

The Civil Wars after 1660

PUBLIC REMEMBERING IN LATE STUART ENGLAND



Matthew Neufeld

STUDIES IN EARLY MODERN CULTURAL,
POLITICAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY

Volume 17

THE CIVIL WARS AFTER 1660

Studies in Early Modern Cultural, Political and Social History

ISSN: 1476-9107

Series editors

Tim Harris – Brown University
Stephen Taylor – Durham University
Andy Wood – University of East Anglia

Previously published titles in the series
are listed at the back of this volume

THE CIVIL WARS AFTER 1660

PUBLIC REMEMBERING IN LATE STUART ENGLAND

Matthew Neufeld

THE BOYDELL PRESS

© Matthew Neufeld 2013

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner

The right of Matthew Neufeld to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988

First published 2013
The Boydell Press, Woodbridge

ISBN 978-1-84383-815-9

The Boydell Press is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620-2731, USA
website: www.boydellandbrewer.com

A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

The publisher has no responsibility for the continued existence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Papers used by Boydell & Brewer Ltd are natural, recyclable products made from wood grown in sustainable forests



Typesetting by User design, UK.
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Contents

Illustrations	vi
Preface	ix
Acknowledgements	xi
Abbreviations	xiii
Note	xiv
Introduction	1
1 The Restoration Regime and Historical Reconstructions of the Civil War and Interregnum	17
2 Restoration War Stories	55
3 Representing the Civil Wars and Interregnum, 1680–5	87
4 Struggling over Settlements in Civil-War Historical Writing, 1696–1714	135
5 John Walker and the Memory of the Restoration in Augustan England	169
6 Thanking God those Times are Past	203
Conclusion	243
Select Bibliography	251
Index	271

Illustrations

Figures

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1 Charles I's flight from Oxford, his trial and his death
[Nathaniel Crouch], <i>Wars in England</i> (1681), p. 139. This
item is reproduced by permission of The Huntington Library,
San Marino, California, RB 72410 | 125 |
| 2 Images of Enslavement, Thomas May, <i>Arbitrary Government</i>
(1682), p. 24. ©The British Library Board (RB.23.a.9563) | 126 |
| 3 Images of Liberation, Thomas May, <i>Arbitrary Government</i>
(1682), p. 200. ©The British Library Board (RB.23.a.9563) | 127 |
| 4 Frontispiece, Thomas May, <i>Arbitrary Government</i> (1683).
©The British Library Board (RB.23.a.9563) | 128 |
| 5 Frontispiece, Thomas May, <i>Arbitrary Government</i> (1683).
©The Trustees of the British Museum (BM Satires 1127) | 129 |

Images 1 and 4 produced by ProQuest as part of Early English Books Online. Inquiries may be made to: ProQuest, 789 E. Eisenhower Parkway, Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA. Telephone: 734.761.4700. Email: info@proquest.com. Web page: <http://www.proquest.com>.

This book is dedicated to the memory of my father,
Arnie Neufeld (1944–2012)

Erinnere mich; laß uns miteinander rechten. Jesaja 43.26a

Preface

On a rainy Bank Holiday in the spring of 2011 I went on a guided tour of Winchester Cathedral. Our guide led us very ably around the building's beautiful exalted interior, at one point pausing with his back toward the very large stained glass west window. He told us that we were looking at a reconstruction, since the window's medieval glass had been destroyed by parliamentarians at the time of the civil war. As an aside, he then noted that during the civil war Hampshire had been predominantly 'Roundhead, or "Labour"'.

I remember this moment vividly because it was the first time in nearly four years of having lived in England, and in almost seven years of thinking about early modern historical culture, that I had witnessed an unsolicited (and unguarded) reference to the civil wars. Moreover, it seemed to me that here was an obvious example of the wars' presence within popular memory. In our guide's mind, the political, social and religious divisions of mid-seventeenth-century England paralleled the partisanship of (post-) modern British political life. It is probably not a view shared by the Cathedral's Dean and Chapter, at least not publicly. Interestingly, visitors to the historical section of Winchester Cathedral's website in the spring of 2011 will have found no reference to Roundheads or parliamentary iconoclasts.¹

This book's examination of one pre-modern nation's attempt to make peace with its violent past and with itself contributes to our understanding of the use and misuse of the past in contemporary life. Public remembering of past conflict that seeks to keep the focus on a blameworthy 'other' does not do justice or bring peace. Rather, such memories create exclusive communities whose collective life is thereby diminished; often this kind of remembering lays the foundation for more conflict and even violence.

This book began from an interest in the power of the past in seventeenth-century England. It ended up exploring public memories of England's civil wars over the two generations after the Restoration of the monarchy. Today there is a great deal of interest in how individuals and groups

¹ URL: <http://winchester-cathedral.org.uk/history-treasures/our-history/> [accessed 18 August 2011].

PREFACE

deal with past experiences of violent conflict. While much is being written about the aftermath of war in modern societies, not much has been done for the era before 1789. This book is an effort at redressing that imbalance. Essentially, it argues that public remembering of the English civil wars and Interregnum after 1660 was not caught up in re-fighting the old struggle, but commending and justifying, or contesting and attacking, the Restoration settlements. In particular, what was at issue was the way the political nation had attempted to address the issue of remembering and forgetting past conflict. The answer was to construct a polity grounded on remembering and scapegoating puritan politics and piety. The proscription enacted by the Restoration settlements endured for nearly two centuries, supported by a memory of the 1640s and 1650s that was used to show that puritans, also known as Dissenters, could not be trusted with power.

These days, past conflict is very often invoked publicly by people in authority or with power for a variety of reasons. While it is fashionable to think that the past is a kind of free-floating signifier, capable of being and meaning many things to very different sorts of people, the past misused can be very dangerous. The history of conflict can easily become a reason to do harm in the present. The fact that it is debatable and belongs to no one is all the more reason to remember it, and argue about it, with honesty, humility and charity.

Acknowledgements

I am delighted to remember and thank the institutions and individuals that assisted me during the course of writing this book. I owe a large debt of gratitude to the University of Alberta and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for funding several years of research. Preliminary research in the UK was undertaken with a travel award from the Sir Winston Churchill Society of Edmonton. Neither can I forget the warm welcome I received as a visiting academic at Royal Holloway College, the University of York and the University of Warwick, nor the supportive guidance provided at those institutions by Professors Blair Worden, Bill Sheils, David Wootton and Mark Knights. More recently, the faculty and staff of the University of Saskatchewan's Department of History have made me feel at home in their midst.

This book could not have been written without the assistance of the staffs at the Bodleian Library, Balliol College Library, St John's College Library, the British Library, Durham University Library Special Collections, Brotherton Library Special Collections, the Borthwick Institute for Archives, York Minster Library, and the inter-library loan departments of the Universities of Alberta, York, Warwick and Saskatchewan. The help provided by the employees of the UK National Archives, the Derbyshire Record Office, the Devon Record Office, the Hampshire Record Office, the Wiltshire and Swindon Record Office, the Cheshire and Chester Record Office, the West Yorkshire Archive Service, Wakefield, the North Yorkshire Record Office and Doctor Williams Library was also much appreciated.

Aspects of Chapter 6 were originally published by Cambridge University Press as 'The Politics of Anglican Martyrdom: Letters to John Walker, 1704–1705', in the *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Volume 62 (2011), pp. 491–514 and are reprinted here with permission. Images reproduced in this book have the permission of their respective repositories as noted in the list of Illustrations. Figures 1 and 4 are produced by ProQuest of Ann Arbor, MI, as part of *Early English Books Online*; Figures 2 and 3 are produced with the permission of the British Library Board; Figure 5 is produced with the permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For reading individual chapters and offering constructive criticism I would like to thank Christopher Baxfield, Jacqueline Rose, Matthew Jenkinson, Nadine Lewycky, Koji Yamamoto, Warren Johnston, Roger Richardson, Stephen R. Roberts, J.R. Jones, Stephen Taylor, David Wootton, Blair Worden and the late Kevin Sharpe. I appreciated the opportunity provided me by Jason Peacey and John Miller to present the book's key arguments at the Institute for Historical Research's 'Britain in the 17th Century' seminar. I must offer hearty thanks to Katharina Megli, who spent hours helping me to improve the initial draft of this study. Andrew Gow, Sylvia Brown, Lesley Cormack, David Gay and Mark Knights deserve extra special thanks for reading an early complete version of this book. Also, I wish to acknowledge particularly the help and friendship of Gary Rivett, who graciously allowed me to test some of my arguments with him, while generously sharing the fruits of his own important work on history and memory during the English Revolution.

Two other scholars played crucial roles in bringing forth this book. I am deeply honoured to thank Daniel Woolf for critical readings of several drafts and numerous suggestions that improved my thinking about Restoration historical culture. I am also profoundly grateful to Andy Wood for his amazing encouragement and support over the final stages of this book's completion.

Very special thanks go to the select cohort that composes my spiritual base of support – my family. Christine, Kent, Liam and Brontë Rygiel have provided food, shelter and joyful welcome on numerous visits to my spiritual home of Winnipeg; Michael Neufeld's friendship and encouragement have helped me through many difficult patches of writing. My parents, Arnie and Trudi Neufeld, were with me at the very beginning of this academic pilgrimage, and their love and prayers have sustained me throughout the journey beyond all my hope and imagining. I am sorry that my father, the first and best historian I knew, was not able to see this book in print. Arnie has left us, but he will not be forgotten.

Saskatoon, Pentecost 2012

Abbreviations

Bodl. Lib.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
CRO	Chester and Cheshire Record Office
DBRO	Derbyshire Record Office, Matlock
DRO	Devon Record Office, Exeter
EHR	<i>English Historical Review</i>
HJ	<i>Historical Journal</i>
HLQ	<i>Huntington Library Quarterly</i>
HRO	Hampshire Record Office, Winchester
JBS	<i>Journal of British Studies</i>
JEH	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
MSS	Manuscripts
NYAS	North Yorkshire Archive Service, Northallerton
ODNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> , online edition
P&P	<i>Past & Present</i>
QS	Quarter Session
SR, v	Great Britain, <i>The Statutes of the Realm</i> , Volume V
WSRO	Wiltshire and Swindon Record Office, Chippenham
WYAS	West Yorkshire Archive Service, Wakefield

Note

All dates are rendered according to the Julian calendar, except that the numbered year is taken to have started on 1 January. Original spelling has for the most part been retained in quotations from manuscript materials. Within the notes, the place of publication for all printed works is London, unless otherwise stated. For the sake of clarity, *English Short Title Catalogue* (Wing) numbers for works published before 1700 are provided in the notes rather than the Select Bibliography.

Introduction

Emerging from a period of civil violence and political upheaval, the English in 1660 faced a critical question: what from the troubled past should be retained in memory and what ought to be consigned to oblivion? It is a question that many nations today with painful and tragic histories still struggle to answer.¹ At the turn of the millennium, Canadian journalist Erna Paris travelled to seven of them – Germany, France, Japan, the USA, Chile, Argentina and South Africa – determined to understand how their citizens remembered or did not remember past conflicts, and the impact that remembering and forgetting had on the people who were excluded from official national narratives. She discovered that while the desire to shape what was remembered was universal, the number of ways it could be shaped was ‘surprisingly limited’. The responses ranged from outright lies and blanket denials, through to judicious myth-making, on to benign or deliberate neglect, and finally, to efforts to confront and possibly redeem past wrongs. Paris’s conclusion was that the ‘long shadows’ cast by conflict in the past were best managed – never overcome – with remembrance, accountability and justice.²

The legal, ethical, academic and popular struggles over remembering and forgetting the great catastrophes of the modern era have generated a large body of literature.³ Yet there are far fewer studies of how pre-modern

¹ Martha Minow, *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence* (Boston, MA, 1998).

² Erna Paris, *Long Shadows: Truth, Lies and History* (Toronto, 2000), p. 449.

³ T.G. Ashplant, Graham Dawson and Michael Roper, ‘The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration: Contexts, Structures and Dynamics’, *The Politics of Memory: Commemorating War*, eds Timothy G. Ashplant, Graham Dawson and Michael Roper (New Brunswick, NJ, 2000), pp. 3–86; Richard Ned Lebow, ‘The Memory of Politics in Postwar Europe’, *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, eds Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner and Claudio Fugo (2006), pp. 1–39; Jeffery K. Olick, *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility* (New York, 2007); Alon Confino, ‘History and Memory’, *The Oxford History of Historical Writing. Volume V: Historical Writing Since 1945*, eds Axel Schneider and Daniel Woolf (Oxford, 2011), pp. 36–51.

politics addressed the problem of a difficult, if not traumatic, past.⁴ Part of the reason for this is because contemporary debates over, for example, the legacy of the Second World War or the Holocaust clearly have more popular resonance and political relevance than the Anglo-Dutch wars or the War of the Austrian Succession.⁵ Another more prosaic reason is the relative abundance of sources on modern approaches to past conflicts in comparison with those that exist for the period before 1800. Finally, the advantage of attending to the way past societies addressed the question of remembering and forgetting conflict may not be evident to all historians.⁶ In this book I argue that the ways in which seventeenth-century England forgot and remembered the civil wars and Interregnum explains the country's lengthy attachment to the politically and religiously exclusive Restoration settlements, and its deep mistrust of puritan piety and religion well into the eighteenth century. Immediately after the English civil wars and Interregnum, the majority of the political nation chose the option of deliberately neglecting the recent past, most famously in the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. However, this was swiftly replaced by a form of partial public remembering that provided historical justification for the proscription of the puritan impulse from an exclusively Anglican polity.

Public remembering of the English civil wars and Interregnum after 1660 was not ultimately concerned with re-fighting the old struggle, but rather commending and justifying, or contesting and attacking, the Restoration settlements that underlay the Anglican confessional state. In particular, at issue was the way the Restoration settlements attempted to solve the problem of the presence of the recent past by excluding from power and authority adherents of the puritan impulse. Much public remembering of the civil wars down through the late Stuart period occurred within a framework created by the legislation intended to guarantee peace and security. The fact that this was attempted through foisting the burden of war-guilt

⁴ A prospectus for work on seventeenth-century England was set out in Mark Stoyle, 'Remembering the English Civil War', *The Memory of Catastrophe*, eds Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver (Manchester, 2004), pp. 19–30. The bias towards the modern is evident even in a recent forum in the *JBS* 'on remembering the past': James McConnel, 'Remembering the 1605 Gunpowder Plot in Ireland, 1605–1920', *JBS* 50 (2011), 865–91; Edmund Roger, '1688 and 1888: Victorian Society and the Bicentenary of the Glorious Revolution', *JBS* 50 (2011), 892–916.

⁵ John R. Ellis, ed., *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (Princeton, 1994); Dominick LaCapra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz* (Ithaca, 1998); Eelco Runia, 'Burying the Dead, Creating the Past', *History and Theory* 46 (2007), 313–25.

⁶ Wulf Kansteiner, 'Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies', *History and Theory* 41 (2002), 179–97.

upon a recognisable religious minority is not surprising, nor is it unexpected that in turn it resulted in fresh tensions and splits in England's political and religious cultures. It is remarkable, however, that the proscription enacted by the settlements endured for nearly two centuries, as did their historical basis – a public memory of what happened during the 1640s and 1650s showing that puritans, also known as Dissenters, could not be trusted with political power. Certainly after 1689 in England, and after 1707 in Britain, Protestant subjects could unite to carry out programmes of Christianisation at home and to wage war against Jacobites and Catholic France abroad.⁷ It could be quite another story, however, when external and internal forces appeared to combine menacingly against the Church and king, as English Dissenters learned again in the 1790s.

While a vigorous (and prolific) minority embraced the civil wars and then the Commonwealth regime as opportunities to reform and reinvigorate the nation, during the 1640s and 1650s most of the English longed first for peace and then for the return of the antebellum established order.⁸ Civil war cost the lives of tens of thousands of men and women, and caused enormous damage to property.⁹ At the same time as Englishmen were killing each other on the field of battle, the religious landscape of the kingdom was undergoing the biggest overhaul in eighty years, as reform-minded clergy and laymen set about reforming what had been achieved by the Elizabethan Reformation.¹⁰ Before the end of the 1640s, Charles I had been executed by his English subjects for treason, England declared a republic, and Ireland subjected to a harsh and bloody invasion by the new political entity. Subsequently, the republic's leading military officer assumed for himself supreme executive power, styling himself Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell. However, less than a year after Cromwell's demise, the republic was reinstated through an army-led coup, only to fall itself to

⁷ Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (New Haven, 2003).

⁸ Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (New York, 1975). Modern scholarship on the English civil wars continues to grow rapidly. Recent major works include J.S.A. Adamson, ed., *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49* (Basingstoke, 2009); Michael Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (2008); Ian Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638–1652* (2007).

⁹ Gentles, *English Revolution*, pp. 433–9; Barbara Donagan, *War in England, 1642–1649* (Oxford, 2007); John Walter, *Understanding Popular Violence in the English Revolution: The Colchester Plunderers* (Cambridge, 1999).

¹⁰ That is, the magisterial framework in which the Church in England became the Church of England 'by law established'; John Morrill, 'The Puritan Revolution', *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, eds John Coffey and Paul C.H. Lim (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 67–88.

the same force around six months later. By December of 1659 many people were unsure who was really running the country. The serial regime changes were (finally) stopped by the arrival in London of General George Monck's troops, and the reconstitution – with the support of London's mainstream puritans – of a parliament willing to negotiate with the late king's son, Charles Stuart. As it turned out, in the month of May 1660, Charles II returned from his European exile to rule his kingdoms without any terms and conditions attached. He was greeted with much rejoicing.¹¹

Given the undeniable misery and hardship wrought by the war-induced loss of life and property, not to mention the social and religious divisions the conflict had stirred, along with the unpopularity of Charles I's execution, it is no wonder that the impulse of the political nation immediately before and after the restoration of Charles II was to blot out or destroy reminders of the recent past.¹² Public displays of the republic's seal were taken down; embarrassing or compromising records were altered – such as the journal of the House of Commons for the months around the late king's trial.¹³ Most dramatically and famously, the Convention Parliament embraced the king's stated claim to overlook the troubled past for the sake of social peace by enacting an Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. Forgetting the so-called 'late troubled times', particularly the abusive labels the combatants had hurled at each other, was now the law of the land.¹⁴

People did not, of course, forget what had occurred to them and to their country despite what the Act of Oblivion enacted. For example, Paul Seaward argues that in Restoration England politicians' minds were so occupied with the events of the recent past that they tended to equate even the tiniest indication of disagreement in parliament with the cataclysmic breach of 1641. Similarly, John Miller contends that during the political furore over the succession of the Catholic Duke of York in the early 1680s, people's views of current affairs were 'coloured' by memories of the civil wars. More recently, George Southcombe and Grant Tapsell have suggested that after 1660 personal knowledge of what had happened during the 1640s

¹¹ Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658–1667* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 47–77; Gary S. De Krey, *London and the Restoration, 1659–1683* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 20–65.

¹² Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his kingdoms, 1660–1685* (2005), p. 46.

¹³ For example, the records of several resolutions from 12 December 1648 were 'obliterated' by an order of 2 March 1660, which meant they were scribbled over with loops; House of Lords Record Office, HL/CL/JO/1/33, p. 440.

¹⁴ 12 Car. II, C. 11, 'An Act of Free and General Pardon Indemnity and Oblivion', SR, v, pp. 226–35.

and 1650s – the English Revolution – transformed the context in which longstanding political and religious concerns were debated.¹⁵

Nevertheless, I am less concerned with what individuals remembered or forgot about the recent past as with the political nation's answer to the question of remembering and forgetting the conflict. Jonathan Scott has argued that both personal and public memories of the violence and upheavals of the recent past determined (indeed, almost overdetermined) the responses of the political nation to events after 1660.¹⁶ Restoration England was, in Scott's estimation, a 'prisoner' of its memory of the late civil discords.¹⁷ My contention is rather the reverse: the public memory of civil wars after 1660 functioned as a prison. That is to say, the public memory of the conflicted past undergirded a legal *cordon sanitaire* around the puritan impulse, separating it from mainstream political and religious life for the sake of what today would be deemed national security. Very soon after the restoration of the monarchy, the political nation began to encourage and disseminate a memory of the civil wars and Interregnum that vindicated an exclusively Anglican confessional polity. In particular, the nation was exhorted to remember accounts of the recent conflict that legitimated the settlements' proscription of the puritan impulse from civil and spiritual affairs. Adherents of the puritan impulse were legally locked out from places of power in the Church and the state. This was represented as crucially important for the kingdom's peace, security and the survival of English Protestantism.

Scholarship on the processes by which groups and communities remember and represent the past, and the outcomes of those processes – memories – has grown rapidly since the early 1990s. The process of developing and upholding an awareness of the past that is useful for sustaining a sense of common identity is known as social memory.¹⁸ By contrast, collective

¹⁵ Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661–1667* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 325; John Miller, *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Harlow, 2000), p. 254; see also N.H. Keeble, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford, 2002), p. 208; George Southcombe and Grant Tapsell, *Restoration Politics, Religion and Culture* (Basingstoke, 2010), p. 19.

¹⁶ Jonathan Scott, 'England's Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot', *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, eds Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 108–31; idem, 'England's Troubles, 1603–1702', *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, ed. R. Malcolm Smuts (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 20–38; idem, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 20–39.

¹⁷ Scott, *England's Troubles*, pp. 26; 162–6.

¹⁸ James Fentress and Chris Wickham, *Social Memory* (Oxford, 1992); Geoffrey Cubitt, *History and Memory* (Manchester, 2007), p. 17.

memories connect aspects of the past to the present while denying the ideological implications of the connections.¹⁹ According to Jan Assmann, social memory tends to emerge in two phases.²⁰ First of all, people who experienced an event later orally recall it in what Assman calls 'communicative memory'. The life span of communicative memories can be about three generations or eighty years, although in modern societies it might last up to a century or more. In late Stuart England, it is conceivable that communicative memories of the civil wars and Interregnum circulated among families, kin networks, parishes, and many other kinds of spiritual and trade affiliations, well into the eighteenth century. For example, in early 1702, Richard Kelke of Aston, Yorkshire was well enough to recall his having served in Charles I's army for eighteen months as part of a successful petition for a pension. A clergyman from the same county, Nathaniel Denton, who had been ejected for nonconformity in 1662, lived until 1720.²¹ The bulk of the memories of the civil wars that survive today are found within cultural products, such as memorials, poems, plays, sermons, memoirs, images, letters and historical writing. These cultural memories, Assman argues, convey knowledge about the past that very often forms the basis of a group's sense of belonging to each other, and its awareness of its distinctiveness from other groups. From these factors arise the 'formative and normative impulses' that enable a group to exist over time.²² The objects from the past on which cultural memories focus tend to remain the same over long spans of time, especially in foundational moments or periods of conflict. Therefore, both collective and social memories are framed by and incarnated within cultural artefacts that attend to what are deemed to have been crucial events and individuals from the past.

My argument about the public remembering of the civil wars and Interregnum after 1660 is based largely on late Stuart cultural memories concerned with representing the conflicted past, particularly histories and memoirs. Up until now, this literature has been analysed by literary

¹⁹ Olink, *Politics of Regret*, p. 86; Claudio Fugo and Wulf Kansteiner, 'The Politics of Memory and the Poetics of History', eds Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner and Claudio Fugo, *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe* (2006), pp. 284–310.

²⁰ Jan Assmann, 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', *New German Critique* 65 (1995), 125–33, and idem, *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies*, translated by Rodney Livingstone (Stanford, 2006), pp. 3, 8, 24–5. A similar two-track approach to social memory is found in Avashi Margalit, *The Ethics of Memory* (Cambridge, MA, 2002), pp. 51–67.

²¹ WYAS, QS 1/40/3; John Spurr, 'Later Stuart Puritanism', *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, eds John Coffey and Paul C.H. Lim (Cambridge, 2008), p. 89.

²² Assmann, 'Collective Memory', p. 128; see also Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, pp. 38–41; 49–50.

INTRODUCTION

scholars and historians mostly interested in the story of English historiography, or else the history of political thought.²³ In this book, historical writing, along with published sermons, petitions, images and letters, are analysed as memories aimed at answering for the public the question of remembering and forgetting the past conflict. Historical writing in particular was the most important product of cultural remembering in late Stuart England. For much of the period, the ruling regime sought to ensure that only certain kinds of historical works about the recent past were released. The stories about that past conveyed in historical writing give us glimpses into a set of emotionally charged and intellectually complex debates that revolved around the question of distributing power and authority across the state and Church in a way that would secure, now and in the future, public peace and stability.

Until the latter part of the seventeenth century the word 'public' was most commonly used as an adjective that referred to the sphere of human activity that concerned everyone. Relatedly, it connoted the offices responsible to tend to the welfare of all people.²⁴ Public speech meant that which was open, available (if not affordable) and common, which particularly concerned the affairs of the polity.²⁵ Generally throughout this book, public is used as an adjective, most crucially in connection to remembering and memories. Nations and other large human collectives obviously do not remember the past in exactly the same way as individuals do – just as groups generally do not feel or think as particular people do.²⁶ Nevertheless, nations do, and did, foster and broadcast certain representations of their shared past openly to be recalled and discussed and applied to their present predicaments. Similarly, other aspects of their history were (and are) discouraged or even suppressed from public discourse. Public remembering, therefore, refers to those representations of the past that were put abroad

²³ Daniel Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The light of truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto, 1990); idem, 'Narrative Historical Writing in Restoration England: A Preliminary Survey', *The Restoration Mind*, ed. W. Gerald Marshall (Newark, NJ, 1997), pp. 207–51; idem, 'Speaking of History: Conversations about the Past in Restoration England', *The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain, 1500–1700*, eds Adam Fox and Daniel Woolf (Manchester, 2000), pp. 119–37.

²⁴ Geoff Baldwin, 'The "public" as a Rhetorical Community in Early Modern England', *Communities in Early Modern England*, eds Alexandra Walsham and Phil Withington (Manchester, 2000), pp. 199–215.

²⁵ Phil Withington, 'Public Discourse, Corporate Citizenship, and State Formation in Early Modern England', *American Historical Review* 112 (2007), 1016–38. By 'polity' I mean the ruling regime, the state and people legitimately able to exercise political power.

²⁶ Fugo and Kansteiner, 'The Politics of Memory', p. 288.

for common and open consumption, discussion and debate. Particularly during moments of political tension or crisis, memories of the past conflict were articulated for the purpose of orienting the polity towards a certain policy. It was only at the end of the century that 'public' became used as a noun to mean the whole people, increasingly called upon to adjudicate major questions about the nation's future direction.²⁷ While public memory does not require a bourgeois public sphere to exist and operate, it does by its very nature assume the existence, if not at present then in the future, of a public who will take on and make its narrations of the past part of their own personal stories, and, once thus incorporated, make them a basis for action.²⁸ Significantly, the popular adoption and predominance of national over local history appears to have occurred at the same time as the public was increasingly invoked as umpire over political and religious debates.²⁹

This book's object of study is a particular sphere of cultural memory, what I call public remembering. Public remembering refers to the process of constructing and disseminating representations of public events, usually in the form of a story.³⁰ Some of these stories were complex and complete. In particular, historical writing, by definition that form of discourse concerned to narrate public events, derived its authority in part from its ability to encompass what had happened within comprehensible explanatory narratives.³¹ Other kinds of stories, especially those closer in form to oral testimony, including letters and petitions from wounded veterans, were more partial, fractured and incomplete. Published materials make up the bulk of this book's evidentiary base, partly because of their accessibility, and partly because much printed matter in this period was produced in order to influence the direction of public affairs. Printed public discourse was, as has been argued in relation to public memory during the 1640s, a form of

²⁷ Edward Phillips, *The new world of words: or, A universal English dictionary* (1696), sig. Hhhh3; Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2004), p. 29.

²⁸ Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (New York, 2002), pp. 66–90; Michael Braddick, 'Mobilization, Anxiety and Creativity in England during the 1640s', *Liberty, Authority, Formality: Political Ideas and Culture, 1600–1900, Essays in Honour of Colin Davis*, eds John Morrow and Jonathan Scott, (Exeter, 2008), pp. 176–82.

²⁹ Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500–1730* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 300–51.

³⁰ Jörn Rüsen, *History: Narration, Interpretation, Orientation* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 24–5; David Carr, *Time, Narrative, and History* (Bloomington, 1986), *passim*.

³¹ J.G.A. Pocock, 'Modes of Political and Historical Time in Early Eighteenth-Century England', in *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 91–102.

political participation.³² It is well accepted that before, during and after the civil wars, print was a crucial agent for mobilising formerly (or periodically) passive people into dynamic political actors.³³ Such was the power accorded to print after 1660 that new laws were made, and new offices created, to police and control better the domain of published discourse.³⁴ Moreover, the attempted clamp-down on publication by the Restoration regime was directly connected to the question of forgetting and remembering the civil wars. It was also, after 1660, about securing the established framework of politics and religion from the dangerous traces of the past conflict.

Restoration was both an event and a process after 1660.³⁵ Charles II returned from exile to rule simply upon his hereditary right, but the question remained: how and on what basis would he govern? Moreover, it was not clear to what degree, if at all, the political and social consequences of the civil wars and Interregnum would be retained within the king's dominions. The answers were, as one would expect, complex and contingent. Complex not the least because in England they were addressed by two very different sets of legislators: the Convention and then Cavalier Parliaments; contingent because their settlements in part were crafted in response to contemporary events. However, agreements were reached and a polity constructed upon which governance and religion would henceforth proceed. Nonetheless it needs to be acknowledged that historians generally speak of settlements in the plural, both first and second or else the political and the religious.³⁶ It will be helpful briefly to describe them.

The first settlement was aimed at healing the body politic's wounds and moving forward from the broken past. The settlement worked out by the Convention Parliament meshed well with the king and his Lord Chancellor's desire to blot out the recent past as much as possible, and to ensure

³² Gary Rivett, "'Make Use Both of Things Present and Past': Thomas May's Histories of Parliament, Printed Public Discourse and the Politics of the Recent Past, 1640–1650", Unpublished PhD Thesis (Sheffield, 2010), pp. 2–14.

³³ Alastair Bellany, 'The Murder of John Lambe: Crowd Violence, Court Scandal and Popular Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England', *P&P* 200 (2008), 37–76 at 73; Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004); Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007); Harris, *Restoration*, pp. 142–6, 212–19.

³⁴ See below Chapter 1, pp. 20–23.

³⁵ Jonathan Sawday, 'Re-Writing a Revolution: History, Symbol and Text in the Restoration', *The Seventeenth Century* 7 (1992), 171–99 at 174; Scott, *England's Troubles*, pp. 393–5.

³⁶ Hutton, *Restoration*, pp. 147, 157; Southcombe and Tapsell, *Restoration Culture*, pp. 8–9.

that what had happened would not become the basis of future conflict.³⁷ For example, Charles II's reign was dated from 30 January 1649, implying that there had in fact been no Interregnum. However, in constitutional terms the kingdom of England was brought back to 1641, the year subsequently identified with the emergence of an irreparable breach between Charles I and the Long Parliament. Starting the clock from 1641 meant that the legislation enacted by the Long Parliament in response to the excesses of Charles I's so-called personal rule was upheld. Also, lands that royalists had 'voluntarily' sold to pay fines to the Long Parliament or the Republic were not expropriated. Most significantly, the Convention passed an Act of Free and General Pardon Indemnity and Oblivion. The statute explicitly avoided the issue of culpability for the conflict, its rhetoric suggesting that the nation had tripped over itself into civil war.³⁸ The first settlement suggested that peace would be achieved by forgiving and forgetting.

The second settlement, by contrast, was grounded on remembering and punishing those deemed responsible for causing the broken past. The Cavalier Parliament pointed an accusatory finger at the puritan impulse. In the spring of 1661 it ordered a copy of the *Solemn League and Covenant*, the military and ecclesiological treaty signed by the Long Parliament and Covenanter Scots in 1643, burned by the common hangman.³⁹ While not overturning the first political settlement, the Cavalier Parliament rejected its reconciliationist impulse, and set about to purge the state and the Church of the sorts of men it identified as having led the nation into war. Admittedly, in this it was only partly successful.⁴⁰

The Cavalier Parliament's achievement had profound and long-lasting consequences for English and later on British public life. For example, the Corporation Act was intended to cleanse borough governments from those connected to the politics of the *Solemn League and Covenant*: corporators were to renounce the Covenant and take communion at a parish church or

³⁷ Paulina Kewes, 'Acts of Remembrance, Acts of Oblivion: Rhetoric, Law and National Memory in Early Restoration England', *Ritual, Routine, and Regime: Institutions of Repetition in Euro-American Cultures*, ed. Lorna Clymer (Toronto, 2006), pp. 109–28.

³⁸ Keeble, *The Restoration*, pp. 70–7.

³⁹ House of Commons Journal Volume 8: 21 May 1661, *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 8: 1660–1667* (1802), pp. 256–7. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=26348>; House of Lords Journal Volume 11: 20 May 1661, *Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 11: 1660–1666* (1767–1830), pp. 259–61. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=14107>.

⁴⁰ John Patrick Montañó, *Courting the Moderates: Ideology, Propaganda, and the Emergence of Party, 1660–1678* (2002), pp. 43–4; Seaward, Cavalier Parliament, pp. 196–213.

else lose their places.⁴¹ The following year, the religious settlement, put in effect by a new Act of Uniformity, compelled ministers to assent to everything within the Book of Common Prayer, including all ceremonies and sacraments. It also demanded episcopal ordination, and required clergymen to renounce the Covenant, thereby forswearing any future attempt to alter the government of the state and the Church.⁴² Hundreds of clergymen lost their positions when the law came into effect on 'Black Bartholomew's Day', August 1662. Effectively, the Cavalier Anglican settlements excluded those subsequently labelled Dissenters from full participation in civil and religious life.⁴³ Subsequent legislation – the Conventicle Acts of 1664 and 1670, the Five Mile Act of 1665, the Test Act of 1673 – further constrained Dissenters from positions of authority, and penalised the ongoing refusal of some of the more disenchanted of their number to conform to the established Church.⁴⁴ Essentially, the Cavalier Parliament's exclusive political and religious settlements proscribed the puritan impulse from the public domain. This settlement sought to make peace by excluding puritans from power forever.

Throughout this book the phrase 'puritan impulse' is employed when referring to that which the Restoration settlements sought to exclude from civil and spiritual affairs. The noun and its adjective both demand clarification. In part, I use the word impulse because the settlements did not target particular individuals (save the regicides) but rather a strand of piety and politics with roots in England's Reformation. Furthermore, the laws did not succeed in removing all old puritans, re-branded as Dissenters, from public life. Neither did they completely expunge puritan-minded clergymen from the Church of England.⁴⁵ As a descriptor, the term puritan impulse reflects both the consistent and evolving realities of puritan piety and political action from the accession of Elizabeth I to the return of Charles II, and

⁴¹ Paul Halliday, *Dismembering the Body Politic: Partisan Politics in English Towns, 1650–1730* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 92–117.

⁴² John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646–1689* (New Haven, 1991), pp. 38–42.

⁴³ David J. Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Non-Conformity* (Manchester, 2007); Spurr, 'Later Stuart Puritanism', p. 90.

⁴⁴ Gary S. De Krey, *Restoration and Revolution in Britain: A Political History of the Era of Charles II and the Glorious Revolution* (Basingstoke, 2007), pp. 44–5.

⁴⁵ Douglas R. Lacey, *Dissent and Parliamentary Politics in England, 1661–1689: A Study in the Perpetuation and Tempering of Parliamentary Politics* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1969); Kenneth Fincham, 'Material Evidence: The Religious Legacy of the Interregnum at St George Tombland, Norwich', *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, eds Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 224–40.

the intent of the exclusive Restoration settlements, which was to remove a political and ecclesiological agenda that was judged culpable for blowing up the Tudor regime and the Elizabethan Reformation settlement.⁴⁶ For the sake of clarity, the puritan impulse was represented by and embodied in women and men seeking fervently to evangelise and catechise the whole people under the inspiration of the best Reformed Churches.⁴⁷ This ambition was behind the puritan attempt to reform the English Reformation from 1640 to 1646. As part of making peace with the past, especially what were deemed to have been the catastrophic consequences of the second Reformation, the Restoration settlements renounced the reforming ambition and attempted to blast it from political culture. Within the cultural memory of the civil wars and Interregnum, this legislative catharsis was represented as crucially necessary for the future health and safety of the bodies politic and ecclesiastic.

The book's chapters unpack the argument through a series of case studies, delimited for the most part by generic and chronological boundaries. Chapter 1 examines a sample of published historical writing from the early Restoration period, roughly 1660 to 1673. During these dozen years the Restoration regime was most concerned to oversee the domain of public remembering. At this time the foundational explanatory narrative of a longstanding puritan conspiracy against the Church and state, and the notion of the civil conflict as a war of religion, emerged as part of the ideological case for the exclusive settlements.⁴⁸ I do not mean to suggest that the regime and its supporters in parliament were completely united in their approach to public remembering during the early Restoration era and after. What is clear from historical writing concerned with the recent past, however, is that public remembering of the civil wars and Interregnum were not narrative re-enactments of the conflict, but rather were interventions in an intermittent but often heated debate over the necessity of retaining

⁴⁶ Michael Winship, 'Freeborn (Puritan) Englishmen and Slavish Subjection: Popish Tyranny and Puritan Constitutionalism, c. 1570–1606', *EHR* 124 (2009), 1050–74; Nicholas Tyacke, 'The Puritan Paradigm of English Politics, 1558–1642', *HJ* 53 (2010), 527–50.

⁴⁷ This definition arises from De Krey, *Restoration and Revolution*, p. 43; and Paul C.H. Lim, 'Puritanism and the Church of England: Historiography and Ecclesiology', *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, eds John Coffey and Paul C.H. Lim (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 223–40 at 228.

⁴⁸ Jason Peacey, 'The Paranoid Prelate: Archbishop Laud and the Puritan Plot', *Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theory in Early Modern Europe: From the Waldensians to the French Revolution*, eds Barry Coward and Julian Swann (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 113–34; Glenn Burgess, 'England's Wars of Religion and Royalist Political Thought', *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*, eds Charles W.A. Pryor and Glenn Burgess (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 169–92.

an exclusively Anglican polity in order to safeguard right religion and the constitution.

Drawing on a blend of published and manuscript sources, in particular the petitions of wounded ex-servicemen, I show in Chapter 2 how public recollections of military service in war stories were implicated in the politics of remembering delimited by the Restoration settlements. After 1660, petitioners for state pensions and military memoirists recalled their experiences of service in ways that linked their present sense of self with the political triumph of royalism. I also argue that Restoration war stories represent a unique development in English war culture. In England after 1660, thousands of veterans publicly narrated an experience of defeat as a demonstrable vindication of their personal sacrifices and suffering, and as a legitimisation of the political and religious order for which they had taken up arms.

In the following two chapters, 3 and 4, my analysis returns to historical writing during two very different moments in English political affairs. Chapter 3 examines the final five years of Charles II's reign, 1680 to 1685. These years are noteworthy because of the marked rise in the volume of printed public discourse, comparable to what had occurred in the early 1640s. At the centre of those debates was King Charles I's commitment to the Reformation settlement. During the early 1680s, by contrast, the concern was over the future viability of the Restoration settlements should the Duke of York, a Roman Catholic, accede to the throne. Furthermore, the domain of public remembering underwent both a structural and substantive transformation during this period. Structurally, the temporary suspension of pre-publication censorship resulted in an explosive growth of available printed matter, eventually including publications emanating from the regime that were aimed at influencing the reading public. Relatedly, the arena of public remembering was substantively transformed during these years thanks to the unprecedented rise in the amount of evocations of the civil wars and Interregnum.

From an examination of historical writing and a selection of historical images, I argue in Chapter 3 that narrations of the civil wars point towards a major development within this form of public remembering: the advent of partisan historical parallelism. The troubled times were repeatedly re-screened, I argue, as part of whiggish or tory reimaginings of their meaning for the polity's future. Chapter 4 analyses historical writing about the civil wars from the mid-1690s, when pre-publication censorship ended for good, to the accession of the first Hanoverian king. These years witnessed another modulation within the cultural memory of the wars and Interregnum, as historical writings represented the recent conflict to vindicate the political

and religious settlements attending the returns of either Charles II or William of Orange. At the core of the debate over which of the two settlements – Restoration or Revolution – was the best prescription for the security of Protestantism and the stability of the polity, remained the question of the continuing necessity of the proscription of the puritan impulse. The more supportive a historical writing was of the achievement of the Glorious Revolution, the more likely it was to suggest that it was safe to remove the civil disabilities under which Dissenters still lived.

The penultimate chapter, Chapter 5, focuses on the creation of one major late Stuart historical work, which concerned the experiences of Anglican clergymen and their families during the 1640s and 1650s. John Walker's *The Suffering of the Clergy* (1714) was to a large extent based on recovered communicative memories of clergy families or parish-based informants. The accounts that Walker received in Exeter from across the nation arose from an ecclesiological and political sensibility deeply rooted in communicative and cultural memories of vulnerability and victimisation. In this chapter I argue that Walker's project represented a significant effort on the part of High Anglicans to vindicate historically the Restoration settlement's proscription of the puritan impulse. The Walker papers thus shed light on the powerful communicative memories that underlay a particular religious constituency's strong attachment to the necessarily exclusive nature of Restoration settlements in the early eighteenth century.

The final chapter, Chapter 6, examines a crucial genre in late Stuart public discourse: preaching. The political relevance of sermons in post-Reformation England was particularly heightened when they were delivered on public days of fasting, thanksgiving and remembrance.⁴⁹ From a chronological survey of published sermons dedicated to expounding the case for giving thanks to God for the restoration of Charles Stuart and the Church of England, I argue that over the late Stuart period, annual 29 May thanksgiving sermons defended, commended and eventually contested the Restoration religious settlement. In particular, the myth of the Restoration as an instance of divine liberation was re-articulated to demonstrate God's support of the Stuart monarchy and the Elizabethan Reformation, understood to have been rightly recapitulated by the 1662 Act of Uniformity. Thus, the cultural memory of the Restoration moment became tied up with working out the legacy of England's long Reformation.

⁴⁹ Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge, 2003), *passim*.

INTRODUCTION

The nation's troubled past was not forgotten or ignored after 1660.⁵⁰ This book is a focused attempt to highlight how much and in what ways the experience of civil violence and religious upheaval was narrated to orient a polity desperately seeking to move on. It does not aspire to be the last word on the subject of the wars' place in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century public memory. For example, questions of reception and diffusion of printed memories do not receive sustained analysis. Obviously, readers will have made choices about what exactly from a historical writer's narrative they would poach and what they would put aside.⁵¹ The response of readers to civil war historical writing is not dealt with here simply because such a study warrants its own book.⁵² There must have been a good deal of 'back talk' going on when people engaged with historical narrations in books, pamphlets and sermons. To give just one example, one of the readers of Thomas Gumble's biography of General George Monck disputed in the margin Gumble's claim that Monck had been tempted to assume supreme power for himself.⁵³ Within the domain of public remembering that was a Quarter Session court, the clearest gauge of audience response to a maimed veteran's war story was the denial or conferral of a pension. Yet, as will be discussed below, being granted a pension may not always have been connected to the force and credibility of an ex-serviceman's narrative of service and injury.⁵⁴ The kinds of 'publics' that were generated in response to and reaction against the dominant narratives put abroad in cultural memory deserve much more study. If my examination of part of the public conversation about the recent past after 1660 prompts such work, then this book will have fulfilled a key part of its purpose.

The relationship between the political nation's answer to the question of forgetting and remembering the conflicted past is crucial for understanding the character of its political culture after 1660. Not the wars only, but the ways they were remembered and forgotten divided England's seventeenth century into 'before' and 'after' the late troubled times. People who publicly remembered the civil wars and Interregnum were not necessarily engaging in the same debates and issues that had brought them, or their immediate

⁵⁰ Eviatar Zerubavel, *The Elephant in the Room: Silence and Denial in Everyday Life* (Oxford, 2006).

⁵¹ Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, translated by Steven Rendall (Berkeley, 1984), Chapter 12.

⁵² Daniel Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2002).

⁵³ Copy of Thomas Gumble, *The Life of General Monck, Duke of Albermarle* (1671) in York Minster Library, XXXC.K.24, p. 270. The reader noted that according to 'Mr Locke's acc[ount]' Monck's ambition was in fact arrested by Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper.

⁵⁴ See below, pp. 62–63.

forbears, to violent discord. Very often they were narrating the past within and in response to a framework erected after 1660 to ensure political and religious stability and concord. That framework itself represented a way of working through the legacy of the civil wars through expunging the politics and piety of those deemed most culpable, despite, or perhaps because of, the fact that many puritans, especially in London, did so much to help bring about the restoration of Charles II.⁵⁵ Thus, while the content of cultural memories of the wars evolved as the political and religious landscape of late Stuart England changed, their focus – their aim – remained centred on the question of whether or not it was safe for the polity to stop placing the blame and the shame primarily on the puritans. In other words, was it finally time to forget about the Restoration settlement?

⁵⁵ De Krey, *London and the Restoration*, pp. 20–65.