annus Mirabilis."* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Mendle, Michael. *Dangerous Positions: Mixed Government, the Estates of the Realm, and the Making of the Answer to the XIX Propositions*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1985.

Miller, John. *Charles II*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991.

Miner, Earl, ed. *John Dryden*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1972.

Miner, Earl. *The Restoration Mode from Cotton to Dryden*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Nenner, Howard. *The Right to Be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1608-1714.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

Nevo, Ruth. *The Dial of Virtue: A Study of Poems on Affairs of State in the Seventeenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Norbrook, David. *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Nuttall, Geoffrey and Owen Chadwick, eds. *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662-1962.* London, S.P.C.K., 1962.

Parker, William. *Milton: A Life.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Patterson, Annabel. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.

———. *Marvell and the Civic Crown.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

———. *Reading Between the Lines*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993.

Payne Fisk, Deborah, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Peacy, Jason. *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004.

Peck, Linda Levy. *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Phillipson, Nicholas and Quentin Skinner, eds. *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Potter, Lois. *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Randall, Dale B. J. *Winter Fruit: English Drama, 1642-1660.* Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995.

Raymond, Joad. *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England 1641-1660.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Seaward, Paul. *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Schowerer, Lois. *No Standing Armies! The Antiarmy Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England*

Baltimore, MD and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Sharpe, Kevin. *Criticism and Compliment: the Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Sharpe, Kevin and Steven N. Zwicker, eds. *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Shaw, Catherine M. *Richard Brome*. TEAS 290. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1980.

Skerpan, Elizabeth, *The Rhetoric of Politics in the English Revolution, 1642-1660.* Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1992.

Skinner, Quentin. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Smith, David L. *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640-1649.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Smith, Nigel. *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660.* New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1994.

Smyth, Alfred P. *King Alfred the Great*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Sommerville, C. John. *The News Revolution in England: Cultural Dynamics of Daily Information*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Spufford, Margaret. *Small Books and Pleasant Histories*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1981.

Spurr, John. *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.

Staves, Susan. *Players' Scepters: Fictions of Authority in the Restoration*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.

Summers, Claude J. and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds. *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999.

———. *The Muses Common-weale: Poetry and Politics in the Earlier Seventeenth Century.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988.

Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1974.

Reprint, London: Penguin Books, 1991.

Tormählen, Marianne. *Rochester: The Poems in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Underdown, David. *Royalist Conspiracy in England*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971.

Vieth, David M., ed. *John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester: Critical Essays*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1988.

Wallace, John M. *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Watt, Tessa. *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640*. Reprint ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Watts, Michael R. *The Dissenters*. Volume 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Weber, Harold. *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship Under Charles II.* Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996.

Weston, Corinne and Janelle Greenberg. *Subjects and Sovereigns: The Grand Controversy over Legal Sovereignty in Stuart England*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Wheale, Nigel. *Writing and Society: Literacy, Print, and Politics in Britain, 1590-1660.* New York: Routledge, 1999.

Wilcher, Robert. *The Writing of Royalism, 1628-1660.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Winn, James Anderson. *John Dryden and His World*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1987.

Wiseman, Susan. *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Woolrych, Austin. *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

———. *Commonwealth to Protectorate.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Zwicker, Steven N. *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Zwicker, Steven N., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature 1650-1740.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Theses and Dissertations

Davis, David A. "A New Treason: The Trials of the Regicides of Charles I." M.A. thesis, Florida State University, 1990.

Greenberg, Stephen Joel. "Cavalier: Propaganda Stereotypes in Seventeenth-century England." Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1983.

Jones, Bunny Paine. "'The Cully of Britain': Satiric Rhetoric Against Charles II in Selected Poems on Affairs of State." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Houston, 1980.

Kezar, Dennis Dean, Jr. "Renaissance Killing Poems: the Subject of Death and Its Literary Executions in Early Modern England." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1997.

Maccallum, Paul H. "Public Poetry, Memory, and the Historical Present: 1660- 1745." Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Hampshire, 1997.

Sampson, Joyce E. "Popular Prophecies in England, 1510-1691." M.A. thesis, Kent State University, 1989.

Shelton, Myrtle Elizabeth Edwards. "Oliver Cromwell and Charles II in the Epideictic Poetry of Andrew Marvell and John Dryden." Ph.D. dissertation, Texas Woman's University, 1985.

Stevenson, Julie Robin. "The English Monarch Interpreted through Renaissance Historical Drama." Ph.D. dissertation, The Florida State University, 1994.

Thomson, Elizabeth. "Poetry and the Court in the Reign of Charles I." D. Phil., Oxford University, 1989.

Turner, Dorothy. "Roger L'Estrange and the Print Culture of the Restoration." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Ottawa, 1996.

Articles and Chapters

Brooks, Harold F. "English Verse Satire, 1640-1660: Prolegomena." *Seventeenth Century* 3 (1988): 17-46.

Brown, Laura S. "The Divided Plot: Tragicomic Form in the Restoration." *ELH* 47 (1980): 67-79.

Burns, William E. "'Our Lot is Fallen into an Age of Wonders': John Spencer and the Controversy over Prodigies in the Early Restoration." *Albion* 27.2 (1995): 237-52.

Cacicedo, Alberto. "Seeing the King: Biblical and Classical Texts in Astraea Redux." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 32:3 (Summer 1992): 407-427.

Canfield, J. Douglas. "The Ideology of Restoration Tragicomedy." ELH 51 (1984): 447-64.

———. "The Significance of the Restoration Rhymed Heroic Play." *Eighteenth- Century Studies* 13 (1979): 49-62.

Collins, Jeffrey R. "The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy." *Church History* 68.3 (1999): 549-80.

Greaves, Richard L. "Great Scott! The Restoration in Turmoil, or, Restoration Crises and the Emergence of Party." *Albion* 25.4 (Winter 1993): 605-618.

Gunn, J. A. W. "'Interest Will Not Lie:' A Seventeenth-Century Political Maxim." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 29:4 (October - December 1968): 551-564.

Hammond, Paul. "Dryden's Employment by Cromwell's Government." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 8 (1981): 130-136.

Harris, Tim. "The Problem of 'Popular Political Culture' in Seventeenth-Century London." *History of European Ideas* 10 (1989): 43-58.

Hill, Christopher. "Literature and the English Revolution." *Seventeenth Century* 1 (1986): 15-30.

———. "Political Discourse in Early Seventeenth-Century England." In *Politics and People in Revolutionary England*. Ed. Colin Jones, Malyn Newitt, and Stephen Roberts, 41-64. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

Hirst, Derek. "The Politics of Literature in the English Revolution." *Seventeenth Century* 5 (1990): 133-55.

Jones, Virgil L. "Methods of Satire in the Political Drama of the Restoration." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 21 (October 1922): 662-69.

Kerrigan, John. "Revenge Tragedy Revisited: Politics, Providence and Drama, 1649-1683."

Seventeenth Century 12 (1997): 207-29.

Ketcham, Michael G. "Myth and Anti-Myth and Poetics of Political Events of Two Restoration Poems." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 10 (1984): 117-32.

Key, Newton E. "The Political Culture and Political Rhetoric of County Feasts and Feast Sermons, 1654-1714." *Journal of British Studies* 33:3 (July 1994): 223-256.

Korshin, Paul J. "Types of Eighteenth-Century Literary Patronage." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 7 (Summer 1974): 453-73.

Love, Harold. "State Affairs on the Restoration Stage, 1660-1675." *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 14 (May 1975): 1-9.

MacLean, G. M. "An Edition of Poems on the Restoration." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 11 (1987): 117-21.

———. "The King on Trial: Judicial Poetics and the Restoration Settlement." *Michigan Academician* 17 (1985): 375-388.

Malcolm, Joyce Lee. "Charles II and the Reconstruction of Royal Power." *Historical Journal* 35 (1992): 307-30.

Markley, Robert. "Introduction: History, Ideology, and the Study of Restoration Drama." *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 24 (1983): 91-102.

McMahon, Susan. "John Ray (1627-1705) and the Act of Uniformity, 1662." *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 54.2 (2000): 153-78.

Metcalfe, Jean LeDrew. "The Politics of Panegyric: Poetic Representations of Oliver Cromwell." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture* 18 (Spring 1994): 1-16.

Nelson, Nicolas H. "Astrology, Hudibras, and the Puritans." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37:3 (July-September 1976): 521-536.

Nicoll, Allardyce. "Political Plays of the Restoration." *Modern Language Review* 16 (1921): 224-42.

Nixon, Cheryl L. "Creating the Text of Guardianship: 12 Car. II.c.24 and *Cutter of Coleman Street*." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 19 (Spring 1995): 1-28.

Owen, Susan J. "Interpreting the Politics of Restoration Drama." *Seventeenth Century* 8 (Spring

1993): 67-97.

Patterson, Annabel. "*The Country Gentleman*: Howard, Marvell, and Dryden in the Theatre of Politics." *Studies in English Literature* 25 (Summer 1985): 491-509.

Pocock, J. G. A. "The Significance of 1688: Some Reflections on Whig History." In Robert Beddard, ed. *The Revolutions of 1688*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991. 271-92.

Quintana, Ricardo. "Samuel Butler: A Restoration Figure in a Modern Light." *ELH* 18.1 (March 1951): 7-31.

Raymond, Joad. "The Daily Muse: or, Seventeenth-Century Poets Read the News." *Seventeenth Century* 10 (1995): 189-218.

Roberts, Stephen K. "Public or Private? Revenge and Recovery at the Restoration of Charles II." *Bulletin of the Institute for Historical Research* 59 (November 1986):172-88.

Rosenheim, James M. "Documenting Authority: Texts and Magistracy in Restoration Society." *Albion* 25 (Winter 1993): 591-604.

Ryrie, Alec. "The Unsteady Beginnings of English Protestant Martyrology." In David Loades, ed., *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective.* Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 1999.

Sawday, Jonathan. "Re-Writing a Revolution: History, Symbol, and Text in the Restoration." *Seventeenth Century* 7 (Autumn 1992): 171-99.

Scouten, Arthur and Robert D. Hume. "'Restoration Comedy' and its Audiences, 1660-1776." *Yearbook of English Studies* 10 (1980): 45-69.

Seaward, Paul. "A Restoration Publicist: James Howell and the Earl of Clarendon, 1661-6." *Historical Research* 61 (1988): 123-31.

Seidel, Michael. "Patterns of Anarchy and Oppression in Samuel Butler's *Hudibras*." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 5:2 (Winter 1971-1972): 294-314.

Sharpe, J. A. "'Last Dying Speeches:' Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in Seventeenth-Century England." *Past and Present* 107 (May 1985): 144-67.

Streitberger, W. R. "The Royal Image and the Politics of Entertainment." *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 29 (2000):1-16.

Thirsk, Joan. "The Restoration Land Settlement." *The Journal of Modern History* 26:4 (December 1954): 315-328.

Thompson, James. "Histories of Restoration Drama." *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 24 (1983): 163-172.

Till, Barry. "The Worcester House Declaration and the Restoration of the Church of England." *Historical Research* 172 (1997): 203-30.

Turner, Dorothy. "Restoration Drama in the Public Sphere: Propaganda, the Playhouse, and Published Drama." *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research,* 2nd ser., 12 (Summer 1997): 18-39.

———. "Roger L'Estrange's Deferential Politics in the Public Sphere." *Seventeenth Century* 13 (1998): 85-101.

Wasserman, George. "Carnival in *Hudibras*." *ELH* 55:1 (Spirng 1988): 79-97.

———. "'A Strange Chimaera of Beasts and Men': The Argument and Imagery of Hudibras, Part I." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 13:3 (Summer 1973): 405-421.

Williams, J. B. "The Forged 'Speeches and Prayers' of the Regicides." *Notes and Queries* 11th series, vol. 7 (1913): 301-02.

Woolf, Daniel. "The Politics of Literature in Early Modern England." *Queen's Quarterly* 94 (1987): 133-53.

Indices, Bibliographies, and Catalogs

Catalogue of English Broadsides 1505-1897. N.p.: James Lindsay-Crawford, 1898. Reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.

Day, Cyrus Lawrence and Eleanore Boswell Murrie, eds. *English Song-Books 1615-1702*. London: Oxford University Press, 1940.

Stephen, Leslie, and Sidney Lee, eds. *Dictionary of National Biography*. 22 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1949-50.

Early English Books Online [database online]. Ann Arbor, MI: Proquest Information and Learning.

Foster, Joseph, ed. *Alumni Oxonieses*. 4 vols. Nendeln: Kraus Reprint, 1968.

Greaves, Richard L. and Robert Zaller, eds. *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*. 3 vols. Brighton, UK: Harvester Press, 1982.

Matthews, A. G., ed. *Calamy Revised*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

———. *Walker Revised.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Murph, Roxane C. *The English Civil War through the Restoration in Fiction: An Annotated Bibliography, 1625-1999*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2000.

Plomer, Henry Robert. *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers Who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667.* London: Printed for the Bibliographic Society, Blades, East, & Blades, 1907.

Matthews, A. G., ed. *Walker Revised.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Myers, Robin. *The Stationers' Company Archive: An Account of the Records, 1554-1984.* Winchester: St.Paul's Bibliographies; Detroit: Omnigraphics, 1990.

Stephen, Leslie and Sidney Lee, eds. *Dictionary of National Biography*. 22 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1949-1950.

The Thomason Tracts, 1640-1661: An Index to the Microfilm Edition of the Thomason Collection of the British Library. 2 volumes. Ann Arbor, MI.: University Microfilms International, 1981.

Wing, Donald, ed. *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700*. 3 vols. 2nd ed. New York: Index Committee of the Modern Language Association of America, 1972-88.

Venn, John and J. A. Venn, eds. *Alumni Cantabrigienses*. 10 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Joanna T. Neilson grew up in Birmingham, Alabama. She attended Centre College, double majoring in History and Dramatic Arts. She completed her M.A. in British History under Dr. Richard L. Greaves in 1998. She has taught several introductory history courses at the University and Tallahassee Community College. In the spring of 2000 she taught for the Florida State University London program. She married Wayne Harden that summer.