

The Reactions to the Regicide of Charles I, 1649-1715

Cheryl Kerry

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of History

University of East Anglia

31 March 2023

"This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognise that its copyright rests with the author and that use of any information derived therefrom must be in accordance with current UK Copyright Law. In addition, any quotation or extract must include full attribution."

Word count – 92,332

Abstract

This thesis explores the ways in which the regicide, the man who was condemned and those who condemned him were remembered in England between 1649-1715. Within the 'memory turn' that has taken hold of Civil Wars studies over the past decade, interest in the regicide has been episodic at best. This thesis seeks to redress this through the first detailed study of how people reacted to the regicide across the sixty-year period.

These findings contribute to the wider debates about how the Civil Wars were remembered and the nature of early modern memory. It presents a picture that the remembrance of the regicide went beyond the groan described by Philip Henry that has so often been quoted to symbolise it. By situating this study across sixty years it has been able to identify the short and long-term tactics of the government and their opponents, which has not been articulated through previous research. It reveals a distinct arc of emotions in the immediate aftermath of the regicide and then attempts by both royalists and parliamentarians to employ emotional governance, which ultimately found mixed results. Despite the perceived popularity of Charles through *Eikon Basilike*, the evidence presented here suggests a clear lack of interest in commemorating Charles across this period. However, the regicides and their families were able to celebrate their association to this seemingly horrible event openly.

The thesis considers attempts on how the regicide was presented and manipulated, both by governments and their opponents, and evidence of what ordinary people were remembering. It moves beyond just using the traditional printed material to use a much-varied source base that includes court records, diaries, letters, commonplace books and funeral memorials. This approach reveals how the regicide, Charles I and the regicides were remembered and how political manipulation of events served (or undermined) the immediate interests of governments across the sixty years.

Access Condition and Agreement

Each deposit in UEA Digital Repository is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the Data Collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission from the copyright holder, usually the author, for any other use. Exceptions only apply where a deposit may be explicitly provided under a stated licence, such as a Creative Commons licence or Open Government licence.

Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone, unless explicitly stated under a Creative Commons or Open Government license. Unauthorised reproduction, editing or reformatting for resale purposes is explicitly prohibited (except where approved by the copyright holder themselves) and UEA reserves the right to take immediate 'take down' action on behalf of the copyright and/or rights holder if this Access condition of the UEA Digital Repository is breached. Any material in this database has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the material may be published without proper acknowledgement.

Contents

Declaration	4
Acknowledgements	5
Abbreviations and Conventions	6
Introduction	8
i - Historiography of the Regicide	10
ii - Methodology and Sources	17
iii - Structure	31
 Part One: Short Term Emotional Reactions to the Regicide	
 Chapter One - Politics and the Regicide, 1648-1650	35
i - Public Discourse	39
ii - Personal Sources	54
iii - One Year after the Regicide	66
iv - Conclusion	75
 Chapter Two - Politics and the Regicide during the Restoration	77
i - Charles II and the use of Emotional Governance	78
ii - Mediations	89
iii - Guilt and the need for Retribution	94
iv - Conclusion	106
 Part Two: Enduring Memories of Charles I and the Regicides	
 Chapter Three - Enduring Memories of Charles I, 1649-1715	109
i - 30 January, Commemorating the Regicide	111
ii - Memorials of Charles I	127
iii - Churches Dedicated to Charles I	141
iv - Conclusion	152
 Chapter Four - Enduring Memories of the regicides, 1649-1715	155
i - Role of the Scaffold Performance	157
ii - Retribution, Leniency and Memorialisation	163
iii - Regicide Generation	175
iv - Conclusion	186
 Conclusion	188
 Bibliography	199

Declaration

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

Cheryl Kerry

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, thanks are due to my supervisor, Dr Joel Halcomb who has supported me since I began my MA in 2014, it has been a long journey. Thank you for your wisdom, patience and generosity which has been unfaltering. As a medievalist you opened the Stuart world to me.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to the other academics who have assisted me along the way, especially Professor Geoffrey Plank, who has been my secondary supervisor and on hand to read and provide advice on my work. To Ed Legon for helping me to understand the contested memories of the past and how there was still much more to explore around this topic and the regicide.

This project has involved a good deal of archive work, and I would like to thank Nick and Katie for providing me with a London base when I needed it.

For proof reading chapters in the final months, I want to thank Katie, Carola, Melissa and Emma who took the time to look through my work and provide feedback. Thank you.

I would like to acknowledge and thank my father Philip who sadly passed away in 2018. As someone who himself had received limited education he fully supported me throughout my endeavours, and I know how proud he would be. You are missed every day.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband, Mark, who has been with me every step of the way from when I began this adventure in 2013 through the OU, throughout my MA, the decision to leave my career to come and research this topic. You have been my biggest supporter and the most generous proof-reader. I simply could not have done it without you.

Abbreviations and Conventions

Ahmed, <i>Cultural</i>	Sara Ahmed, <i>The Cultural Politics of Emotion</i> (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004).
Baillie, <i>Letters</i>	Robert Baillie, <i>The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1637-1662</i> . ed. David Laing (Edinburgh, 1841).
BL	British Library, London.
CJ	<i>Journals of the House of Commons</i> , Vols 6-12 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1802).
Clifford, <i>Diaries</i>	Lady Anne Clifford, <i>The Diaries of Lady Anne Clifford</i> , ed. D. J. H. Clifford (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1990).
CSPD	Mary Anne Everett Green, F. H. Blackburne Daniell, and Francis Bickley (eds), <i>Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, May 1660-Feb. 1685</i> , Vols 1-28 (London, 1860-1939).
Evelyn, <i>Diary</i>	John Evelyn, <i>The Diary of John Evelyn</i> , ed. Nigel Smith, Vols 1-4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).
Henry, <i>Diary</i>	Philip Henry, <i>Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry, M.A. of Broad Oak, Flintshire, 1631-1697</i> , ed. Matthew Henry Lee (London: Kegan Paul, 1882).
Josselin, <i>Diary</i>	Ralph Josselin, <i>Diary of Ralph Josselin</i> , ed. E. Hockliffe (London: Royal Historical Society, 1908).
JHL	<i>Journals of the House of Lords</i> , Vols 11-19 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1767-1830).
HOP	Andrew Thrush and John P. Ferris (eds), <i>The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629</i> , Vols 1-4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); B.D. Henning (ed), <i>The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1660-1690</i> , Vols 1-4 (London: Secker & Warburg, 1983); E. Cruickshanks, S.Handley and D.W. Hayton (eds), <i>The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1690-1715</i> , Vols 1-4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Roney Sedgwick (ed.), <i>The House of Commons, 1715-1754</i> , Vols 1-4 (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1970).
Lacey, <i>Cult</i>	Andrew Lacey, <i>The Cult of King Charles the Martyr</i> (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003).
Legon, <i>Revolution</i>	Edward Legon, <i>Revolution Remembered: Seditious Memories After the British Civil Wars</i> (Politics, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain) (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019).
Neufeld, <i>Public Remembering</i>	Matthew Neufeld, <i>The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England</i> (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013).

Newcome, <i>Autobiography</i>	Henry Newcome, <i>Autobiography of Henry Newcome</i> Vol 1, ed. Richard Parkinson (Manchester: Cheltenham Society, 1852).
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (online at https://www.oxforddnb.com)
Pepys, <i>Diary</i>	Samuel Pepys, <i>The Diary of Samuel Pepys</i> , eds. Robert Latham and William Matthews, Vols 1-7 (London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd, 1970).
Peters, <i>Commemoration</i>	Erin Peters, <i>Commemoration and Oblivion in Royalist Print Culture, 1658-1667</i> (London: Palgrave, 2017).
Razzell, <i>Contemporary account</i>	Edward and Peter Razzell, (eds), <i>The English Civil War: A Contemporary Account</i> , Vols 1-5 (London: Caliban Books, 1996).
Reddy, <i>Feeling</i>	William Reddy, <i>The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
Rich, <i>Diary</i>	Mary Rich, <i>Memoir of Lady Warwick: Also Her Diary, from A.D. 1666 to 1672, Now First Published: To Which Are Added, Extracts from Her Other Writings Paperback</i> , ed. Anthony Walker (London: Religious Tract Society, 1847).
Richards, <i>Governance</i>	Barry Richards, <i>Emotional Governance: Politics, Media and Terror</i> (London: Palgrave, 2007).
Rugg, <i>Journal</i>	Thomas Rugg, <i>The Diurnal of Thomas Rugg, 1659-1661</i> ed. by William S. Sachse (London: Butler & Tanner, 1961).
SP	State Papers Series, The National Archives, Kew
Sydney, <i>Papers</i>	Robert Sydney, Earl of Leicester, <i>Sydney Papers: Consisting of a Journal of the Earl of Leicester, and Original Letters of Algernon Sydney</i> , ed. R.W. Blencowe (London: John Murray, 1825).
TNA	The National Archives, Kew.
Wallington, <i>Notebooks</i>	Nehemiah Wallington, <i>The Notebooks of Nehemiah Wallington, 1618-1654</i> , ed. David Booy (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).
Whitelocke, <i>Diary</i>	Bulstrode Whitelocke, <i>The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke</i> , ed. Ruth Spalding (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
Verney, <i>Memoirs</i>	Frances Verney, <i>Memoirs of the Verney Family During the Civil War: Compiled from the Letters and Illustrated by the Portraits at Claydon House</i> , Vol 2 (London: Longmans Green, 1892).

Introduction

I remember wel, there was such a Grone by the Thousands
present, as I never heard before and desire I may never hear
again.¹

The groan which Philip Henry witnessed at the regicide has been used in various histories written about the Civil Wars and regicide to symbolise a universal reaction to it. There was no denying that the killing of a king was a momentous event; it was the first time that a king of England had been legally killed by his people and parliament. Thomas Fairfax, ostensibly the king's enemy, consoled himself by writing poetry in which he begged, 'Oh let that day from time be blotted'.² But that day could not be blotted out. The deed was done, the king was dead. The regicide of Charles I has been characterised as the final act of the English Revolution. Within half an hour of the axe falling, Whitehall had been cleared of spectators and souvenir hunters, but the repercussions of the act could not be so easily removed. Unfortunately, by continually prioritising the groan witnessed by Philip Henry historians have obscured more rich and complex reactions to the regicide.

Amongst the burgeoning bookshelves of writing covering this period, reactions to the regicide remains a neglected part of this revolutionary period. Despite its obvious importance and an abundance of primary sources to investigate, 'The Regicide of Charles I is remarkably little studied'.³ Sarah Barber and Jason Peacey in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* both made a call to arms in 2001 for other historians to research the regicide. Since then, only chapters in large, edited volumes have been produced focusing on the regicide and the potential reactions and consequences.⁴ A recent unpublished thesis examined if the regicide impacted people's concept of time through what was published in almanacs,

¹ Henry, *Diary*, p. 12.

² C.V. Wedgwood, *Trial of Charles I* (London: Collins, 1964), p. 195.

³ Jason Peacey, 'Introduction, in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 4-5.

⁴ Philip Baker, 'The regicide', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Marcus Nevitt, *Women and the Pamphlet Culture of Revolutionary England, 1640-1660* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006) provides a chapter on female pamphleteers and how they wrote about the regicide; Melinda Zook, '"Blood will have Blood": The Regicide Trials and the Popular Press' in *The State Trials and the Politics of Justice in Later Stuart England*, eds Brian Cowan and Scott Sowerby (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2021), pp. 112-134.

histories and newsbooks.⁵ While historians have produced excellent research on printed materials, the reception of these public ideas on individuals remains understudied.

This thesis will look to take up the challenge laid down by Jason Peacey and Sarah Barber through an analysis of the politics, emotions, and memory of the regicide. It will be split into two pairs of chapters. The first two chapters – Part One – will focus on the immediate and short-term reactions to the regicide. Both chapters highlight the political manipulation of events and emotions to serve (or undermine) the immediate interest of the government, in the immediate aftermath of the regicide and then at the time of the Restoration. The second pair of chapters – Part Two – will examine the longer-term memory of the regicide through acts of remembrance for Charles I and the men who condemned him. The reason for this approach is that public memory and its emotional resonances differ when examined in the short and long term. In the short term, we see powerful raw emotions in reaction to that momentous event. Yet over time, when emotion turned into memory, efforts at commemoration trialled off, messages got lost, subversive messages persisted. The implications of the regicide changed in unpredictable ways over time. By drawing upon the interdisciplinary studies of emotional governance, memory and the transmission of ideas through generations, this thesis will investigate how people reacted to the regicide across these sixty years.

The image of Charles I as a stubborn king, blind to a more politicised country and unable to deal with the growing power of parliament, has provided a convenient narrative for scholars across the historiographical spectrum, eager to depict the Civil Wars as a clash of two cultures. The regicide, we are often told, was the result of Charles' character flaw, something another monarch may have looked to compromise on. This thesis aims to re-evaluate the regicide through the lens of the emotional reactions to it: did contemporaries who shared few political allegiances view the regicide in the same light? It will question the existence of a bipolar model of political participation by demonstrating that whereas public facing sources are full of dissent and early calls for the king's head, a stronger sense of shock and disgust

⁵ Meng Yan Matthias Wong, *The Impact of the Regicide of Charles I on Contemporary English Notions of Time and the Future* (PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 2019).

can be detected within more personal sources. It will challenge the perception of the two competing cultures of royalism and parliamentarianism, as the initial reactions to the regicide tore through these political allegiances. The royalists quickly used the symbol of Charles as Martyr, the parliamentarians looked to justify their actions. The Restoration was a turning point where the rise of the Whig party questioned the power of the monarchy but did not use the trial and the regicide as an example of their political ideology. It is notable by its absence and this itself signalled an emotional reaction: one of embarrassment. The Whigs, seen as the ancestors of the parliamentarian party, shunned their parliamentary forebearers' most revolutionary act. This thesis will illustrate how the regicide remained a source of contention across the seventeenth century.

Of course, how the regicide was remembered changed over time, so this thesis will ask how these communities influenced the memory of the regicide? Samuel Pepys in his diary remembered how, with boyish delight, he watched the execution and celebrated the death of the king. In his later life he noted that this reaction was childish, and he subsequently viewed the regicide as a horrendous act.⁶ We might ask, then, how was Charles I remembered and revered after the return of monarchy in 1660? Did the martyr cult hold firm? How did ideas transmit across the generations from those who endured the Civil Wars to their children and grandchildren; did the actions of the 1640s and 1650s remain a scar on their consciousness? To look at the reactions across sixty years will enable a rounded and more thorough investigation of the most remarkable political act of the seventeenth century.

i - Historiography of the Regicide

A survey of existing literature makes it quickly apparent that most work on the regicide has concentrated on more traditional political and military history, the institution of parliament, and the rise of radical political ideas. How contemporaries viewed the regicide remains understudied. This has led to a partial analysis of this

⁶ Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 1, p. 280.

event: there has been no in-depth research understanding how contemporaries reacted to the event and how these reactions changed over time.

John Nalson's *A True copy of the Journal of the High Court of Justice for the Tryall of King Charles I* was published in 1684 and was the first attempt to analyse the basis for putting the king on trial and the potential motivations of those who signed the death warrant. He drew comparisons between the mid-century upheavals and the crises of the 1670s and 1680s. He bemoaned the fact that too little had been learned from the recent past; another disintegration, as he saw it, was about to happen.⁷ Nalson, therefore, wrote history with a present-centered purpose and looked to the past for guidance and warnings. If the country was to be saved from another disaster, then no period of English history, he was confident, had more lessons to teach than that of the Civil Wars. Nalson's book depicted the tragedy of the dismal, bloody, wicked, and outrageous rebellion of the mid-century, the insolent wickedness of those who endeavored to consecrate murder, treason and sacrilege. Charles I was fulsomely celebrated in this account as the best and most illustrious sovereign of the Christian world. The book was dedicated to the Duke of York and therefore there was clear bias with Charles as the sainted martyr with no character flaws.

Samuel Gardiner created a very detailed account from Civil War to the Commonwealth, which is still used as the foundation for many looking at this period.⁸ He was able to provide in depth analysis of the regicide, but his Whig view of history meant that the conclusions he drew from the event now seem very ideological. His analysis of the regicide was 'the work of military violence cloaked in the merest tatters of legality'.⁹ He believed that the small minority of parliament governed by the sword and that they were only able to stay in power because of the army. In Gardiner's view parliament would never be able to recover from the act of killing the king. The regicide was so abhorred that they were never able to wash their hands of the king's blood. The underlying notion of the new regime being doomed

⁷ John Nalson, *A True Copy of the Journal of the High Court of Justice for the Tryal of K. Charles I as it was read in the House of Commons and attested under the hand of Phelps, clerk to that infamous court / taken by J. Nalson Jan. 4, 1683: With a large introduction* (London, Printed by H.C. for Thomas Dring, 1684).

⁸ Samuel Gardiner, *A History of The Commonwealth to the Protectorate 1649-1656*, Vol 1, (Adlestrop: Windrush Press, 1903).

⁹ Gardiner, *History*, p. 1.

undermined his analysis as it was always clouded by this enviable failure of the Commonwealth.

This thesis will chart reactions to the regicide from the trial of Charles I to the end of the Stuart reign in 1715. For many contemporaries, the trial was the first moment when the execution of their king became a real possibility. The first half of the twentieth century saw three historians tackling the trial of Charles: J.G. Muddiman, Gardiner and C.V. Wedgwood. Muddiman used the contemporaries' accounts of the trial, including 'Bradshaw's journal', to piece together the trial, how it was viewed by those who attended, and how it was reported in the public sphere.¹⁰ However, his antipathy is clear, where he placed his own prejudices throughout his account of the trial. Muddiman's strength was in his use of contemporary sources, but his conclusions appear clouded by the heavy use of Nalson's account of the trial and mirroring those conclusions. C.V. Wedgwood built upon this approach, examining the trial of Charles from 20 November 1648 to 30 January 1649.¹¹ While Wedgwood's sympathies lie with the monarch, Charles was in no way absolved in her writing. The trial and execution of Charles I for treason was an exceptional event. It had far reaching implications, 'Since then, monarchs have perished by popular decree in more violent and far-reaching revolutions, and the conception of monarchy for which King Charles both lived and died has vanished from the earth. Where the institution survives to-day it does so in a form that he would not recognise.'¹² Indeed, the reaction to the execution is in itself interesting because it illustrates that wider forces and interests were predominant. While there was wide manifestations of grief and respect for the king, this was not an indication of militant Royalism. As Wedgwood succinctly acknowledged, the execution of Charles I was a piece of political theatre and she saw the legal rationale for putting the king on trial as deeply flawed.

Since Wedgwood, the trial and regicide has again been side-lined into the narrative of larger studies of this period. Underdown asserted that there was a revolution in seventeenth century and his research *Pride's Purge* had a clear aim to

¹⁰ J.G. Muddiman, *The Trial of Charles I* (London: W Hodge & CO, 1928).

¹¹ C.V. Wedgwood, *Trial of Charles I* (London: Collins, 1964), pp. 180-191.

¹² Wedgwood, *Trial*, p. 184.

'rewrite the history of that revolution'.¹³ The high-point of this revolution was Pride's Purge and the ensuing execution of the king, which constituted the decisive break with turmoil of the Civil Wars. Blair Worden's study of Rump Parliament followed the trial and regicide but only through the lens of the actions made in parliament.¹⁴ Recent publications by Sean Kelsey and Clive Holmes have considered if the trial was part of a negotiation tactic or a propaganda tool to justify the king's execution. This has led to a fresh and interesting perspective on the trial as Kelsey argued that the ultimate function of the trial was an extended piece of negotiation.¹⁵ The king's judges appeared to have recognised the enormous strategic and political dangers inherent to regicide and to have appreciated the potential advantages in reaching an accommodation with the lawful ruler of three kingdoms. Consequently, when the trial began, regicide was probably its least likely outcome. Some saw the proceedings against the king as an opportunity to establish more firmly the sovereignty of the people of England, first proclaimed on 4 January 1649, while the majority saw the trial as the last chance to salvage at least some aspects of the old order, including the office of king and the House of Lords. Charles himself sought to expose and exploit their outstanding differences. The consequences of his overwhelming success were fatal.

In contrast, Holmes has argued that Kelsey has overestimated the strength of the king's position, overblown the last-ditch attempts to negotiate with him, and placed too much weight on the wishful thinking of ill-informed Royalist newsletter writers, such as Marchamont Nedham. He contends that the evidence suggests the trial was in earnest and that there were no secret negotiations.¹⁶ Holmes adheres to the traditional view that Cromwell was prepared to countenance the king's death because God had evidenced against the king, time and time again on the battlefield, and if they failed to follow the signs of God's providence, God would punish England further. So, restating an older perspective, Holmes contends that once the trial began, the king was doomed.

¹³ David Underdown, *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. 2-3.

¹⁴ Blair Worden. *The Rump Parliament, 1648-53* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).

¹⁵ Sean Kelsey, 'The Death of Charles I', *The Historical Journal*, 45 (2002), pp. 727-754; 'The Ordinance for the Trial of Charles I', *Historical Research*, 76 (2003), pp. 310-331.

¹⁶ Clive Holmes, 'The Trial and Execution of Charles I', *Historical Journal*, 53:2 (2010), pp. 289-316.

This thesis will explore reactions to the regicide but what is meant by a reaction? The word derives from the Latin word for action and the French word reaction which means a response to an action by another opposite action.¹⁷ Both illustrate that to have a reaction there must be an action to act against. Therefore, we react with, and often create an emotion towards, what we come into contact with. Emotions are directed towards an object which then turn into a thought or a judgement about what it is. For example, if someone tells a joke your reaction might be to laugh, sigh or even groan. In his dictionary Samuel Johnson noted that a reaction is 'the reciprocation of any impulse or force impressed, made by the body on which such impression is made: action and reaction are equal'.¹⁸ A reaction is an action to something; it can be an emotion as emotions are relational. A reaction can be something that you continue to do across a time period: you have an immediate response to something but then across time you can continue to react to the feeling you had at that moment.

As Samuel Johnson observed, a reaction can occur when an impression is made. The term reaction is an important aspect to understand as reactions can be long lasting, they can leave a lasting impression on someone. This is where we turn from immediate reaction into memory. For example, an individual can remember something and this memory will likely trigger a feeling, an emotion. The past can persist, as memories are remembered and the emotions that were felt at the time get re-remembered. For Sara Ahmed emotion works on the surfaces of bodies, aligning bodies with communities or situating them outside of communities. One type of example is racially derogatory terms, which accumulate cultural meaning over time. Each repetition has an effect as it generates bodily affects that carry emotional value. As they are repeated, emotions accumulate value, producing affect through reiteration.¹⁹ 'Emotions shape the very surfaces of bodies', according to Ahmed, 'which take shape through the repetition of actions over time.'²⁰ She noted that 'attending to emotions might show us that all actions are reactions as what we

¹⁷ J. Coulson, C.T. Carr, Lucy Hutchinson and Dorothy Eagle, eds. *The Oxford Illustrated Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 703.

¹⁸ Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of The English Language*, Vol 2 (London: Plummer & Brewer, 1825), p. 460.

¹⁹ Ahmed, *Cultural*, p. 92.

²⁰ *ibid*, p. 4.

do is shaped by the contact we have with others'.²¹ Ultimately, emotions grow over time and she has been able to research how emotions such as hate, anger and love are built over time from an initial event: every time that event is replayed the emotion relating to it increases. The transmission of emotion into memory is fundamental to this thesis. As Jan Assman argues, people who experience an event will later recall it through oral transmission in what she refers to as 'communicative memory'. This type of social memory is where people who lived through an event then orally recall it to their community, forming a collective memory. Communicative memory goes back to around 80 years, where at least some living members of a group can remember an event.²² This thesis will look at the initial reactions to the regicide, how the emotions of that event moved into memory, and how they were transmitted through to the next generation.

Wedgwood, Richard Bonney and Michael Walzer have all analysed reactions to the regicide through foreign relations. Wedgwood provided a chapter regarding the European reaction to the regicide in her book on the trial, which concluded that the main European powers were too busy on domestic affairs to broker much opposition.²³ Bonney also dedicated a chapter to European reactions to the trial and execution in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, taking up the European response not only to the king's execution but also to the Commonwealth and Protectorate. He found that 'reason of state' and practical concerns, rather than ideology, guided Spanish, French and Dutch diplomacy.²⁴ Michael Walzer highlighted the importance of the regicide in wider contexts, especially in France and the United States, as a blueprint for putting a king on trial in a legitimate way.²⁵ In these works the legacy of the regicide and reactions to it provided a precedent for others to consider or follow.

Within the three kingdoms, historians have focused far more on the men responsible for bringing the king to justice and those who signed the death warrant. There have been a series of works on individual regicides, such as John Blakiston,

²¹ *ibid*, p. 13.

²² Jan Assman, 'Collective memory and cultural identity', *New German Critique*, 65 (1995), pp. 125-133.

²³ C.V. Wedgwood, *Trial; A Coffin for King Charles: The Trial and Execution of Charles I* (London: Lifetime Book, 1981) both follow this traditional view of events as originally argued by Gardiner.

²⁴ Richard Bonney, 'The European Reaction to the Trial and Execution of Charles I', in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 247-280.

²⁵ Michael Walzer, 'Regicide and Revolution', *Social Research*, 40 (1973), pp. 617-42.

Francis Hacker, Henry Marten and Thomas Andrewes with varying degrees of success.²⁶ The life of the regicides who fled abroad after the return of Charles II has been another area of interest, with the memoirs of Ludlow bringing to life the experience of the regicides on the run. Howard Nenner has investigated the trials of the regicides. By recapitulating the arguments of the King's Attorney, Nenner stressed that treason was in the thought rather than the action and therefore defences based upon appeals to the authority of the High Court of Justice were doomed to fail. Although Nenner emphasised that the treason trials of captured regicides were conducted through conventional legal processes, it is hard to imagine that the defendants had any chance of acquittal.²⁷ The men who committed the act have mostly been analysed as a homogenous mass who committed this act together. Much has been written about the prominent individuals such as Charles I and Cromwell but the regicide and the impacts of this event go beyond these prominent men. As much as this thesis is about Charles, it is also about his son, the regicides, and the children and grandchildren of those involved. Apart from Edward Legon's work on the 'Restoration Generation', no one has explored if ideas transmitted from the regicides to their children or, as Mark Noble argued in the eighteenth century, if they were embarrassed to be related to a regicide.²⁸

This lack of investigation into the regicide was the primary reason why in 1999, with the 350th anniversary of this act as a catalyst, Jason Peacey organized a conference on the regicide. His edited book which emerged from this conference considered the key themes yet unexplored by historians, including the moment when Oliver Cromwell was prepared to remove the king's head. David Scott examined the potential motives of a select band of regicides from the North and how they came to sign the death warrant.²⁹ Sarah Barber explored the language used around the time

²⁶ R. Howell, 'Newcastle's Regicide: the parliamentary Career of John Blakiston', *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 4th series, 42 (1964), pp. 207-30; H.L. Hubbard, 'Colonel Francis Hacker, Parliamentarian and Regicide', *Transactions of the Thornton Society*, 45 (1941), pp. 5-17; Sarah Barber, *A Revolutionary Rogue: Henry Marten and the English Republic* (Stroud Sutton, 2000.); J.C. Whitebrook, 'Sir Thomas Andrewes, Lord Mayor and Regicide, and his Relations', *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*, 13 (1939), pp. 151-65.

²⁷ Howard Nenner, 'The trial of the regicides: retribution and treason in 1660', in *Politics and the political imagination in later Stuart Britain: essays presented to Lois Green*, ed. Howard Nenner (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1997), pp. 21-39.

²⁸ Legon, *Revolution*; Mark Noble, *The Lives of the English Regicides, and other Commissioners of the Pretended High court of justice, appointed to sit in Judgement upon their Sovereign, King Charles the First* (London: J. Stockdale, 1798).

²⁹ David Scott, 'Motives for King-Killing', in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 138-161.

of the regicide and how it centred upon biblical exegesis.³⁰ Religion provided a language to rationalise why the regicide happened. Exploring several significant themes surrounding the trial and regicide indicates the potential motivations of the main protagonists.

In outlining the current state of the historiography, it is not the intention of this thesis to diminish the importance of existing research. On the contrary, the following chapters will draw upon many of these studies in order to understand the emotional reactions and memory of the regicide. Nonetheless, this thesis will also seek to challenge two of the main assumptions that underlie much of current work: first, that the general reaction to the regicide can be summed up by the groan as outlined by Henry; and second, that the memory of the regicide and Charles I was one of universal reverence for a fallen king. Instead, it argues that the Commonwealth and Restoration governments made concerted, if sometimes inconsistent, efforts to frame the public memory of the regicide, and that these narratives were deployed, contested, and rejected by communities across the sixty-year period.

ii - Methodology and sources

The section that follows provides an outline of the theoretical and methodological frameworks that ground this research. It examines the working definitions of key terms and explains the implications that these have for the selection of the source material. Though ostensibly chronological, each chapter will look to solve a particular historical problem through the use of different analytical frameworks. Reactions to the regicide changed over time in meaningful ways and therefore to address the changing nature of these reactions the thesis utilises a number of approaches from scholars of emotions and memory, to tease out how we can understand the reactions found in the sources. For example, the intensity of the moment led me to consider the arc of emotions felt by contemporaries as the event of the trial and execution unfolded. Later, issues of memory and commemoration became more important. Over the sixty-year period context enviably changed and

³⁰ Sarah Barber, 'Belshazzar's Feast: Regicide, Republicanism and the Metaphor of Balance', in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001); Scott, 'Motives', pp. 138-161.

therefore so did the sources used and the questions they begged. Each chapter engages in different conceptual and theoretical approaches adapted to fit the questions posed by the period covered.

Emotions

Emotions are personal and private and are largely inaccessible to an historian. But, emotions are also something that we all practice and experience. It has to be acknowledged that emotions are not well encapsulated in words but words are the main basis that we have as historians to analyse emotions. As historians we are not always encouraged to see that the text can also contain considerable evidence of feeling, for example in a letter a husband could have sent his 'beloved wife' a gift to illustrate his love and goodwill.³¹ This thesis will examine what evidence of feeling are in texts and what they can tell us about the reactions to the regicide. It will also move beyond text to consider material culture and how feelings were carried by objects, spaces, and bodies.³² William Tullett noted that 'understanding material objects as emotional prosthesis that supplemented and intensified emotional states offers a potent way of thinking about material culture and emotions.'³³ This thesis will use both texts and material culture to bridge the gap and help understand the emotions being expressed.

The regicide was a traumatic and emotional event. It seems reasonable, therefore, to expect recent work in the history of emotions to provide useful concepts for better understanding contemporary reactions to the execution. History of emotions is a relatively new field of historic research. Lucien Febvre, seen as the founder of emotion history, warned historians against seeing human psychology as a universal concept.³⁴ Since the 1970s anthropologists and psychologists have looked to understand and analyse what emotions are and if people felt differently throughout history; for example, did the concept of love mean the same to those in 1320 and as it did in 1850? Some early attempts to historicize emotions proved

³¹ Jan Plamper, 'The History of Emotions: An Interview with William Reddy, Barbara Rosenwein, and Peter Stearns', *History and Theory*, 49 (May 2010), pp. 237-265.

³² William Tullett, 'Political Engines: The Emotional Politics of Bells in Eighteenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies*, 59:3 (July 2020), p. 561.

³³ Tullett, 'Political Engines', p. 579.

³⁴ Jan Plamper, *History of Emotions: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 1-15; Lucien Febvre, 'Sensibility and History: How to reconstitute the emotional life of the past', *A New Kind of History* ed P. Burke, pp. 12-26

controversial. Lawrence Stone, for example, argued that because death was omnipresent in early modern society, it was difficult for people to form deep relationships.³⁵ Decades of work followed outlining the myriad ways in which early modern people did express their attachment to others.

This thesis will use two approaches developed within the field of the history of emotions: emotional communities and emotional regimes. Considering the heightened emotional atmosphere of the trial and execution of the king, it makes sense to test whether people at the time formed emotional communities, whether they developed shared expressions in reaction to this dramatic event. Using the concept and methodology of emotional communities first outlined by Barbara Rosenwein, this thesis will examine public and personal sources for the language used to describe these events. Rosenwein studied evidence of feeling within texts and whether the same words or phrases were used to describe certain emotions. She confirmed that 'we cannot ever see emotions', yet they are always embedded in gestures and words and will be expressed in some way, whether through the face, uttered or written.³⁶ According to Rosenwein, all societies form 'emotional communities'. These communities were groups in which people with common interests and values developed the same modes of emotional expression. She argued that emotions are socially determined, according to norms common to the group. It is the lack of homogeneity in emotional expression between groups that led her to argue that emotional communities can be compared geographically and diachronically.³⁷ She used the term 'communities' in order to stress the social and relational nature of emotions. There are also textual communities in which people are linked together through the material they read.³⁸ These communities were formed on a daily basis and because they are temporary they can be in conflict with each other, which can cause friction. The importance of her approach is that it deals with the interplay between the emotional reaction and the need for people to share their reaction.

³⁵ Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (London: Penguin, 1979).

³⁶ Plamper, *History of Emotions*, pp. 237-265.

³⁷ Barbara Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006), pp. 195-201.

³⁸ Rosenwein, *Communities*, pp. 195-201.

There is a difficulty in untangling individual's responses and how the reaction the regicide was portrayed at a wider, even national level. The aim of this thesis is to examine the aftermath of the regicide in the post-restoration era. To test how regimes, and their opponents, orchestrated a strategic approach to mobilising the emotions of the regicide. To be able to test this hypothesis I will turn to William Reddy's concept of emotional regime. Reddy established the concept of emotional regimes, where political entities such as governments or monarchies try to control the emotions of those who live under their regime. He argued that every society sets up an emotional regime where certain expressions are created and maintained. He believed that emotives – which are the way emotions are expressed and performed – possess the same power to shape, or enhance, feelings depending on how we think, write and speak about them. Emotions are thus discursively constituted in individuals and are similarly constructed as emotional regimes in societies under particular historical conditions. Emotional regimes are also political. They may be strict, imposing a heavy toll of suffering on individuals whose emotional liberty is constrained by law. For Reddy, the restrictive emotional regime of Louis XIV led to many seeking refuge outside the government who then rose up in rebellion, leading to the French Revolution.³⁹

Conversely this concept of repression is where Reddy's method is limited and why this framework will be used to understand if the new commonwealth regime looked to suppress how people reacted to the regicide. Any concept of emotional regime which is underpinned by a stable political regime also raises some questions. As Rosenwein has observed, 'it may fit for modern societies, but not for societies in which power was more dispersed'. Political regimes at a national level are therefore a more recent invention and in the early modern period regimes could not reach into the full fabric of social life.⁴⁰ The binary view that Reddy presents of one emotional regime has been argued against by Rosenwein who believes that societies are far more diverse than this framework implies.⁴¹ William Tullett has tested Reddy's emotional regime framework against the emotional politics of bell ringing in the

³⁹ Reddy, *Feeling*, pp. 187-207.

⁴⁰ Jan Plamper, 'The History of Emotions: An Interview with William Reddy, Barbara Rosenwein, and Peter Stearns', *History and Theory*, 49 (May 2010), pp. 237-265.

⁴¹ Plamper, 'The History of Emotions', p. 256.

eighteenth century. He noted how bells spoke to the communities they were in; they could ring out joy at certain days celebrating victories, their silence could suggest possible resistance or their ringing could signal dissent when rung on days that might signal as an example Jacobite sympathy.⁴² Tullett was able to illustrate how historians can integrate material culture into the methodology of Reddy's emotional regime. Using Reddy's concept and the observations of his critics, chapter one will explore if the new Commonwealth regime tried to create a repressive emotional regime around the regicide and repress how Charles I was remembered. It will use the example as argued by Tullett to test the emotional regime framework against the backdrop of the regicide. It will seek to understand to what extent can the commonwealth regime wielded any control on the reactions to the regicide. Subsequent chapters will consider the long durée of how governments across the late seventeenth century failed to mobilise emotional regimes.

Memory

What happens to these reactions as we begin to examine them in the longue durée? We see the process by which emotions turn into memory. A key element of the thesis is to explore the self-conscious acts of commemoration, such as monuments and collective rituals, but also the more nuanced ways that the regicide was remembered across sixty years. To do this it will examine some of the less obvious facets of memory, such as material culture and diverse speech acts. Maurice Halbwachs argued that individual memory develops with interaction between social groups and the larger community.⁴³ More recent work by James Fentress and Chris Wickham confirmed that memories, regardless how personally felt, are shaped by the memories of the people around us.⁴⁴ This thesis will also take the view that memory is more than just personal; it is also social. This is because every act of recalling exists through its relationship with what is shared with others.

Over the last twenty years seventeenth-century studies has seen what can be described as a 'memory turn'. The consensus until recently has been that royalist

⁴² William Tullett, 'Political Engines: The Emotional Politics of Bells in Eighteenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies*, 59:3 (July 2020), pp. 555-581.

⁴³ Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, translated from the French by Francis J. Ditter, Jr and Vida Yazdi Ditter (New York: Harper & Row, 1980).

⁴⁴ James Fentress and Chris Wickham, *Social Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

interpretations of the Civil Wars continually stoked anxieties and fears of another Civil War. In his *Revel, Riot and Rebellion*, David Underdown uncovered that pro-parliamentarian memories did exist where inhabitants of Taunton celebrated their deliverance from their royalist besiegers.⁴⁵ Worden's *Roundhead Reputations* explored how prominent parliamentarians had been represented over three hundred years and how their perceptions changed over this long period.⁴⁶ He argued that their reputations were in fact moulded to fit into political discourse. Without explicitly addressing memory history, he illustrated how key people were remembered and since its publication there has been an explosion in histories of the memories of the Civil Wars. David Scott argued that the Restoration settlement could not escape what had happened before and was not quite the defining turning point that many historians have claimed.⁴⁷ The kingdom was in fact a prisoner to the past and these fears stoked concerns of popery and arbitrary government. While the dominate royalist version of events mostly held sway – no one wanted to return to '41' and this fear dominated the political landscape for the post-1660 settlement – as we will see in chapters three and four, there were various plots against the Stuart monarchy. Alternative, non-royalist narratives survived the Restoration.

Like Worden's, Matthew Neufeld's work has also been a catalyst for new studies of memory in the seventeenth century. He also debunked the view that the royalist narrative remained dominant. Neufeld argued that public remembering after 1660 was founded on 'commending and justifying or contesting and attacking the Restoration settlements'.⁴⁸ Neufeld's work was ground-breaking. He was able to provide a picture of the contested natures of memories of the Civil War and how the Restoration regimes had tried to place a national amnesia over the memory of the wars and Interregnum. This had led to developments in memory studies which have focused on the memory of war. Edward Legon's work focused on how recollections of the wars could be 'mis-remembered' and challenge the Restoration regime's attempt to impose memory. Through use of seditious memories Legon reconstructed

⁴⁵ D.E. Underdown, *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 289-90.

⁴⁶ Blair Worden, *Roundheads Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (London: Allen Lane, 2001).

⁴⁷ Scott, 'Motives', pp. 138-161.

⁴⁸ Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, p. 2.

plebian counter memories that existed throughout the Restoration.⁴⁹ Imogen Peck's recent work has looked at the memory of the wars during the Interregnum. She argued that it was not just the republican regimes and their supporters who sought to control the public memory of the Civil Wars. In fact, the republic's opponents often succeeded in propagating their own versions of past events too.⁵⁰ This connects with Reddy's work, as he established that regimes and their opponents sought to control the past, in part through emotions. For our purposes it is important to note that in all these studies the regicide plays only a small part of their research; this thesis will aim to fill this research gap.

Sources

When considering the history and memory of Charles I after his death one source stands out above all the rest: the *Eikon Basilike*.⁵¹ Historians have built a narrative of the popularity of Charles the Martyr around the popularity of the *Eikon Basilike*, but if we turn to other sources the memory of Charles becomes much more complex and troubled. Work around the death of Charles and his life post-mortem has mostly examined the *Eikon*, its popularity and the rhetoric it presented.⁵² *Eikon*, supposedly Charles' account of his last years published the day of his execution, figured the king as an innocent Christ who had died for his people. The thirty-nine editions that followed within a year not only ensured that a textualised Charles lived on in public memory, but also served to overcome the charge of bloodguilt that had justified regicide and it damaged the fledgling republic. Andrew Lacey looked at the formation of an image of King Charles I and the performances of that image in the political culture for over a century and a half. He surveyed in the later chapters of his study 'the ways in which the figure of Charles was used and abused to fight the political and religious battles of the period'.⁵³ Charles began as a scarred martyr for the royalist cause but the act of regicide itself and Charles' dismembered head then

⁴⁹ Legon, *Revolution*.

⁵⁰ Imogen Peck, *Recollection in the Republics: Memories of the British Civil Wars in England, 1649-1659* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).

⁵¹ Anon, *Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of his Majesty King Charles 1st* (London: D. Stewart, 1879).

⁵² Thomas Corns, *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603- 1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010); K.A. Esdaile, 'The Busts and Statues of Charles I', *The Burlington Magazine*, 91:550 (1949), pp. 9-15.

⁵³ Lacey, *Cult*, p. 174; 'The Office for King Charles the Martyr in the 'Book of Common Prayer', 1662-1685', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 53 (2002), pp. 510-526.

became an act of political discourse, to be rolled out when a crisis occurred as an omen of what might happen again. To fully understand the lasting remembrance of the regicide we need to look beyond the *Eikon*. This thesis will examine various sources of media, from personal to public, material to textual. By broadening the evidence base it will illustrate that the perceived popularity of Charles I we find in the *Eikon* disappears when we look elsewhere.

The case study approach outlined above has implications for the source material which will be used in the thesis. In order to capture and understand both the initial raw reactions and longer-term memory practices a wide range of source material is examined below. Legon's work on seditious speech excepted, the majority of the current research on the memory of the civil wars has focussed purely on the printed word but there is a need to expand the materials of memory to encompass diaries and material culture. In an effort to capture the various ways in which the regicide was remembered across 1649-1715, this thesis will use a varied and innovative source base. This includes printed texts, court records, diaries, civic records, church records and material culture, including monuments and memorials. The use of such a wide range of sources also has other advantages. It will ensure that the thesis does not just focus on one version of events; just looking at printed sources, for example, could result in conclusions are purely that of elite or public memory and would provide a misleading picture of how the regicide was remembered.

The thesis will also uncover gaps and silences. Part of these silences reflect how those who lived through these times came to terms with the trauma of war and regicide. Modern research on post-traumatic stress disorder suggests that traumatic memories could be repressed and then emerge once triggered. Recent research associated with the Civil War Petitions project has focussed on soldiers who petitioned to receive relief after the Restoration.⁵⁴ What they are able to illustrate is how they used emotive words such as crazy or sadness to encapsulate the impact

⁵⁴ David Appleby, 'Veteran Politics in Restoration England, 1660-1670', *The Seventeenth Century*, 28:3 (August 2013), pp. 323-342; Mark Stoye, "'Memories of the Maimed': The Testimony of Charles I's Former Soldiers, 1660-1730", *History*, 88:290 (April 2003), pp. 204-226.

that the war had on those who had fought in it.⁵⁵ Medical research on PTSD has shown that those who encounter a traumatic event process this trauma through a dissociative response. That means that they are 'encoded ... with a fragmented and disorganised sequencing, thereby reducing the likelihood that the memory is adequately embedded into one's ... memory base'.⁵⁶ That traumatic memories might be deliberately elided by a person's response does not mean that they had no emotional engagement to these events, rather a more complex reaction is at play. It is difficult to find evidence of how contemporaries handled painful memories and this could be due to their dissociative response to years of turmoil, including the regicide.

Silences speak volumes and this is a consistent theme throughout the thesis. To expand the field of research from a reliance on words, it will also consider how actions could express an emotional response or even reveal a lack of emotion towards the regicide. Jenny Edkins' study of the relationship between trauma, memory, and power has demonstrated that states use the process of memorialisation as a method for establishing meaning. She argues that trauma is not experienced at the moment of occurrence and preserved in memory, but is in fact experienced through memory and throughout time.⁵⁷ Edkins' conclusions will be useful when we consider the (failed) attempts to build a formal funeral memorial to Charles I.

Because emotions and memories are inherently personal and yet regimes and factions attempted to control both, we need to carefully consider how we think of sources as public and private. The sources that will be explored will cover printed items such as newsbooks and also the more personal material including diaries and letters. It is difficult to provide a clear-cut definition of sources as there will be overlap between them but the next section will look to justify this distinction. Public sources will focus on items that were printed such as newsbooks and pamphlets and public facing material culture such as monuments and funeral memorials. The latter are included

⁵⁵ Iismini Pells, 'Soliciting Sympathy: The Search for Psychological Trauma in Petitions from Seventeenth-Century Maimed Soldiers', in *Early modern trauma: Europe and the Atlantic World*, eds Erin Peters and Cynthia Richards (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2021), pp. 129-150.

⁵⁶ Richard A. Bryant, 'Post-traumatic stress disorder: a state-of-the-art review of evidence and challenges', *World Psychiatry*, 18:3 (Oct. 2019), pp.259-269.

⁵⁷ Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p.54

due to the fact they were created to be installed in public spaces such as churches or shared spaces.

There has been much speculation and debate about the role of the printed material in the seventeenth century. Most historians accept that the volume of political news increased during the early seventeenth century, but the consequences of this change are uncertain. Whig historians argued that the increase in news led to public political conscience and was one of the reasons for the creation of political parties. Cust argued, in line with the Whig view, that news contributed to a process of political polarisation.⁵⁸ The emergence of popular public politics led the state to use the Stationers' Company to control the output from the printing presses. In an acknowledgment of how popularity and public opinion had integrated into Stuart political culture, both royalist and parliamentarians courted support through print and pulpit. As Steve Pincus and Peter Lake have argued, the Restoration period showed that prominent members of the regime needed to appeal to popular opinion and engage in dialogue with those outside the court.⁵⁹

However, the effects of news should not be exaggerated. While it undoubtedly helped to shape political opinion, the link between opinion and political action was by no means straightforward. Joad Raymond has argued that there was a transformation in the role of printing and its relationship with the public. Although it was untrustworthy and irregular it did end up a necessary and powerful communicative tool.⁶⁰ Clive Holmes and Felicity Heal have examined the flow of news at a local level. They outlined the gentry's receipt of news, their understanding of the key events and the potential ramifications of those events.⁶¹ The privately held documents being analysed in this thesis will largely focus on the gentry due to the sources available. They would reinforce this notion that they were kept informed of events through several means, from family members, paid employees and the

⁵⁸ Richard Cust, 'News and politics in Early Seventeenth Century England', *Past and Present*, 111 (1986), pp. 60-90; *Politics, Religion, and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in honour of Conrad Russell*, eds. Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

⁵⁹ Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England,' in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, eds Lake and Pincus (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 1-30.

⁶⁰ Joad Raymond, *Pamphlet and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 25-26.

⁶¹ Clive Holmes and Felicity Heal, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994).

printed material. Printed materials became an increasingly important part of how information was obtained and throughout this thesis illustrates how print contributed to the reaction to the regicide.

Reactions to the regicide were not constrained to the elite. Recent research has sought to uncover how news permeated down to the lower levels in society. Adam Fox explored the function rumour and news across society in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries through use of court records of those accused of spreading false reports.⁶² Fox was able to show even humble people participated in political debates before the war. They reacted to the loss of the king and engaged in the changing order from monarchy to Commonwealth. They demonstrated their views through ballads and outspoken acts of sedition. What emerges from such records is the frequent ability of people to talk about political events and issues and the apparent alacrity with which they were prepared to do so. This is important when it comes to assessing the impact of news. Political discourse and understanding was not confined exclusively to the educated but also had the potential to shape attitudes among the lower orders.

Joad Raymond argued that weekly newsbooks with detailed reporting of domestic politics were an invention of 1641, 'the child of Parliament's campaign against the king for popularity'. They were central to a public debate in direct opposition to the authorities of the state.⁶³ Studies of news and debate therefore demonstrate that the press was frequently combative; both Raymond and Cust noted that Charles was the first British monarch to be represented by a popular press beyond his control. This created a tension between ruler and the ruled, shattering the divine authority of the king. Deeds rather than divine authority were to be judged. 'The tension public opinion created between ruler and ruled, and the implicit emancipation of the people, was unprecedented in history.'⁶⁴ The analysis of a desacralisation of monarchy was closely aligned to the emergence of a public sphere

⁶² Adam Fox, 'Rumour, news and popular political opinion in Elizabethan and early Stuart England', *The Historical Journal*, 40:3 (Sept. 1997), pp. 597-620; Adam Fox, 'Ballads, libels and popular ridicule in Jacobean England', *Past and Present*, 145 (1994), pp. 47-83.

⁶³ Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641-1649* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), p. 111.

⁶⁴ Dagmar Friest, *Governed by Opinion: Politics, Religion, and the Dynamics of Communication in Stuart London, 1637-1645* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 1997), p. 6

in which opinion could be formed and criticism voiced. However, this desacralisation enabled the Commonwealth to become highly criticised after the regicide and the new government was unable to stem this criticism.

Cust pointed to an integration of local and national interests and awareness of politics that resulted in a polarisation between court and country, helping to create an 'underground press' which in turn perpetuated that divide.⁶⁵ It was through the growing belief that there was a connection between place and outlook that political language came to represent this divide as part of the contemporary commonplace of viewing the world in terms of bipolarity. Political language reflected this in terms of a confrontation between order and disorder. The underground press came to illustrate aspects of 'public interest' with recordings of parliamentary proceedings and state trials; their copying and distribution ensured an increasingly detailed insight into current affairs, and this spilled over into ballads and verses which, whilst entertaining, frequently had serious political undertones. As the control exerted over publications shows, print could also be used to disseminate ideas from the 'elite' to the 'popular', exerting authority and influence on a national scale, thus demonstrating that models of consensus and conflict could and did co-exist.

The acknowledgement that opinion and 'popularity' had to be courted does not necessarily mean that either was desirable when not controlled by the state. As Griffiths, Fox and Hindle wrote, 'order was never inevitable; authority had to be disseminated. Nor does it mean that there was a 'majority view' in the country other than a general curiosity and growing awareness of political proceedings'.⁶⁶ Although there was clearly a fear of disunity, genuine opposition and potential conflict is difficult to measure whilst efforts to exert authority upon dissenters and to ensure the continuance of a fear of discord amongst the majority show. Friest has noted how many thought authority was undermined by popular opinion: 'public opinion was usually held to be the opposite of truth and justice'.⁶⁷ The Rump in the lead up to and after the regicide looked to court this opinion and the public sphere but fell

⁶⁵ Cust, 'News and Politics', pp. 60-90.

⁶⁶ Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle, eds. *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), p. 2.

⁶⁷ Friest, *Governed by Opinion*, p. 2.

short. This allowed the figure of Charles as martyr to be developed during the Commonwealth and the Restoration periods. Through the publication of notable memoirs, such as Thomas Herbert and Archbishop Juxon, the ineffective character of Charles was erased into a chaste and charismatic leader who died for his beliefs.⁶⁸ The Commonwealth's attempts to control printed material after the regicide illustrates the importance it placed on the development of Charles as martyr.

Public discourse, of course, spilled over into the private. Personal sources such as diaries, letters, journals and memoirs will be used to explore the relationship between public discourse and the individual. This thesis will investigate the interplay between personal and printed sources. Some personal sources clearly illustrate the influence of printed material: we can trace the rumours and rhetoric in the public sphere as it filtered into the private. The Earl of Leicester, Bulstrode Whitelocke, John Evelyn and Robert Baillie all pointed to their sources of information, usually newsbooks or pamphlets; the public sphere fed the personal.⁶⁹ There are also examples where both spheres interlink; for instance, Leicester's journal was a commonplace book that was originally written as an aide but was later published. This interplay is further exaggerated with memoirs, where personal reflection and memories are written down for the purpose of being shared with an audience. The perception of 'private' is important to explore; memoirs were positioned as the 'private' thoughts of an individual. Whitelocke was involved in the commonwealth regimes, including during some key moments. His memoir is not a private source, but had the perception of private and personal thoughts and this perception of 'private' is crucial to many sources. Another example is the Lawrans newsletters which are explored in the first chapter. These were paid for information possible by the newsletter editor Marchmont Needham but they were written in manuscript form to be seen as private correspondence to bolster a sense of authenticity compared to printed newsbooks. The perception that private was more authentic is explored in this thesis.

⁶⁸ Thomas, Herbert. *Memoirs of the Two Last Years of the Reign of King Charles I* (London: Wright, 1839); William Juxon, *Memoirs of Archbishop Juxon and his Times: With a Sketch of the Archbishop's Little Parish of Compton*, ed. Mark Hennessey (Oxford: J. Parker and Co., 1869).

⁶⁹ Baillie, *Letters*; Whitelocke, *Diary*; Evelyn, *Diary* and Sydney, *Papers*.

Where possible this thesis will examine manuscript materials such as diaries and letters. The aim of the thesis was to conduct vast archival research to examine where possible the manuscripts of a selection of diaries, letters and memoirs. Unfortunately, the covid pandemic hampered this endeavour significantly, with many archives being closed on and off over a two-year period. I conducted a series of archival visits to the British Library, TNA, Ipswich Archives, Derbyshire Archives, Chatsworth House and examined a vast array of manuscript materials. I consulted over 35 diaries, whether in manuscript form or published. However, the majority of the personal sources I researched made no reference to the regicide and therefore these have not been included in the work here. However, when archival examination was not possible edited and published letters were utilised.

Printed memoirs will be used, though they must be treated with care. Fitzgibbons has shown how 'private memories were fitted to, or shaped around, public memories prescribed by the state after 1660.'⁷⁰ After 1660 a flood of memoirs were published from servants who stayed with Charles I during his trial and execution to prominent parliamentarians. These included Thomas Herbert's *Memoirs*, Edmund Ludlow's famous *History of the Rebellion* and Bulstrode Whitelocke's *Memorials* of his time in office during the Commonwealth.⁷¹ None of these sources are straightforward accounts of personal experience. Worden has revealed how Ludlow's memoirs were heavily edited for publication.⁷² Fitzgibbons' work on Whitelocke's memoirs noted that they 'are fabrications designed to promote certain narratives that served his purposed after the Restoration.'⁷³ Memoirs are also written with a degree of hindsight, so those written after 1660 knew that the monarchy had been restored. They followed two main narratives: men like Herbert highlighted their loyalty to Charles I and Stuart monarchy; parliamentarians justified their actions during the years of turmoil. Therefore, evidence from memoirs will be used in conjunction with other primary evidence. For

⁷⁰ Jonathan Fitzgibbons, "'To settle a government without something of Monarchy in it': Bulstrode Whitelocke's Memoirs and the Reinvention of the Interregnum', *English Historical Review*, 137:586 (June 2022), p. 656.

⁷¹ Edward Ludlow, *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Lieutenant-General of the Horse in the Army of the Commonwealth of England, 1625-1672*, ed. C.H. Firth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894); Thomas Herbert, *Memoirs of the Two Last Years of the Reign of King Charles I* (London: Forgotten Books, 2016) and Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs: Or, an Historical Account of What Passed from the Beginning of the Reign of King Charles I, to King Charles II. His Happy Restauration* (London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1682).

⁷² Blair Worden, *A Vantage from the Watch Tower* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1978).

⁷³ Fitzgibbons, 'Whitelocke's Memoirs', pp. 656-691.

example, Hyde's memoirs will also be used when his view is bolstered by further evidence such as speeches made in parliament or evidence in the state papers.⁷⁴

Historians have hotly debated the authenticity of personal, manuscript sources in relation to print. Mark Kishlansky looked to establish the motives of the members of the New Model Army by only analysing 'personal' contemporary accounts such as diaries and letters; he argued memoirs have a tendency to polarise and exaggerate the situations they have observed. He believed that contemporary manuscripts provides a more robust view of the motivations and the thoughts of members of the New Model Army.⁷⁵ Peter Lake has rebutted this approach and believes that historians need to explore and understand the interaction between public and personal sources; for example, what was written down in personal accounts was often influenced by the printed works. In *Boxmaker's Revenge*, Lake read his printed sources against the grain, collating and comparing them to overcome the biases, silences and exaggerations that the polemical mode produces.⁷⁶ Ultimately even sources considered more private has an audience.

iii - Structure

This thesis will chart the responses to the regicide from the initial shock of the act through to the end of the Stuart reign in 1715. This will enable a significant study into the changing nature of reactions to this event. The thesis will be constructed in four chapters which will cover how the man who had been condemned and the men who condemned him were remembered, mis-remembered and manipulated by successive governments and propagandists across sixty years. In Part One, chapters one and two illustrate the short term a distinct arc of emotions in the immediate aftermath of the regicide and then attempts by both royalists and parliamentarians to employ emotional governance, which ultimately found mixed results. Chapter one will explore the six-month period from the Treaty of Newport in November 1648, through the trial, the regicide itself and then initial reactions after this event to

⁷⁴ This is used on p.70; 87 where primary sources and memories are used in combination.

⁷⁵ Mark Kishlansky, *A Rise of the New Model Army* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. ix-xi. Conrad Russell has also argued with this approach and that only manuscript sources can provide authenticity.

⁷⁶ Peter Lake first made this argument in the introduction to Peter Lake and Keven Sharpe, eds. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994); Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, eds. *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007); *The Boxmaker's Revenge: Orthodoxy, Heterodoxy and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009).

outline the arc of emotions that is present across this time period. Chapter two will explore Charles II's attempt at the Restoration to create emotional governance centred on his martyred father. Charles II used the regicide and memories of his father to legitimate his new regime. The 1660 Act of Indemnity and Oblivion was an attempt of the new regime to control what could be remembered of the past 20 years. This was Charles' attempt to employ emotional governance. The new Restoration regime looked to reinterpret the previous decades and the regicide of Charles I. This emotional regime did not go unchallenged: those who were in the commonwealth government used the public sphere to legitimise their actions and affect narratives of the past.

In Part Two, chapters three and four will focus on the remembrance of the condemned man and the men who condemned him. Chapter three will examine Charles as martyr beyond the *Eikon* by looking at a variety of other mediums. The analysis of diaries, letters, memorial sermons, seditious speech, monuments, and church dedications will reveal how Charles remained a problematic and contested figure after the Restoration. Charles II is key in this chapter for how he attempted to use formal commemoration to build and sustain the sainted image of his father. It will analyse his role in the commemoration and if he continued to commemorate his father across his reign. Ultimately, this chapter will question whether the popularity of the cult of Charles the martyr hinged on the text of *Eikon* alone. The final chapter will consider the legacy of the regicide by examining the fifty-nine men who signed the death warrant. It will look at how the regicides were commemorated and remembered while the Stuarts remained on the throne from 1660-1715. Some historians have argued that families wanted to forget their role in this act and for some this was true. However, looking at a range of sources – from diaries, funeral memorials and what has been recorded about the children and grandchildren of the regicides – will help to complicate and reframe this story. One of the main objectives of this chapter is to build upon the emerging interest into how ideas were transmitted across generations. Are the ideals that the regicides fought for in the 1640s and 1650s continued by their children and grandchildren? These children were caught in a difficult position after 1660 as their ancestors were considered traitors.

How this regicide generation reacted in these circumstances will provide an insight into whether these ideals did transmit by generation.

Part One: Short Term Emotional Reactions to the Regicide

Chapter 1 - Politics and the Regicide, 1648-1650

He was willing to sacrifice his life, for the liberty and freedom
of his people, and to dye a martyr of the people of England,
by changing this corruptible crowne of misery, to an
incorruptible crowne of glory.¹

On 30 January 1649, Charles I was beheaded outside Banqueting House. This chapter will examine reactions to the regicide in both personal sources (including letters, diaries, and journals) and public ones (including the printed word) to understand the reactions of those living through these tumultuous times. It will focus on the six months between the formal ending of negotiations in the Treaty of Newport in December 1648 and the formal establishment of the Commonwealth in May 1649. During this period, the King was put on trial in the name of his people and sentenced to death for acts of treason.² The execution of Charles was a unique event in British history and historians have explored extensively the political and diplomatic context of the Civil War and the legal rationale for putting Charles on trial. The trial was a significant turning point in the regicide, as without the trial the regicide would not have happened. Through examination of how people reacted to this event, this chapter will uncover an emotional arc and a set of processes that created that arc. As they processed the shifting politics of the trial and execution of the King, rival communities attempted to establish emotional regimes to control and shape the narrative of the regicide. The political and emotional manipulation of these events both served and undermined the immediate interest of the Commonwealth government.

The chapter is split into three sections. The first will focus on what was reported publicly and how competing emotional responses were created within public discourse. Kevin Sharpe, in *Reading Revolutions*, argued that texts reveal much

¹ *His Majesties speech on the scaffold at White-Hall on Tuesday last Jan 30 before the time of his coming to the block of execution and a declaration of the deportment of the said Charles Stuart before he was executed to the great admiration of the people: And a proclamation of the Commons of England assembled in Parliament to be published throughout the Kingdoms prohibiting the proclaiming of any person to be King of England, Ireland or the dominions thereof. Also a letter from the north to a member of the Army containing the declaration and resolutions of the Northern Army touching the late King of England and the lofty cedars of the city of London*, (London, 1649), p. 5.

² David. L. Smith, *A History of the Modern British Isles, 1603-1707: The Double Crown* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), p. 133.

about political authority and demonstrates 'the relationship between the word and exercising power'.³ The printed word, according to Jason Peacey, 'encapsulates expressions and embodiments of political power'.⁴ He has pieced together the relationship between the pamphleteers and prominent leaders of the Parliamentary party. He confirmed the growing importance of the printed word and how journalists were recruited to create an official story of these events. This thesis will take the argument one step further by introducing how the printed material produced by both the government and royalists looked to influence the narrative of the trial and the regicide. Government writers legitimised the need to kill the King for stability, and royalists refashioned Charles as a martyr worthy of public mourning.

The second section will examine a range of more personal material from letters, diaries and journals to examine how contemporaries viewed the unfolding events and whether their reaction to the trial and regicide mirrored public discourse. There has been some research over the past thirty years that has, through the use of contemporary accounts, examined the impacts of the Civil Wars. Morrill's influential edited work *The Impact of the English Civil War* examines a range of subjects political, social, religious, economic, cultural and military to understand how the Civil Wars impacted all aspects of society. All the essays combine primary sources such as memoirs, journals and contemporary printed materials to investigate the real impacts of the Civil Wars.⁵ In 2015 Cressy's biography of Charles I looked to shed new light on the King through first-hand accounts and contemporary private writings. *Charles I and the people of England* is innovative as he mines a wide range of material from archival to printed sources including ballads, sermons, letters, diaries, petitions and proclamations.⁶ He was able to piece together how Charles I was viewed by his contemporaries and uncovered how Charles' authority was constituted and how it fell apart. This chapter will look to build upon the methodology of Cressy

³ Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 27.

⁴ Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), p. 20.

⁵ John Morrill, ed., *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins & Brown, 1991).

⁶ David Cressy, *Charles I and the People of England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

to unearth how this highly emotional event was viewed and processed by those living through the times.

The final section will examine a curious episode one year after the regicide, where a series of pamphlets were produced which centred on three men and their deaths. These men all died due to their perceived troubled conscience concerning the regicide. The year on from the regicide would be a potential emotional moment for some and the timing of these deaths was fortunate and could be viewed as an extension of the emotional response from loyalists post regicide.

What is central to this chapter is how this event was viewed and comprehended in both the public and personal sources. It will illustrate that the public discourse was centred with the tension between rationalism and emotionalism. Royalists used emotive language before and after the regicide to create fear and anxiety. The parliamentary regime used rational argument to illicit emotional reactions, to gain trust from their new subjects. Just because a rational argument is produced does not mean that it was not aiming to create an emotional response; due to the previous years of turmoil the new regime positioned themselves as trusted leaders. Jurgen Habermas has defined the public sphere as a virtual or imaginary community that does not necessarily exist in any identifiable space. The public sphere is 'a sphere that mediates between society and state'.⁷ Through acts of assembly and dialogue, the public sphere generated opinions and attitudes which serve to affirm or challenge the state. The public sphere was the source of public opinion and needed to legitimate authority in any functioning democracy.⁸ However, this idea that society is a harmonious group is flawed and idealistic. He argued that the public sphere began to emerge in the eighteenth century, through the growth of coffee houses and the press. In their efforts to discipline the state, parliament and other agencies of representative government sought to manage this public sphere. Peter Lake asserts that in England the public sphere first came to the fore during petitioning campaigns against Queen Elizabeth I's proposed marriage to the Duke of Anjou. This was all to change public opinion in

⁷ Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, translated by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), p. 176.

⁸ Habermas, *Public Sphere*, p. 18.

opposition against the match.⁹ In the 1620s public political discourse increased through an exponential growth in the number of pamphlets, broadsides and poems. Political gossip and news was circulated over a much broader geographical and social domain than before. This meant that more and more people were being brought into public discussion. Joad Raymond contented that the public sphere that emerged in the seventeenth century was discursive and contentious. The tone that was illustrated in a range of printed material was often seditious, slanderous and at times vulgar.¹⁰ This does not correspond to the view that Habermas presented.

The latter part of this chapter will focus on personal or 'private' sources. Habermas defined the private sphere as 'private autonomy'; this is the area of life which included the family, exchange and even work. It was everything that did not include the state.¹¹ Helen Wilcox discussed the importance of letters in understanding the experiences at the time: 'We overhear the public and private dialogues of the war.'¹² Through examination of a range of primary sources from diaries, letters and commonplace books, this chapter will examine how people reacted to the regicide: what did they write down about the event and what can this tell us about how this momentous event was viewed by contemporaries? However, the boundary between the public and personal sources is not fixed; instead, it is flexible and permeable and is always fluctuating and evolving. In this respect there is a blurring of the lines between public and personal and a creation of black and white definitions would be difficult. In this thesis the public sources will focus upon printed sources such as newsbooks, printed material and ballads. Personal sources will include those created in the non-institution environment such as letters, diaries and commonplace books. Understanding the reactions in both these sources will enable us to build a picture around these competing reactions. By bridging the gap between

⁹ Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, eds., *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), p. 6.

¹⁰ Joad Raymond, *Pamphlet and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 10-11.

¹¹ Habermas, *Public Sphere*, p. 51.

¹² Helen Wilcox, 'Civil War Letters and Diaries and the Rhetoric of Experience', in *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, ed. Laura Linger Knoppers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 215-227. Others have also followed a similar approach, Tristram Hunt, *The English Civil War at First Hand* (London: Penguin, 2011); Martyn Bennett, *The Civil War Experienced: Britain and Ireland, 1638-1661* (London: Routledge, 2000).

the public and the personal we can gain a more complete picture of emotional reaction to the trial and execution of the king.

i - The Public Discourse

CHARLES – ah forbear, forbear! Lest mortals prize
His name too dearly, and Idolatrize.
His name! Our losse! Thrice cursed and forlon
Be that Black night which usher's in this Morn...¹³

In the aftermath of the regicide two competing emotional regimes emerged within public discourse, one from the royalists and one from the new parliamentary government. 'Emotional regimes', according to William Reddy, refers to the dominant modes for acceptable emotional thought and expression as created and enforced by governments or societies.¹⁴ Reddy argued that emotional control was exerted through political institutions: 'any enduring political regime must establish as an essential element a normative order for emotions'; emotions outside this 'norm' were viewed as illicit and were repressed.¹⁵ Reddy therefore looked for evidence in historical texts of emotions that were favoured in a given cultural context and those that were restrained, arguing that this in turn shaped the emotional expression of individuals. This approach avoids the assumption that a particular period in history is characterised by a single emotional narrative.¹⁶ The Rump's attempt to create an emotional regime is evident in the printed rhetoric being produced before and after the regicide. The new regime, across both newsbooks and pamphlets, justified their legitimacy and defended their case that Charles I was a tyrant. Royalists sought to establish their own counter-emotional regime, although outside the official structures of government. Editors of the royalist newsbooks like Marchamont Nedham were defiant throughout the trial and execution of Charles. In the pamphlets printed after the regicide, defeatism began to emerge. For a while

¹³ Alexander Brome, ed., *Rump, or, An exact collection of the choycest poems and songs relating to the late times by the most eminent wits from anno 1639 to anno 1661* (London: 1662), p. 367.

¹⁴ Reddy, *Feeling*, p. 124.

¹⁵ *ibid*, p. 124.

¹⁶ *ibid*, p. 12.

after the regicide there were two competing royalist emotional responses, one defiant and the other in deep mourning.

To create an emotional regime, both the royalists and parliamentarians needed to harness the public discourse, through newsbooks and pamphlets, to shape and assert their reaction to the regicide, and it is worth noting here that neither attempt was reliant on governing institutions.¹⁷ The distribution of information is where an interaction between the personal and public sources can be seen. Many of the diaries that have been analysed here pinpoint their information source as coming from public sources. Nehemiah Wallington commented 'those little pamphlets of weekly news about my house ... were so many thieves that had stolen away my money before I was aware of them'.¹⁸ The Earl of Leicester's journal is a not uncommon example of the public and personal sources inhabiting the same space. The journal is a commonplace book and therefore was created to be an aide for the author. The Earl of Leicester compiled the unfolding events in his journal and throughout commented where his source of information came from: 'So saith the Diurnall from the 18th to the 25th December'.¹⁹ Leicester noted that he received information via his own personal network. On 3 January he received an update from Sir John Temple, who at the time had just been removed from parliament after Pride's Purge but was still in London.²⁰ His sons Philip and Algernon were also still in London. Just before the execution, he noted that they 'came unexpedictely to Penshurst ... and stayed there till Monday 29th Jan. So as neither of them was at the condemnation of the King.'²¹ Leicester was receiving information from a wide range of sources – he was studying the newsbooks and as a leading noble he had a network of acquaintances who were providing updates. This is why a focus on the public discourse is vital to understanding how the regicide was viewed and processed.

To get a sense of the emotional response from a staunch royalist perspective an examination of the opening verses of *Mercurius Pragmaticus* from November 1648 to May 1649 will be explored. Marchmont Nedham as editor began to use fear

¹⁷ Joad Raymond has examined and analysed the pamphlet in culture in several publications. Raymond, *Pamphlets; The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641-1649* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).

¹⁸ Wallington, *Notebooks*, p. 156.

¹⁹ Sydney, *Papers*, p. 45.

²⁰ *ibid*, p. 54.

²¹ *ibid*, p. 54.

to provoke a reaction from his readers. He might have hoped that his public discourses could influence the ongoing negotiations. Much like the personal sources, at the end of November, there was still hope of the Treaty of Newport being signed. 'Return hard hearts, or treaty ends' implies that the treaty needed to be signed or the royalists will bid the 'world farewell'.²² The treaty was seen as paramount to the conclusion of the war. However, his tone quickly changed in the next edition as Charles was from the Isle of Wight: as he noted, 'wearing a crowne is treason'.²³ This was the first time he gave an overt reference to the possibility of the King being under the sentence of treason. Nedham used the term treason to highlight and provoke a reaction from his readers. This rhetoric continued when he commented on Pride's Purge: 'Dull cuckolds! We are dainty slaves, And well may be content, When thirty fooles and twenty knaves make up a parliament' and that 'they banish all men in their wits'.²⁴ This was a threat from Nedham to gain a response to frighten the royalists into action. In essence, the country will be ruined if action was not taken.²⁵

The header of *Pragmaticus* confirmed it was from Westminster and indicated that Nedham was close to the unfolding events. Jason McElligott, who examined Nedham's career, noted that he had a network of allies in London who kept him informed and, unlike other royalist newsbooks, was more up to date on the developing events.²⁶ On 19 December he confirmed that 'No pow'ers are safe; Treason's a tilt, And the man Sainted Elves Boast, when the Royall blood is spilt, They'll all be Kings themselves'.²⁷ Printed material was quicker to announce that the end result of the trial would be regicide. The prime reason was to provoke an emotional reaction from the audience. To write of the King's blood Nedham looked to galvanise royalist support.²⁸ Fear is described as an emotional reaction 'to a threat that is identifiable'.²⁹ This threat was to the current social order where the King had

²² *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 34 (14-21 November 1648), p. 1.

²³ *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 34 (21-28 November 1648), p. 1.

²⁴ *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 35 (12-19 December 1648), p. 1. For Pride's Purge, see David Underdown, *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

²⁵ *The Man in the Moon*, 1 (16-23 April 1649); 11 (20-27 June 1649) also followed this approach.

²⁶ Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), pp. 111-117.

²⁷ *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 39 (19-26 December 1648), p. 1.

²⁸ *The Man in the Moon*, 4 (30 April 1649) used the same language to 'rouze royalists'.

²⁹ Stanley Rachman, *Fear and Courage* (London: W.H. Freeman & Co Ltd, 1990), pp. 2-3.

been at the centre of it. This threat of what will happen if the King was killed encapsulated the following editions of *Pragmaticus*.

Factions, like Billowes, rage and tosse,
And death mounts ev'ry wave;
Yet in the store we are so crosse,
We will no pilot have.

Nedham again used the fear of the unknown to highlight that the country will fall if the monarchy is ended. He looked to use anxiety about the war, it had been ongoing for seven years and if the King is killed then the war will continue. The emotions of fear and anxiety are paramount in the editions leading up to the regicide.

Are you resolved to bathe your soules
In guiltless Royal blood?
Doe you believe, when a Judge ROLES
Swears that 'tis wondrous good?
Beleeve me then, for what I speak is true,
You've try'd the King, The Devill will try you³⁰

Nedham's denunciation of the regicide is evident here. It is a curious dynamic as he was speaking directly to the regicides and therefore not his royalist base. He is ventriloquising the royalists' anger and opposition into a dialogue that had not happened. The use of the devil is in stark contrast to the perceived innocence of Charles. This was in aid to present a clear emotional narrative of Charles as martyr. After the regicide, Nedham changed the focus of provoking fear within the royalist faction to a creation of fear and anxiety toward the new government. He undermined the position of the new government and suggested that the country would decline under the charge of the army. He became more fervent in distaste for the new government in the next edition. 'Now Englands glory is removed, both King and noble murther'd.'³¹ As the new council of state had destroyed the old order of government all new laws would be void of all sense and reason. More importantly

³⁰ *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 42 (26 January-30 January 1649), p. 1.

³¹ *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 43 (20-27 February 1649), p. 1.

for Nedham he would continue to write *Pragmaticus* to ensure that 'the Kingdomes know, though tyrants yet doe rule and raigne, it be not long be so.'³² Nedham continued with the threat against the new regime on 17th April: 'Doe you not see the rising sun? (K.Charles) preparing your o're-throw.'³³ Nedham, throughout the editions he was editor for, denounced the new government, claiming it would be overthrown and the monarchy restored. Through the use of emotional language, he positioned the new government as tyrants and rogues who ultimately had no right to govern the country. The final edition that covered the time period stated that 'Then Cavaliers, clap hands for joy, you'le see the Levellers bring, usurpers t'ruine and destroy, Those rogue that kil'd our King.'³⁴

There were two competing emotional communities among royalists, one stayed defiant and looked to provoke fear in the new regime, the other mourned for the loss of the king and, as argued by Adam Smyth, accepted the event and awaited for the new regime to fall.³⁵ Smyth and Jason McElligott have argued that royalists were resigned to the death of the King.³⁶ However, Nedham, like the editors of the other royalist newsbooks, was defiant and insistent that killing the king would not go unpunished. Even those who were being hounded by the new government continued to publish throughout this period. They may not have had the financial and political backing of printers such as Robert Ibbitson, but they continued with their defiance initially after the regicide.

Immediately after the regicide royalist pamphlets exploited Charles' performance during the trial and execution.³⁷ The final dramatic performance was quickly printed in several pamphlets: *Collections of notes taken at the Kings tryall* and *The life and death of King Charles the martyr, parallel'd with our saviour in all his sufferings* not only presented the king as calm and controlled in the face of such a

³² *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 46, (27 February 1649), p. 1; *The Man in the Moon*, 6 (14-20 May 1649), p. 1 also talked of the royalist newsbooks working together to publish the treason of the new regime.

³³ *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 51, (17-24 April 1649), p. 1.

³⁴ *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 54, (8-15 May 1649), p. 1.

³⁵ Adam Smyth, *A pleasing Sinne: Drink and conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2004) p. 3.

³⁶ Jason McElligott, *Censorship*; Smyth, *A pleasing Sinne*.

³⁷ Jason Peacey, 'Reporting a Revolution: A Failed Propaganda Campaign' in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 161-80; Joad Raymond, *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England 1641-1660* (Moreton-in-Marsh: Windrush Press, 1993); Amos Tubb 'Printing the Regicide of Charles I'. *History*. 89:296 (2004), pp. 500-524; McElligott, *Censorship* all make this argument.

fate, but as a man held by conviction to the idea of monarchy.³⁸ There was no better political coup than a man who died gracefully and for his held convictions.

Charles as martyr presented royalist authors with a figurehead to present their counter-emotional regime. After the regicide, a series of epitaphs and elegies were produced lamenting the death of the king. *A Crowne, A Crime*, printed on 13 February 1649, grieved 'Un-king a King, because He was too good! Doome Him a Tyrant, who for justice stood! Cruell, whose hand was never dipt in blood!'³⁹ The epitaph was public mourning and throughout it referred to Charles in glorious words: he was 'the living emblem of a glorious shade' and 'a brave creature'.⁴⁰ The king's death had left the nation headless, and God's judgement was at hand. There are similarities here to the verses of Nedham – the King had left behind a power vacuum and those who took part in his death would be judged. Another epitaph is styled like a tombstone and called Charles 'The best of Kings'; he was martyred to save the laws that he believed and fought for.⁴¹ Instead of relying on political or logical arguments these stood as an emotional regime. They focused on the creation of grief and sadness at the death of Charles. *The Monument of Charles the First* brings all the elements together. It is unique in that it contains an image a tomb with the body of the king:

[here] lyes great CHARLES, first King of that same name,
Englands great glory, Englands lasting fame;
A Butcherd Martyr King, whose patient mildnesse,
Crowneth himselfe with Fame, his foes with vildnesse:
A persecuted Saint, for seven yeares space
Prest downe with sorrowes, yet held up by Grace;
In whom those Vertues constantly did live,
Which to the Worthies lasting fame did give:

³⁸ Anon, *Collections of Notes Taken at the Kings Tryall, at VVestminster Hall, On Munday last, January 22 1648* (London: Robert Ibbitson, 1649); Anon, *The Life and Death of King Charles the Martyr, parallel'd with our Saviour in all his sufferings. Who was murdered (before His own palace at Whitehall) the 30th of Jan 1648. With some observations upon his cruel and bloudy persecutors* (London, 1649).

³⁹ Anon, *A crowne, a crime or, the monarch-martyr* (London, 1649), p. 1.

⁴⁰ *A Crowne, a crime*, p. 1.

⁴¹ A.B., *An Epitah* (London, 1649), p. 1. Other examples include Anon, *An Elegie on the Meekest of Men, the Most Glorious of Princes, the most Constant of Martyrs* (London, 1649); Anon, *Charles the I, the Most Glorious of Princes* (London, 1649); Anon, *The Most Constant of Martyrs, Charles the I* (1649).

Patient as Job, and like to Moses, milde,
Salomons wisdom makes him Wisdomes childe.⁴²

The aim of all these royalist elegies was to evoke the reader's sympathy. Throughout they used emotive words to shape and control the reaction to the regicide. With these newsbooks and pamphlets royalists were able to present a compelling emotional narrative: a man who was unjustly killed, a man with many good qualities who had left behind him a directionless country. Throughout the public discourse, the royalist publications continued to use the same words the Rump employed to accuse Charles. Every pamphlet referred to the new regime as a murderer, a tyrant or that they have committed treason. The simple tactic of referring to Charles' crimes and turning this back on to the new regime is there to pose a question to the reader: who is the real person committing these crimes? Andrew Lacey, in his study of elegies after the regicide, concluded that royalists were trying to create and sustain an exaggerated image of Charles, who was a saintly King who embodied the virtues of monarchy.⁴³ These martyr narratives demonstrated Charles' dedication to his cause which was the protection of his people. As will be explored later in the thesis, there was no public funeral for the king and these printed epitaphs were the public outpouring of grief for the king.

Ballads, a cornerstone of seventeenth-century popular culture, were also used to establish this royalist emotional regime. Angela McShane argues that royalists and parliamentarians 'strategically deployed the medium of popular songs as military recruiters, morale boosters, emotional outlets and as party-political campaigning tools.'⁴⁴ The rhyming verse on the front page of *Pragmaticus* illustrated how the oral and printed word worked together to share and disseminate information. Natascha Wurzbach estimated that there were 1,000 ballads created between 1550 and 1650.⁴⁵ Ballads were used as a way of communicating and sharing moral tales, romantic woes and politically motivated messages. They were a bridge

⁴² Anon, *The Monument of Charles the First, King of England* (London, 1649).

⁴³ Andrew Lacey, 'Elegies and Commemorative Verse', in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 225-243.

⁴⁴ Angela McShane, 'Drink, Song, and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England', *Folk Music Journal*, 11:3 (2018), pp. 108.

⁴⁵ Natascha Wurzbach, *The Rise of the English Street Ballad 1550-1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

between oral and print cultures, sung at street corners and sung or read aloud in alehouses.⁴⁶ Ballads and pamphlets shared the same space whether the audience were literate or not. It has been estimated that 30 per cent of women and 50 per cent of men could read by 1700, therefore sharing information was passed through more oral traditions.⁴⁷ To create a sustained emotional regime William Reddy confirmed that all elements of communication culture needed to be controlled.⁴⁸ As McShane confirmed, royalists had gained little access to the popular music press but this all changed after the regicide and Charles's defeat at Worcester. New ballads regularly appeared throughout this period and the interregnum.⁴⁹ Perhaps we should not expect the Rump to have invested in ballad campaigns, but royalist dominance of contemporary ballad culture hindered the Rump's efforts to change public opinion. While ballads of course largely reflect popular opinion, royalists were able to utilise this method of communication to amplify their own emotional reactions in their effort to establish their counter-emotional regime.

The ballads produced after the regicide centred on Charles as martyr or mocking the new Rump regime, such as *The Independents resolve* or *The Power of the Sword*.⁵⁰ The ballad entitled the *Traytor's Downfall* started by lamenting the death of Charles, the noblest of Kings. It quickly turned into a satire about Cromwell, his low birth, and his grasp for power.

Oliver was of Huntington, ...
 Born he was a Brewers son,...
 He soon forsook his dray and flings,...
 And counted a Brewers house a pitifull thing...
 When he came to the stately throne of a King:
 Oliver had a heart of gall,

⁴⁶ Walsham, 'Reformed Folklore?', pp. 173-196; L. Bowen, 'Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism, 1649-1660', in *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, eds. Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), pp. 44-66.

⁴⁷ J.A. Sharpe, *Early Modern England: A Social History, 1550-1760* (London: Arnold, 1997), p. 26.

⁴⁸ Jan Plamper, 'The History of Emotions: An Interview with William Reddy, Barbara Rosenwein, and Peter Stearns', *History and Theory*, 49 (2010), p. 246; Reddy, *Feeling*, p. 5.

⁴⁹ McShane, 'Drink', pp. 107-123.

⁵⁰ *Rump, or, An Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs relating to the Late Times by the Most Eminent Wits from Anno 1639 to Anno 1661*, ed. Alexander Brome (London: EBO, 2010), pp. 288; 333.

For to murder his Prince at white-Hall.⁵¹

Cromwell began to emerge as the principle enemy of the king. As Laura Lunger Knoppers has argued, Cromwell became a public figure not by parliamentarians but by royalists, who set out to demonise and personalise opposition to Charles I.⁵² In *Cromwell's Panegyrick* Cromwell was a leader of men who wanted beer and disorder. He had torn down the Ten Commandments and that 'To Justice what e're you say or do: Whose circumcised ears are hardly grown, Ripe for another Persecution.'⁵³ Cromwell was condemned as a man who has tasted power and abused it. It ends with: 'And on his Grave since there must be no Stone, Shall stand this Epitaph; That he has none.' Cromwell would not be lamented, mourned, or remembered like the martyred King Charles who had a series of printed epitaphs produced in his honour. The royalists continued to mock Cromwell for his low birth, his appearance, and his Machiavellian attempts to steal the crown.⁵⁴

Biblical references were also used in ballads. The ballad below quotes from Luke 7:26 and alludes to John the Baptist's fame for drawing in vast numbers to hear him speak. Here the ballad placed the listener at the scaffold who was there to witness the death of a martyr king. The sin of this crime and the potential outcome for the nation is also a concern throughout the ballads too.

'What went you out to see ? a dying King ?
Nay more, I fear an Angel suffering.
But what went you to see ? a Prophet slain ?
Nay that and more, a Martyr'd Sovereign'.⁵⁵

The royalists were able to share their reaction to the regicide via this oral tradition. Research by Laura Mason on the French Revolution has highlighted the role of the

⁵¹ *Rump Songs*, p. 267.

⁵² Laura Lunger Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645-1661* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 10.

⁵³ *Rump*, pp. 224-227.

⁵⁴ Mercurius Melancholicus, *Craftie Cromwell: or, Oliver ordering our new State. A Tragi-Comedie. Wherein is discovered the Trayterous undertakings and proceedings of the said No I, and his Levelling Crew* (London, 1648); Mercurius Pragmaticus, *The Second Part of Crafty Crvmwell, or, Oliver in his glory as King a Trage Commedie wherein is presented, the late treasonable undertakings, and proceedings, of the rebells, their murthering of Capt. Burley, with their underhand workings to betray their King* (London, 1649) both follow this narrative.

⁵⁵ *Rump Songs*, p. 291.

ballad in the new French government's attempt to create and sustain an emotional and cultural regime by sharing their new rhetoric and ideology by all communication methods.⁵⁶ For Robert Darnton, Mason and Reddy, the new regime in France was effective as it consumed all cultural forms.⁵⁷ The French Revolution was successful because all forms of communication were utilised to engender long-term support, but the failure of the Commonwealth to do this led to its downfall.

The reaction from the Commonwealth regime was in opposition to that of the royalists: their focus was a rational discourse to legitimise their actions. Control was paramount in creating and sustaining their new emotional regime. Amos Tubb analysed their reaction to the regicide and how they looked to legitimise their actions. In January 1649 government print houses such as Ibbitson produced fifty four pamphlets and proclamations supporting its actions, along with twenty seven editions of nine sympathetic newsbooks.⁵⁸ Unlike the royalists, whom Tubb estimated to have produced half this amount, the new regime used the printed material as a propaganda tool to proclaim the reasoning for their actions. They also looked to control publications: on 5 January Parliament ordered the imposition of the 'ordinances of parliament' against scandalous and unlicensed pamphlets. Every printed item had to be previewed by Gilbert Mabbot.⁵⁹ The new regime wanted to create, shape and control the official narrative. To create the impression that the new regime was in control and were ready to lead they needed to present a united narrative. Only Mabbot was sanctioned to print an account of the trial.

The new government looked to control how the emotional reaction to the trial and regicide was published. For Darnton, who examined the new regime in the French Revolution, print was an ingredient in the events happening and the struggle for power was a struggle for the mastery of public opinion.⁶⁰ The new government continued to struggle for this power with the royalist print houses. McElligott argued that the enforcement of the new laws was sporadic, mainly due to the volume of pro-royalist material being produced and that when one printer was arrested

⁵⁶ Laura Mason, 'Song: Mixing Media', in *Revolution in Print: The Press in France, 1775-1800*, eds. Robert Darnton and Daniel Roche (London: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 252-270.

⁵⁷ Reddy, *Feeling*, p.25; Darnton and Roche, *Revolution in Print*; Mason, 'Song'.

⁵⁸ Tubb, 'Regicide', p. 508.

⁵⁹ *CJ*, Vol 6, pp. 111-112; Tubb, 'Regicide', p. 507.

⁶⁰ Darnton and Roche, *Revolution in Print*, p. 2.

another one would replace him.⁶¹ However, government printers were greater in number and through the sheer volume of pamphlets looked to control the market. Reddy noted that the initial stage of the French Revolution, culminating in The Reign of Terror, illustrated perfectly his conception of an oppressively strict emotional regime, where all facets of media production was controlled by the new regime that had overthrown the monarchy. The Civil War culminated in the death of Charles which the new regime used as a watershed moment. The death was legitimate, and the tyranny of monarchy had been removed.

The Moderate provided a detailed coverage of the trial while returning to the central question of why this event was legitimate and necessary. There is some dispute over who produced the newsbook. Some attribute it to Mabbot, who refused the previous author John Dillingham licence to publish.⁶² *The Man in Moon* reported that Mabbot was indeed the man behind *The Moderate*.⁶³ The newsbook's coverage of the regicide suggests that it supported the act, even though, as Raymond has argued, 'its political stance wavered, it remained in support of the Levellers.'⁶⁴ In the 14 November 1648 edition *The Moderate* reported, 'The King he is born a monarch, and consequently the people slaves and therefore some authors say he is above law by his absolute power.'⁶⁵ This rhetoric continued: 'Why do people admire the King (the great delinquent of the Kingdom, and the author of Englands ruine).'⁶⁶ *The Moderate*, as early as November before the negotiations of the Isle of Wight had come to an abrupt end, had called for justice and for the king to be put on trial. They looked to rely on an emotional argument by presenting a petition to the readers: the king was unjust and needed to be brought to justice just as anyone who had committed a crime would be. Like Nedham, the aim was to provoke an emotional response of fear and anxiety. The king stood for injustice and, parliament stood for justice and truth and was the only true representative of the people.

⁶¹ McElligott, *Censorship*, pp. 150-183.

⁶² Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 64-5.

⁶³ *Man in the Moon*, 26, (21-28 October 1649), p. 218.

⁶⁴ Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 71.

⁶⁵ *The Moderate impartially communicating martial affaires to the Kingdome of England*, 3 (14-21 November 1648), p. 153.

⁶⁶ *The Moderate*, 3 (14-21 November 1648), p. 153.

Throughout the period *The Moderate* kept on this continued attack that positioned Charles I as the real tyrant. Like *Pragmaticus*, *The Moderate* had its own unique style with an introduction from the editor on the front page. The editions which covered the trial and execution continued with the pro-government narrative that the king was against his people and was therefore sinning. 'The blood of the innocent, cries for the blood of the noncent, and justice now giving attention, pronounces sentence answerable to the Treason, God being no respecter of persons ... Kings were in accusations the worst of creatures because they once had the power to do more good than any.'⁶⁷ The king had the power to make changes to improve the lives of his subjects. However, he went to war against his people and committed the worst of all crimes. He deserved to be killed as innocent blood was on his hands. To undermine royalist emotional arguments, the editor also looked to erode Charles' role as a martyr. Charles will not be immortal for his martyrdom but for his tyranny against his people. 'Not death, but the cause, makes a martyr and who can be more unfortunate, then he that is most wicked? ... The infamy of a Tyrant is immortal: shall not such as climb up publike and highest sins, fall in open and lowest shame?'⁶⁸

For the trial and the regicide, Commonwealth newsbooks represented the public side of proceedings. Arguments for the regicide were represented in pamphlets such as Mabbot's *A perfect Narrative of the Proceedings of the High Court of Justice in the Tryal of the King*.⁶⁹ The main outcome of such newsbooks was to make the trial and regicide appear necessary and to solicit public opinion. Jason Peacey argued that government print houses were at pains to control the rhetoric coming from the trial as this was a public outlet for the government to legitimise putting the king on trial.⁷⁰ There were further editions of newsbooks published

⁶⁷ *The Moderate*, 20 (23-30 January 1649), p. 273.

⁶⁸ *The Moderate*, 15 (30 January-6 February 1649), p. 286.

⁶⁹ Gilbert Mabbot, *King Charls his Tryal: or A perfect narrative of the whole proceedings of the High Court of Iustice in the tryal of the King in Westminster Hall. Begun Saturday January 20. and ended on Saturday Jan. 27 1648. With the several speeches of the King, Lord President, and Solicitor General. Together with that eloquent and learned speech of the Lord President before he gave sentence, not before published. Corrected & enlarged by a more perfect copy. With a perfect copy of the Kings speech upon the scaffold immediately before he was beheaded, Tuesday, Jan. 30. To these proceedings of the tryall of the King, I say, imprimatur, Gilbert Mabbot* (London: Peter Cole, 1649).

⁷⁰ Peacey, 'Reporting a Revolution', pp. 161-182.

during the king's trial, to ensure, as Peacey noted, that the information produced from the trial was controlled by the favourable elements of the press.⁷¹

The reporting of the trial and regicide in the newsbooks followed a relatively consistent pattern. *A Perfect Diurnall* provided a minute detailed account which meant the type-faced needed to be reduced in size. By providing a wealth of information it was perceived to be reporting the truth. Two pages were resigned to the speech and scaffold performance of Charles.⁷² The report of the execution does not provide any reaction from those who attended; it only noted that his body was put into a coffin. To counterbalance the detail of the king's speech, the next page printed the declaration from parliament as to why the king was killed. It outlined his treachery and tyrannical rule and that the proceedings against him were justified and within the laws of the land.⁷³ Throughout the more pro-government newsbooks there was only one passing reference to any reaction to the regicide: 'At first coming he lookt upon the people who were numerous, as also the souldiers, little appeared in their faces of any either joy or sorrow: those who had most cause to mourn as greatest losers were absent.'⁷⁴ Through removal of any reaction and emotion, the new regime continued to present a logical and legitimate reaction to the regicide.

To position the new government as legitimate they needed to undermine the image of Charles I. They needed to provoke an emotional reaction that Charles I had been unfit to rule and had committed great crimes against his people. To do this they presented Charles as a common criminal who had to be punished for his crimes. *A Shrill Crye in the ears of the cavaliers* printed on 5 February 1649 is a 14-page pamphlet that encapsulated the propaganda war that was being produced by the government printers. The pamphlet's author is a 'well-willer to peace and truth'.⁷⁵ The aim of the pamphlet was to use historical precedent to argue that king killing was nothing new. William the Conqueror was not the legitimate heir to the English crown but through conquest he was able to become King of England. The pamphlet

⁷¹ Peacey, 'Reporting a Revolution'; Raymond, *Making the News*.

⁷² *A Perfect Duirnull of some passages in Parliament*, 288 (29 January-5 February 1649), p. 2317.

⁷³ *Duirnull*, 288 (29 January-5 February 1649), p. 2318.

⁷⁴ *Duirnull*, 288 (29 January-5 February 1649), p. 2318.

⁷⁵ Well-willer to Peace and Truth, *A Shrill Crye in the ears of Cavaliers, apostates, and presbyters, for the resolve of XIII queries touching the primitive state of this nation, since the Conquest: the late proceedings of the Army, the Covenant, and other weighty matters, tending to the publique peace of the nation* (London, 1649), p. 1.

answered thirteen queries about the changing state of the nation. For instance, query II asked if a king does not listen to his council, then does this mean he has become a tyrant? Query III was overt in the condemnation of Charles, as it states that a king who supports delinquents, who sets his standard against parliament and forces his people to take up arms in defence of their liberty, must be punished. If the king is then defeated by the army and 'they make him their prisoner, shall it not betray their trust, if they make him not an example of justice for the same?'⁷⁶ This was the crux of the government's argument: if another man had committed these crimes, then by the law of the land he would be sentenced to death. *A Declaration of the Parliament of England* was a short view of some passages of Charles' reign and how he had attempted to awe the people into slavery.⁷⁷ Charles was positioned as a tyrant as shown when he ordered provisions around Oxford to be burned.⁷⁸ This was a common technique across parliamentary pamphlets during this time.⁷⁹

Charles I as a criminal who had shed the blood of his people was central to the argument of a series of parliamentary pamphlets. This is key in the creation of their own emotional regime: they signalled emotional touchpoints within logical arguments. *The Execution of the late King justified* was printed on 26 February 1649 and, like the author of *A Shrill Cry*, was a 'well-wisher to the safety and freedom thereof'.⁸⁰ The title set the tone to vindicate the actions of the army and parliament. In the introduction the author confirmed that he will seek to set out the clear reasons for the regicide and why it was in the interest of the people. He set out the argument that the king was elected by the people and that if he only had his office through 'succession, then he is a usurper'.⁸¹ The king considered himself above his people and God, it claimed, and therefore his actions against them meant that his execution was inevitable.⁸² *King Charles Triall justified* was printed on 9 May 1649

⁷⁶ *A Shrill Cry*, p. 4.

⁷⁷ Anon, *A Declaration of the Parliament of England, expressing the grounds of their Late Proceedings, and of settling the Present Government in a way of a Free State* (London, 1649).

⁷⁸ *Declaration*, pp. 6-7.

⁷⁹ For example, Sir Edward Peyton, *The Divine Catatropshe of the Kingly of the House of Stuarts, or Short History of the rise, Reign and Ruine therefore* (London, 1652).

⁸⁰ Well-wisher to the Safety and Freedom, *The Execution of the late king justified and the Parliament and army therein vindicated: published for satisfaction to the kingdome* (London, 1649), p. 1.

⁸¹ *The Execution*, p. 4.

⁸² Anon, *A True Narration of the Title, Government, and Cause of the Death of the Late Charles Stuart King of England. Written for the satisfaction of all those that are not wilfully obstinate for a regal government, and neglecters or contemners of their own just liberties* (London, 1649) also followed this argument.

and was written by Colonel Robert Bennet, who had fought for parliament during the Civil Wars. This pamphlet is interesting on two levels. First, it came from an army officer and after the regicide royalist pamphlets such as *The Faithfull Souldier* had lamented the role of the soldier and how the army was being used by parliament.⁸³ Second, it was written in Cornwall, one of the last counties to resist parliamentary forces. The pamphlet legitimised the army on both levels, that the army did support the new regime and that all parts of the country were under the yoke of the parliament. Following a similar stylised method to that of *Shrill Cry* it set out eight objections to the trial and execution of the king and provided the legitimate answers. Object one asked by what authority the king was killed; it was by the same authority that the king himself had been given. In the coronation oath he was bound to govern the country and abide by the same laws; if the monarch broke this vow, then he must be brought to justice. Query three questioned how an anointed king can be brought to death; the logical argument was 'he that sheddeth mans blood, by man shall his blood be shed'.⁸⁴ The sustained argument presented in these three pamphlets was just a small illustration of the emotional regime the government print houses tried to create post regicide. The use of emotion centred on Charles as a criminal who had committed the worst crime of all, the shedding of innocent blood. The new regime presented legitimacy and a break from the bloodshed. Monarchy had brought the country to near ruin and the new government would rebuild it.

In the period leading up to the regicide, two narratives formed. Government writers used newsbooks as a petition for the king to be brought to justice for his many crimes against his people. Royalist newsbooks set an agenda of defiance and sought to provoke fear and anxiety saying the country would be ruined if the king was killed. After the regicide, government writers continued with their emotional content that Charles was a common criminal who in modern times would be seen as having committed war crimes against his people. Charles represented tyranny and repression. Perhaps because of the intense emotions surrounding the event, they also looked to base their legitimacy on rational arguments. For many who had gone

⁸³ Anon, *The Faithfull Souldier, or, The Speech of a common souldier concerning his arreares and putting the King to death* (London, 1649).

⁸⁴ Colonel Robert Bennet, *King Charles Triall Justified: or, Eight objections against the same fully answered and cleared, by Scripture, Law, History and Reason. Being the sum of a charge given at the last sessions held at Trewroe in the county of Cornwall, Aprill 4 1649* (London, 1649), p. 4.

through formal education, providing a formal argument and debate was the natural way to present a point of view. This cultural aspect can be seen in what the government writers were attempting to do. Royalists formed two competing regimes: newsbooks remained defiant in the face of censorship while printed epitaphs and elegies turned to mourning and self-reflection.

ii - Personal Sources

Historians studying the regicide of Charles I have drawn extensively from both official court records and the printed materials produced by royalists and government print houses; their focus has been on the legal process of (and justification for) putting the king on trial. There has been little analysis of reactions to the regicide in personal sources.⁸⁵ This section will therefore explore privately recorded reactions to the trial and execution, through personal correspondence, diaries, and journals. It will also analyse changing emotional reactions and will look to establish if emotional communities were formed.

Personal diaries reveal a clear arc of emotions spanning the six months around the regicide. In November 1648 many believed that the negotiations of the Treaty of Newport would be completed, and that normality would be restored. The king would return to lead the country and the war would end. However, in late December and early January 1649 many began to suspect that all would change and fear of the unknown emerged. As newsbooks and pamphlets began to raise the possibility of regicide many people began to express their fears about this outcome privately. The reaction to the regicide itself created a spectrum of competing emotional responses. For example, Lady Clifford and the Earl of Shaftesbury made no comment; John Evelyn, Henry Newcombe and Nehemiah Wallington prayed for the king; and finally Ralph Josselin, Dr Worthington and William Sancroft wrote of their grief at the death of the king.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Peacey, 'Reporting a Revolution', pp. 161-80.

⁸⁶ Clifford, *Diaries*; Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, *Some Observations Concerning the Regulating of Elections for Parliament: Found among the Earl of Shaftesbury's papers after his death*, ed. Tony Randal (London, 1689); Evelyn, *Diary*; Henry Newcome, *Autobiography of Henry Newcome* Vol 1, ed. Richard Parkinson (Manchester: Cheltenham Society, 1852); William Sancroft, *The Life of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. George D'Oyly, Vol 1 (London: John Murray, 1821) and Wallington, *Notebooks*.

In the seventeenth century, with the rise of literacy the keeping of diaries and journals flourished.⁸⁷ Diane Purkiss emphasises that letters were created to enable the author to 'conjure up a series of events and persons absent from the narrative'.⁸⁸ Ultimately, the aim of a letter was to inform and to bring alive events (or narrative as stated by Purkiss) for the recipient and anyone they chose to share a letter with. This is crucial in times of great crisis and when events unfolded quickly. Letters were a method of communicating, sharing thoughts and providing a narrative to the recipient. James Daybell has summarised the social process involved in the creation of letters. Letters were drafted and redrafted based on feedback from members of their family or social circle and replies were often read aloud in public environments such as taverns or within the family environment.⁸⁹ This is a clear example where the public and personal material intersect. Letters were created with a purpose in mind and at times this was to be shared in a public environment. While letters often presented themselves as personal and private, their use was often very public.

Diaries and journals were often created without a clear audience in mind. Diaries commented on the actions of the day and provided a commentary on what the writer saw as key events in their lives. Diaries were an individual creation; they only included material that the author deemed important enough to write about. They are often unmediated, sometimes urgent, and could provide moving and emotional content, providing an insight into the ongoing conflicting views towards the regicide. Three main themes have emerged which illustrate that diaries perform multiple functions. First, a high proportion of the diaries are written by clergymen such as Oliver Heywood, John Ward, and Alexander Jaffray, who focused on noting down their sermons, preaching itinerary or updates on their congregation.⁹⁰ Second, there were diaries of a more domestic nature, such as John Clopton's, who was obsessed with the weather and developing his home and land. Lady Twysden's diary

⁸⁷ Hunt, *First Hand*; Bennett, *Experienced*; Wilcox, 'Civil War Letters', pp. 215-227.

⁸⁸ Diane Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics during the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 34.

⁸⁹ James Daybell, *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-writing, 1512-1635* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 23.

⁹⁰ John Ward, *Diary of the Rev. John Ward, A.M: Vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon, extending from 1648 to 1679. From the original MSS, preserved in the library of the Medical society of London*, ed. Charles Severn (London: Colburn, 1839); Oliver, Heywood. *Oliver Heywood, 1603-1702: His Autobiography, Diaries, Anecdote and Event Books: illustrating the general and family history of Yorkshire and Lancashire*, ed. Horsfall Turner (Brighouse: The Editor, 1980); Alexander Jaffray, *Diary of Alexander Jaffray*, ed. John Barclay (London: Darton & Harvey, 1834).

focused on her home and domestic responsibilities.⁹¹ Finally, there were a smaller number of diaries which interspersed domestic updates with political commentary. Most notably, Robert Baillie and Bulstrode Whitelocke not only commented on political issues such as the regicide, but also mentioned their domestic lives such as births of family members.⁹² Responses to the regicide in these diaries varied from grief to making no comment at all, but regardless of focus and genre, the soulful expressions or silences can all be read as an emotional response to the execution.

W.D. Christie, the editor for *The Shaftesbury's Papers*, argued that because the Earl of Shaftesbury made no mention of the regicide, he must have accepted it.⁹³ This is a bold statement to make. When understanding emotional responses to a certain event, silence on the subject is worthy of analysis. Jan Plamper has noted that silences or lack of comment could have been an avoidance tactic; the event was so traumatic to comment on that no comment was made at all.⁹⁴ More recent research on PTSD has shown that those who encounter a traumatic event process this trauma through a dissociative response.⁹⁵ That traumatic memories might be deliberately elided by a person's response does not mean that they had no emotional engagement to these events but a more complex reaction instead. The absences, spaces and gaps in diaries bear witness, too; they demonstrate what had to be left out, therefore evidencing reactions, retractions, and withdrawals. Put simply, these silences illustrate the topics that contemporaries deemed too dangerous to record or could not record as they were unable to comprehend what had happened.⁹⁶ This can also be illustrated in the public dispatches from the Venetian Ambassador, whose role was to send information back to the Duke of Venice. He painted a picture of calmness after the regicide. On 11 March 1649, he noted that there had been no disturbances in London. Although many went to see the execution there was no news of mass riots or rebellion against the action.⁹⁷ On 10 April he noted that

⁹¹ Isabella Twysden, *The Diary of Isabella, Wife of Sir Roger Twysden, Baronet, of Royden Hall, East Peckham, 1645-1651*, ed. Rev. F.W. Bennett (Kent Archaeological Society, 1940).

⁹² Baillie, *Letters*; Whitelocke, *Diary*.

⁹³ Cooper, *Shaftesbury's Papers*, p. 82.

⁹⁴ Jan Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 1-25.

⁹⁵ Richard A. Bryant, 'Post-traumatic stress disorder: a state-of-the-art review of evidence and challenges', *World Psychiatry*, 18:3, pp.259-269.

⁹⁶ This could reflect that the 35 diaries that I consulted (manuscript and edited versions) only a small selection of them noted the regicide.

⁹⁷ Razzell, *Contemporary Account*, Vol 4, pp. 43-44.

‘people are quite determined in suppressing the ancient monarchy, and parliament has issued an Act declaring all the royal posterity incapable of the succession’.⁹⁸ There was no suggestion in his dispatches of any groundswell of rebellion against the Act being declared.⁹⁹ This could be indicative that after the initial shock of the regicide that life for many returned back to its normal routine or that after a moment of national trauma there was a dissociative reaction, where people were unable to come to terms with what happened – or simply dared not speak out. Work by Bryant and Edkins have suggested that traumatic memories might be deliberately elided.¹⁰⁰ It is difficult to find evidence of how individuals handled painful memories and this could be due to their dissociative response to the regicide. This potential confusion caused by the trauma of the regicide does mean that it is difficult to separate personal responses to this event. To counter this difficulty the thesis has so far explored the reactions through the separation of the printed sources and personal sources.

Philip Henry provided one of the most famous eyewitness account of the execution of Charles I:

On the day of his execution, which was Tuesday, Jan. 30, I stood amongst the crowd in the street before Whitehal gate, where the scaffold was erected, and saw what was done, but was not so near as to hear anything. The Blow I saw given, and can truly say with a sad heart; at the instant whereof, I remember wel, there was such a Grone by the Thousands present, as I never heard before and desire I may never hear again.¹⁰¹

This ‘grone’ has been quoted to signify the reaction and the emotion of the nation, perhaps more broadly than is legitimate.¹⁰² Henry was an interesting character as his

⁹⁸ *ibid*, p. 46.

⁹⁹ *ibid*, p. 57.

¹⁰⁰ Richard A. Bryant, ‘Post-traumatic stress disorder: a state-of-the-art review of evidence and challenges’, *World Psychiatry*, 18:3, pp.259-269; Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

¹⁰¹ Henry, *Diary*, p. 12.

¹⁰² C.V. Wedgwood, *The Trial of Charles I* (London: Collins, 1964); Peter Ackroyd, *Civil War: The History of England*, Vol 3, (London: Pan, 2015); Roger Lockyer, *The Trial of Charles I: A Contemporary Account Taken From the*

father was in the service of Philip Herbert, 4th Earl of Pembroke, and he was a childhood friend of Charles I.¹⁰³ The 'grone' has often been interpreted as evidence of the horror people felt towards the regicide. However, there was no reference to people shouting in protest to what they believed was unjust.¹⁰⁴ It is possible that his account was used too readily as an accurate reflection of the nation's response to the regicide and there are two explanations to be explored; first, he was engulfed in the emotional response of the crowd or second, he projected his own emotion on to the crowd. However, Barbara Rosenwein, who has examined emotional communities within the early medieval period, has argued that crowd action can be an aspect of an emotional community and for that moment when they are in the crowd, they belong to that emotional state.¹⁰⁵ 'Emotions were sometimes used not to express or describe feelings but to label others: was an angry mob angry according to the participants or because it was thus described by hostile observers?'¹⁰⁶ In Philip Henry's eye witness account of the regicide he mentioned only a reaction of a 'grone', but we have to consider that this was a reflection of Henry's own emotional state and his 'observations' are reflections of what he felt he should have witnessed by the crowd. The nature of the execution provided an opportunity around which people could construct emotional communities.

This dynamic within crowd action was clearly illustrated in the eyewitness account of the death of Thomas Wentworth in 1641.

As the axe fell, the huge crowd of spectators on Tower Hill,
 whose madness and fury had led the lieutenant of the tower
 to fear that his prisoner might be lynched ... A deafening
 shout rose from the multitude as the executioner lifted the
 bleeding head; from the outer edge of the crowd gentlemen
 and burghers rode out to the country at full gallop shouting to

Memoirs of Sir Thomas Herbert and John Rushworth (London: Folio Society, 1959); Graham Edwards, *The Last days of Charles I* (Stroud: Sutton, 1999).

¹⁰³ Richard L. Greaves, 'Henry, Philip (1631–1696)', *ODNB*, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/12976>> [accessed 15 June 2015].

¹⁰⁴ Wedgwood, *Trial*, p. 23.

¹⁰⁵ Alain Corbin also argues this in his microhistory account in *Village of Cannibals: Rage and Murder in France, 1870* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992).

¹⁰⁶ Barbara Rosenwein, 'Problems and methods in the History of Emotions', *Parergon*, 3 (2010) p. 12; *Emotional Communities*.

all they passed by as they clattered through the villages 'His
head is off, his head is off! ¹⁰⁷

The quote gives a palpable sense of the crowd's reaction to the execution. They cheered when his head was struck off. Like the execution of Charles, it provided an opportunity to create an emotional response; for Wentworth's execution, the response was of joy and celebration. Crowd action and emotions were crucial to the role public executions played within seventeenth-century society. It is difficult to imagine with a modern-day perspective that public executions were an everyday occurrence. They attracted large crowds and would have affected thousands of people. This included the condemned, their families, friends, officials, and the observers.¹⁰⁸ Executions were part of their popular culture; it was, to some extent, entertainment. There was a ritual which surrounded the execution: the condemned would be led out for the crowd to see, they would be read the last rites, perform their final speech and then the execution would be performed. Charles' execution was no exception, and he would have been very aware of the ritualistic nature and that he would, as the condemned, have a chance to speak. The final speech allowed the condemned to atone and to ensure that the crowd would be on their side. This relationship between the crowd and the culprit was key to the emotional reaction to the execution.¹⁰⁹ In 1582 a Catholic martyr called John Herit wagged his finger at the crowd and received laughter and sarcasm from them. Edmund Campion, also a Catholic martyr, acted with dignity to shouts of 'bless him'.¹¹⁰ Charles' performance on the scaffold helped determine the crowd's emotional reaction to his demise. It is important to note here that the real aim of an execution was not just to kill a person who had committed a crime, but to give the state the opportunity to show its power. This was even more applicable in this case as the Commonwealth needed to show that not only was killing the king lawful but also that they were now the power within the kingdom. However, what the state could not control is how the condemned performed and how the crowd responded to them. Due to the high-

¹⁰⁷ C.V. Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford, 1593-1641: A Revaluation* (London: Cape, 1961), p. 341.

¹⁰⁸ David Brandon and Alan Brooke, *London the Executioner's City* (Stroud: Sutton, 2006), p. 2.

¹⁰⁹ Richard Van Dulmen, *Theatre of Horror: Crime and Punishment in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990), p. 57.

¹¹⁰ Brandon and Brooke, *London*, p. 219.

profile nature of the execution the spectators were some distance from the scaffold and Charles himself noted that no one would be able to hear him.¹¹¹ As has already been explored, much was printed about his scaffold speech and his performance before his death. This performance was fundamental to Charles being seen as a martyr after his death.

An emotional community began to form November 1648, when Charles and his army had been defeated and he was imprisoned on the Isle of Wight. It was this community that began to express an identifiable arc of emotions. Negotiations in the Treaty of Newport had been on-going since September. For many the negotiations presented hope.¹¹² The Venetian Ambassador wrote on 20 October November 1648 that 'The King of England has accepted practically all the proposals'.¹¹³ Historians have debated when the decision to kill the king was made; the traditional view, led by Wedgwood and Gardiner, is that it was made in late 1648, but modern historians such as Sean Kelsey argued that it was not until late January 1649.¹¹⁴ The arc of emotions shown in the personal sources confirm that until January people watching on believed that the monarchy would remain. In December, the Venetian Ambassador noted that: 'General Cromwell is trying not only to throw difficulties on the way of the treaty ... although there is no doubt about his pretensions, yet his hopes will doubtless prove vain.'¹¹⁵ A week later he proudly confirmed 'it likely that the treaty will soon be concluded'.¹¹⁶ Was this just fanciful thought from the ambassador? His opinion was that Cromwell was the power behind the negotiations and was leading the call for regicide. However, Cromwell was reported to have argued 'that there was no policy making away from life ... that if they should at any time, loose the day, they could produce the king, their stake; and His meanes work

¹¹¹ William Juxon, *Memoirs of Archbishop Juxon and his Times: With a Sketch of the Archbishop's Little Parish of Compton*, ed. Mark Hennessey (Oxford: J. Parker and Co., 1869), p. 60.

¹¹² Many diaries follow this narrative: Evelyn, *Diary*; Josselin, *Diary*; Twysden, *Diary*; Wallington, *Notebooks*.

¹¹³ Razzell, *Contemporary Account*, Vol 4. p. 35.

¹¹⁴ Samuel Gardiner, *A History of The Commonwealth to the Protectorate 1649-1656*, Vol 1 (Adlestrop: Windrush Press, 1903); C.V. Wedgwood, *A Coffin for King Charles: The Trial and Execution of Charles I* (London: Lifetime Book, 1981) both follow this traditional view of events as originally argued by Gardiner; Sean Kelsey, 'The Death of Charles I', *The Historical Journal*, 45 (2002), pp. 727-754; 'The Ordinance for the Trial of Charles I', *Historical Research*, 76 (2003), pp. 310-331.

¹¹⁵ Razzell, *Contemporary Account*, Vol 4, p. 37.

¹¹⁶ Razzell, *Contemporary Account*, Vol 4, p. 37.

their peace'.¹¹⁷ In summary, killing the king was not a good idea.¹¹⁸ Kelsey has argued that on 23 December, legal proceedings had begun to bring the king to justice but only as another tactic of increasing the pressure on Charles to sign the treaty.¹¹⁹

The emotional change exhibited during December and January is epitomised in letters found in the Gell family papers. Edward Vallance has identified these letters as likely copies of the so-called 'Lawrans' newsletters, which were at least partly authored by Marchamont Nedham.¹²⁰ Gell was in Derbyshire at this time and the source content suggests that he wanted more detailed information surrounding the changing events. These 'letters' sit in between what we might think of as the private and the public. They mimic the style of 'private' or personal letters both in tone and format (they were shared in manuscript copies), yet they were part of paid-for news culture. As ostensibly private reports (at least in appearance), these types of manuscript newsletters were seen as more authoritative and reliable than printed newsbooks.¹²¹ On 25 December the informant believed that 'his Matie to share in the Government, in the same equipage (perhaps) as the Duke of Venice'; he reported how the Presbyterians were for the treaty and restoring the king but the Independents kept rejecting this approach.¹²² He declared that 'the pretended tryall of his M will be used as a meanes to give him opportunitie to clear himself [of] those scandal and aspersions'.¹²³ He noted that the negotiations were for the king to comply with and that the outcome of the negotiations rested with Charles. He was clear that if he does not comply then they will depose him. The emotion that is shown in the reports is one of growing unease, the king being falsely accused and forced to agree with parliament's demands. Reactions in personal sources mirror

¹¹⁷ T. Carte, *A Collection of Original Letters and Papers Concerning the Affairs of England, From Year 1641-1660 from the Duke of Ormonde* (London: Bookseller's Society, 1739), p. 201; Sean Kelsey, 'Politics and Procedure in the Trial of Charles I', *Law and History Review*, 22 (2004), p. 6.

¹¹⁸ The role of Cromwell has been much debated. Underdown, in *Pride's Purge*, argued that Cromwell played a leading role. Barry Coward, *Oliver Cromwell* (London: Longman, 1991) claimed that he was late to decide on regicide.

¹¹⁹ Sean Kelsey, 'Politics and Procedure in the Trial of Charles I', *Law and History Review*, 22 (2004), pp. 1-25.

¹²⁰ Edward Vallance, 'The manuscript journals of the trial of Charles I: new evidence on their provenance and purpose', *Historical Research*, 94:264 (May 2021), p. 312; Trevor Brighton, 'Gell, Sir John, First Baronet (bap. 1593, d. 1671)', ODNB, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/10508>> [accessed 15 June 2015].

¹²¹ Jason Peacey, 'A Knowing but a Discrete Man': Scribal News and Information Management in Restoration England, *Parliamentary History*, 41 (February 2022), pp. 19-36.

¹²² DRO, *Gell Papers*, (D3287/44/4/6/1), 25 December 1648.

¹²³ *Gell Papers*, 25 December 1648.

Kelsey's view of this time period, that the ultimate function of the trial was an extended piece of negotiation.¹²⁴ At the turn of 1649 this view changed.

Apprehension took over during January. On 1 January 1649 Gell's informant confirmed that Charles was an 'immovable rock' against the demands of parliament.¹²⁵ On 4 January he conceded that 'they have a whole month to worke upon him with threats of deaths ... I am confident his M. will be ready to receive the croune of Martyrdome, rather then give away the Croune of England.'¹²⁶ This was the first reference to the Charles as a martyr and that Charles had made his choice not to bend to the will of parliament. On 11 January Lady Verney wrote to her son Ralph in exile that 'I doubt before this come to you our Kinge will be defunct, and it is feared the sword will govern the crowne'.¹²⁷ This came at the same time as the King's judges had instructed the prosecutors to prepare the case against the king.¹²⁸ The groundswell of fear of apprehension became palpable in personal sources as January continued. As asserted, many newsbooks and pamphlets began to argue for the king to be brought to justice. They used fear tactics to do this, and it would appear that public discourse had influenced the emotional communities that have started to form. On 18 January Lady Verney continued: 'The complexion of our confusion growes ... scaffolds are buildinge for the tryall ... It is almost every man's opinion that nothing will satisfies but his head.'¹²⁹ The journey from the trial as a negotiation tactic to the outright death of the king is viewed here in Lady Verney's opinion. The historian William Dugdale wrote to Simon D'ewes on 20 January: 'I now expect nothing but to heare of his death ... he will perform his part to admiration.' Dugdale also confirmed that he expected that in a short time that great changes would be produced.¹³⁰ The emotional community that formed in January is one of fear for the loss of the king and the stability he represented. John Greene also formed part of this emotional community. On 13 January he believed that:

¹²⁴ Kelsey, 'Death of Charles', p. 728.

¹²⁵ *Gell Papers*, 1 January 1649.

¹²⁶ *Gell Papers*, 4 January 1649.

¹²⁷ Verney, *Memoirs*, p. 396.

¹²⁸ Kelsey, 'Ordinance', p. 310.

¹²⁹ Verney, *Memoirs*, pp. 396-397.

¹³⁰ William Dugdale, *The Life, Diary, and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale*, ed. William Hamper (London: Printed for Harding, Lepard, and Co., 1827), p. 218.

We expect a speedy proceeding against the King and very great alterations in the foundations of our Government it is soe impossible to forsee what the event of these things is like to be ... which is now like a ship being tosst with an imperuous storm... we scarce know what to pray for.¹³¹

January 1649 was clearly a turning point. The world they knew was to be destroyed and the nation would now be adrift and with no clear path. The trial of the king was a clear focal point of this; as per Kelsey's argument, many saw the trial as part of the negotiation tactic, but as January continued this view changed. People began to acknowledge that the king would be killed.

John Worthington provided an acute emotional response to the regicide. He used emotionally charged language describing how hearts had ceased and the nation was in deep mourning. 'Jan 30. King Charles was beheaded. In sermon on lam i.12, When the crown of our head was fallen, then also the joy of our heart was ceased, & our dance was turned to mourning: For this our heart was faint, for these things our eyes were dim, as the prophet Jeremy complains in Lament ... When the father of our country, the anointed of the Lord, was taken, we were orphans, & fatherless'.¹³² His reference to Prophet Jeremiah compared Charles to a man who, due to his beliefs, was plotted against and even his people sought to kill him. He was later accused of being a false prophet and persecuted. We can see that Worthington used this comparison as he believed Charles had been persecuted for his views on the monarchy and that the people (possibly parliament) had been out to kill him. In print Charles was often presented as Babel, yet here he was referred to privately as Jeremiah, which is an interesting contrast.¹³³ Charles as Jeremiah was a victim to circumstance whereas Babel was used to present Charles as the key to law and order, who would be able to bring together these competing radical languages and views.

¹³¹ John Greene, 'The Diary of John Greene (1635-57)'. ed. E.M. Symonds. *The English Historical Review*, 43:171 (1929), pp. 385-394.

¹³² John Worthington, *The Diary and Correspondence of Dr John Worthington*, ed. James Crossley (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1968), p.31.

¹³³ J. Friedman, *Miracles and the Pulp Press during the English Revolution: The Battle of the Frogs and Fairford's flies* (London: UCL Press, 1993), p. 123.

These emotional communities were formed through the use of the same language used to express their reactions. William Sancroft and Ralph Josselin both described the act in the same emotional language. Sancroft, who would later become Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to his father on 10 February 1649: 'The black act is done, which all the world wonders at, and which an age cannot expiate. The waters of the ocean we swim in cannot wash out the spots of that blood, than which never any was shed with greater guilt.'¹³⁴ Sancroft is a curious figure as he represented a significant element of the population who did not agree with the killing of the king but never raised great public objection to it. He moved to Europe during the Interregnum and when he returned was close to the royal court.¹³⁵ Josselin shared this view: 'I was much troubled with the blacke providence of putting the King to death; my teares were not restrained at the passages about his death; the Lord in mercy it not as sinne to the charge of the kingdome.'¹³⁶ Josselin did not hear about the execution until 4 February but the theme of the black act and the kingdom being in danger was prominent in both accounts. Rosenwein has stated that in order to understand if an emotional community has been formed, you need to examine the material being produced.¹³⁷ In the personal sources of both Josselin and Sancroft, the common theme of 'the black act' as a description and reaction to the regicide provides evidence that an emotional community was being formed among those who viewed it as an 'evil' act done to the king.¹³⁸ William Sachse examined the use of the term 'black act' after regicide and into the Restoration, where it was used as a reference to the trial and wrongful execution of the king.¹³⁹ Josselin and Sancroft shared the same emotional reaction to this event despite not knowing each other and each hearing the news at separate times. The fact that they both condemned the act in the same terminology is illustrative of the formation of an emotional community.

¹³⁴ Sancroft, *William Sancroft*, p. 43.

¹³⁵ R. A. P. J. Beddard, 'Sancroft, William (1617–1693)', ODNB, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/24601>> [accessed 15 June 2015].

¹³⁶ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 63.

¹³⁷ Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, p. 3.

¹³⁸ William L. Sachse, 'England's "Black's Tribunal": An Analysis of the Regicide Court', *Journal of British Studies*, 12:2 (1973), pp. 69-85.

¹³⁹ Sachse, 'Black Tribunal', pp. 69-85.

There was a spectrum of emotional reactions to the regicide, and these did come into conflict with each other. Rosenwein has argued that emotional communities can also be in conflict. People do not tend to belong to one emotional community; therefore, communities can come into conflict, overlap, and finally cause friction. This confliction can be seen throughout the kingdom.¹⁴⁰ The Venetian Ambassador noted that 'lost both crown and life ... before all the people, without any one speaking in his favour.'¹⁴¹ Lady Verney referred to her sons attending a meeting for prayer on the morning of the execution and were made to attend the service in the Abbey 'to commemorate the Martyrdom of the blessed Charles I'.¹⁴² However, a school friend next door to her son was muttering 'Bloody Tyrant'.¹⁴³ These emotional communities could be found on both sides of the spectrum, those who did not agree with the act did not speak out against it and those who agreed with the event were not hanging out the bunting either. Emotional communities were being formed and came into conflict as people reacted differently to this event.

The influence of more public material on personal sources is illustrated by comments on the material printed about Charles after his death. *Eikon Basilike* was also referred to as the *King's Book* as many believed he had written it before his death. It had been ghost-written, but the aim of the book was to promote Charles as a martyr. John Paige was a London merchant who wrote many letters to friends and business associates. To his business associate Willam Clerke he wrote on 28 May that 'Our gracious king was beheaded ... to the disgrace of the nation and the undoing of the flourishing kingdom that was. I here send you a book called 'The King's Meditations' ... it is worth reading, I think as good lines as ever you beheld with your eyes.'¹⁴⁴ He also sent his colleague the whole narrative of the trial and his scaffold speech. As Josselin noted in his diary, communities spoke of the regicide and they also shared stories of the king and his performance, all of which helped to create the myth of Charles as a martyr.¹⁴⁵ Lady Verney also shared the view that Charles 'gave great vigour to the royalist cause, and the loyalty which it revived was stirred to

¹⁴⁰ Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, pp. 23-25; 199.

¹⁴¹ Razzell, *Contemporary Account*, Vol 4, p. 42.

¹⁴² Verney, *Memoirs*, p. 399.

¹⁴³ Verney, *Memoirs*, p. 399.

¹⁴⁴ *The Letters of John Paige, London Merchant, 1648-1658*, ed. George F. Steckley (London: London Record Society, 1984), p. 5.

¹⁴⁵ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 63.

enthusiasm by the publication of the *Eikon Basilike*.¹⁴⁶ She continued that in March the book had unsuccessfully been repressed and that it had ‘amazed the whole kingdome, to see soe much courage, Xstianity, and meekness in one man. The women ... are in mourning for him.’¹⁴⁷ The buying of the book can be viewed as an act of defiance and showing their support for the monarchy. Parliament forces had tried to suppress the printing of the book and failed. There was no public outlet for those who wanted to mourn the king’s death. Previously, monarch funerals had been great occasions with people lining the streets to pay their respects.¹⁴⁸ However, Charles’ funeral was performed in secret with a few selected mourners, and he was hastily buried at Windsor.¹⁴⁹ This was the first time since the death of Richard III that a reigning monarch had received no public funeral. As asserted by David Cressy, the seventeenth-century calendar was full of dates celebrating the monarchy, such as accession days, and the death of a monarch was of equal importance.¹⁵⁰ Therefore as there was no public display of grief for Charles, buying his book, reading it and then sharing with others can be seen as a way of people showing their respect.

iii - One year after the regicide

On the first anniversary of the regicide Thomas Hoyle, Alderman of York, apparently committed suicide for the part he played in the murderous act of regicide. On the face of it this suggests that emotional reactions to the regicide had a long legacy, even pushing a man to commit what would have been a violation against God and their soul. Suicide in the early modern period was ‘perceived variously as a desperate, Irrational and ungodly act’.¹⁵¹ It was a terrible crime and viewed as a form of murder. Michael Dalton deemed ‘it as an offence against God, against the King.’¹⁵² The concept of ‘good death’ was key to early modern thinking about the afterlife.

¹⁴⁶ Verney, *Memoirs*, p. 402.

¹⁴⁷ Verney, *Memoirs*, p. 402.

¹⁴⁸ Amy B Oberlin, ‘Share with Me in my Grief and Affliction’: Royal Sorrow and Public Mourning in Early Eighteenth-Century England *Share with Me in my Grief*, *Parergon*, 31:2 (2014), p. 110.

¹⁴⁹ Wedgwood, *Coffin for King Charles*, p. 54.

¹⁵⁰ David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989).

¹⁵¹ M. MacDonald and T.R. Murphy, *Sleepless Souls: Suicide in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 114.

¹⁵² M. Dalton, *The Country Justice: Containing the Practice, Duty and Power of the Justices of the Peace, as well in as out of Their Sessions* (London, 1626), p. 237.

The good death meant time for reflection and repentance against your sins and therefore suicide was the worst kind of death.¹⁵³

Thomas Hoyle was born around 1587 in Slaithwaite, West Riding and in 1611 married Elizabeth Maskewe. His mayoralty in 1632 was marked by efforts to set the city's poor to work and he was instrumental in establishing St Martin's, Micklegate, as a bastion of 'painful' protestantism.¹⁵⁴ In December 1642 he declared that unless the Earl of Essex acted more decisively the kingdom would be ruined.¹⁵⁵ He also emerged as a leading figure in the administration of the excise, customs and the navy and was an active member of the committees for revenue and compounding. In 1644 he was appointed treasurer remembrance in the exchequer (worth £1200 per annum), allegedly for his services to the war party.¹⁵⁶ In September 1648 he pronounced it 'utterly unsafe and dangerous' for parliament to make peace with the king and in October presented a petition from Yorkshire demanding that Charles be brought to justice.¹⁵⁷ He retained his seat at Pride's Purge, but apparently withdrew from the house until the autumn of 1649 and had no hand in the king's trial. He had been named on only eight committees in the Rump before the first anniversary of the regicide, 30 January 1650, when he hanged himself at Broad Sanctuary, his Westminster lodgings. He was buried two days later in St Margaret's, Westminster.¹⁵⁸ Despite not being involved in the trial, the timing of Hoyle's suicide led to rumours that he died of a guilty conscience.

In contemporary personal sources there is very little written about Hoyle and his death. Richard Smyth noted in his 'obituary' guide notable deaths during his lifetime. He recorded: 'Jan 30, Alderman Hoyle of York, hanged himself.'¹⁵⁹ Alice Thornton, who knew Hoyle through his role as Alderman of York, wrote about him in

¹⁵³ Elizabeth K. Hunter, 'Between the Bridge and the Brook', *Reformation and Renaissance Review*, 15:3 (2013), pp. 237-257.

¹⁵⁴ C. Cross, 'A Man of Conscience in Seventeenth-century Urban Politics: Alderman Hoyle of York' in *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-century England*, eds J. Morrill, P. Slack, and D. Woolf (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 205-24.

¹⁵⁵ BL, *Harley MS 164*, fol. 243.

¹⁵⁶ Clement Walker, *Anarchia Anglicana: Or, The History of Independency. With Observations Historicall and Politique Upon this Present Parliament, Begun Anno 16. Caroli Primi., Anno Domini 1640. Together with the Rise, Growth, and Practises of that Powerfull and Restlesse Faction*, Vol 1 (London, 1648) p. 14; BL, E463/19

¹⁵⁷ *The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England from the earliest times to the Restoration of Charles II*, Vol 17, (London: J. and R. Tonson, 1762-3), p. 435.

¹⁵⁸ *HOP, 1604-1629*, pp. 224-5

¹⁵⁹ Richard Smyth, *The Obituary of Richard Smyth, Secondary of the Poultry Compter*, London, ed. Richard Ellis (London: Printed for the Camden Society, 1849), p. 28.

her memoirs. She believed that he committed suicide because 'he saw the king follow him without a head' and said that 'I am damned for the blood of the king'.¹⁶⁰ Alice herself was a staunch royalist and it is not surprising that she believed that he was overcome with grief. John Shaw also referred to the death of Hoyle but unlike Alice denounced the link between the guilty conscience and the regicide. 'On which day the following year, and about the same however ... that the king suffered, Mr. Thomas Hoyle, alderman of Yorke... hanged himself in his chamber. He was well knowne to me ... before his death he grew excessively melancholy'.¹⁶¹ We can never know what led Hoyle to commit suicide. However, Shaw's use of 'melancholy' gives us a clue into contemporary understandings of mental health. Melancholy in the seventeenth century was beginning to be recognised as a serious condition. Robert Burton in *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1611) provided an overview of the justifications for suicide, suicide could be justified in the right circumstances.¹⁶² This was an attempt to explain why someone would commit self-murder. Hoyle had suffered great misfortune through the deaths of all but one of his thirteen children and his wife. There has been a range of recent research that has examined the longer-term emotional effects of trauma on an individual. The idea that traumatic memories could be repressed and then emerge once triggered. More recent research on PTSD has shown that those who encounter a traumatic event process this trauma through a dissociative response.¹⁶³ White noted that the word sadness in the early modern period meant 'an extremely dangerous illness that potentially might lead to suicide'.¹⁶⁴ In the examination of a range of soldiers' petitions Pells argued that the 'effects of grief were understood to be felt deeply, to the extent that death might be the result of those whose grief became excessive and all consuming'.¹⁶⁵ Claire Cross, in her assessment of Hoyle's life, suggests that his grief at the loss of his family, could

¹⁶⁰ Alice Thornton, *The Autobiography of Mrs Alice Thornton of East Newton, Co. York*, ed. Charles Jackson (Edinburgh: Surtees Society, 1875), p. 212.

¹⁶¹ J. Snow, 'The life of Master John Shaw'. *Yorkshire Diaries and Autobiographies in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, ed. C. Jackson (London: Spottiswoode & CO, 1877), pp. 146-7.

¹⁶² Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy: What it is, with all the kinds causes, symptomes, prognostickes, & severall cures of it. In three partitions, with their severall sections, members & subsections. Philosophically, medicinally, historically, opened & cut up* (Oxford, 1611).

¹⁶³ Kruger, Christa, 'Culture, trauma and dissociation: A broadening perspective for our field', *Journal of trauma and dissociation*, 21:1 (2020), pp. 1-12.

¹⁶⁴ R. S. White, 'Language of emotions', in *Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction* ed, Susan Broomhall (Florence: Taylor and Francis, 2016), p. 74-77.

¹⁶⁵ Ismini Pells, 'Soliciting sympathy: the search for psychological trauma in petitions from seventeenth-century maimed soldiers', in E. Peters and C. Richards, *Early Modern Trauma: Europe and the Atlantic World* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2021), pp. 129-150.

be the very reason why he committed suicide.¹⁶⁶ Shaw also confirmed that he was slandered into being called one of the regicides but he was in the eyes of Shaw a good man.¹⁶⁷

Those who killed themselves were often viewed as demonically possessed or insane. The easy explanation for Hoyle, at least for some, was that he went mad due to the perceived part he played in the regicide. This was a much more accessible reason than the loss he felt for his family. Hoyle would have been aware of the potential ramifications of suicide for himself and his surviving son John. If the coroner confirmed suicide, then law dictated that he should be buried profanely and away from consecrated grounds.¹⁶⁸ For instance, in 1664 John Johnson who 'hanged himself in Robin Hood Court in Shoe Lane and was carried into the field near Pinder of Wakefield (and buried) in the Kings highway'.¹⁶⁹ It has been estimated that 95 per cent of people who committed suicide between 1485-1660 were posthumously convicted.¹⁷⁰ Luckily for Hoyle the coroner deemed his case an accident and he was buried in St Margaret's, Westminster. The timing of his death, however, sparked rumours of profound guilt and shame.

The first anniversary of the regicide was a highly emotional event to staunch royalists. From January to March 1650 a new pamphlet genre emerged, which used suicide and conscience as a mechanism to undermine the Commonwealth. The case of Hoyle is central to the pamphlet called *Rebells Warning* which was quickly issued after Hoyle's death.¹⁷¹ The pamphlet portrays to be the suicide letter from Hoyle. He committed this act, it claims, due to his troubled conscience for his part in the regicide and that he signed up to the Oath of Engagement. He had been visited by the King, Strafford and Lord Capel, all men who were executed for the royalist cause. Capel himself on the scaffold gave this advice to his son 'I would not have you

¹⁶⁶ Cross, 'conscience', p. 222.

¹⁶⁷ Snow, 'John Shaw', pp. 146-7.

¹⁶⁸ MacDonald and Murphy, *Sleepless*, p. 15.

¹⁶⁹ LMA, P82/AND/A/010/MS06673/004, 22 April 1664

¹⁷⁰ MacDonald and Murphy, *Sleepless*, p. 16.

¹⁷¹ *The Rebells Warning-piece; being certaine rules and instructions left by Alderman Hoyle (a member of Parliament) being a Burgesse for York-shire, who hanged himself January 30 within half an hour after that day twelve-moneth he and his sectarian brethren had murdered their King. This seasonable caveat being written by his owne hand, was found lying by him in the chamber where he hanged himselfe. Also the sudden madnesse of Sheriff Wilson, a perjur'd relapsed, and apostate Alderman of the City of London, who was carried mad from Guild-hall, so soon as he had taken the new ingagement, and now desperatly seeketh to end his life. With a new epitaph on Alderman Hoyle, and a new ballad on the loathed life and sudden death of Sir Philip E. of Pembrok* (London, 1650), p. 2.

neglect any honourable and just occasion to serve the King ... I would have you engage yourself as I have ... out of conscience and of your duty.'¹⁷² Hoyle was an inversion of this noble rhetoric from Capel as Hoyle:

Who hang'd because he could not kill the King, What
difference is in Traytors, when in despaire, They'l hang before
the ACT, to end their feare.¹⁷³

Hoyle was a coward who was unable to come to terms with his actions and Capel had died in a noble way for his cause.

The pamphlet *Rebells Warning* brought together the three deaths of Philip Herbert, the Earl of Pembroke, Rowland Wilson, and Thomas Hoyle. Their connection, it claimed, was how their consciences and guilt pushed them into an early grave. The deaths of these men provided an opportunity for royalist writers to create a narrative linked to the regicide. The context here is important as Oliver Cromwell had just fought a successful campaign in Ireland and established himself as the leader of the Commonwealth. Charles Stuart had been crowned in Scotland but by the first anniversary of the regicide there had been no wide scale rebellion against the Commonwealth. The return of monarchy appeared very remote at this stage.

According to Lady Anne Clifford, her husband the Philip Herbert died on 23 January 1650 from a 'pestilential fever'.¹⁷⁴ However, according to a series of pamphlets he had died in torment due to his role in the king's death. Philip Herbert had a chequered past and had held the position of lord chamberlain under Charles I. However, he was not seen as one of Charles' key allies and began to drift towards the Parliamentary party. Pembroke was known for his violent temper and Anne his wife spoke of his behaviour as that of a 'lunatic'.¹⁷⁵ He was present at the Treaty of Uxbridge and in conversation with Edward Hyde in which he allegedly 'told him that there was never such a pack of knaves and villains as they who now governed in the parliament'.¹⁷⁶ Hyde felt that his adherence to parliament was guided principally by

¹⁷² HMC Twelfth Report, appendix part IX.

¹⁷³ *Rebells Warning-piece*, p. 2.

¹⁷⁴ Clifford, *Diaries*, p. 183.

¹⁷⁵ Clifford, *Diaries*, p. 175.

¹⁷⁶ Edward Hyde, *History of the Rebellion and Civil War in England begun in 1641*. Vol 2, Part 2 (Oxford: Theatre, 1807), p. 565.

fear of losing Wilton (his ancestral home) and a desire to be on the winning side. On 2 January 1649 Herbert was appointed to the High Court of Justice to try the king. However, he reportedly 'swore he loved not to meddle with businesses of life and death and (for his part) hee would neither speake against the ordinance nor consent to it.'¹⁷⁷ Much like Hoyle, Pembroke was not present at the trial and execution of Charles but was tainted by his association with it.

As a member of the nobility Herbert held a prominent public role, this meant that his death provided fodder for pamphlet writers and a continuation of conscience genre. *Thanksgiving for the Recovery of Philip, Earl of Pembroke* was written when Herbert first became ill and focused upon his character flaws: his foul temper, and his reputation for swearing. He had no real loyalty, it claimed, as he was happy to take any oath, 'I am a traytor, I have suffered switching'.¹⁷⁸ The Earl was not a loyal man and as suggested by Clarendon was mercenary. The pamphlet highlighted this by confirming that 'I am the ancientiest Earl in parliament & should be their head... tis a pity but they should be a body without a Head.'¹⁷⁹ More importantly 'Innocent bloud would trouble a parliament man's conscience, if he had any'.¹⁸⁰ This again highlighted how important a man's conscience was during a time of turmoil.

After Herbert's death, three pamphlets were published that provide an insight into how men who were at least associated with the regicide were portrayed in printed sources. *The Last Will & Testament* mocked Herbert through the goods he was leaving behind and whom he had bequeathed them to. Cromwell was to receive his best dogs as Cromwell's own dogs were so 'fierce, they're able to tear out the devils throat.'¹⁸¹ Henry Martin was to be given his best stone horse and Sir Henry Vane his cloake as it 'twill cover more knavery than foolery.'¹⁸² There is double mockery here, on the items themselves and the description but then to which

¹⁷⁷ *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, nos. 40–41, 26 Dec 1648–9 Jan 1649, p. 4.

¹⁷⁸ *A Thanksgiving for the Recovery of Philip, Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery. Who being lately admitted into the supreme authority of the nation a Knight for Berkshire; was unfortunately jeared into a pestilent-feaver, which after turn'd to the fowl disease, but by the skill of a state-emperick and Mrs. May his nurse is happily recovered: and desires a thanksgiving for the same, from the supreme authority, and all other well-affected to the nation. Taken verbatim from his own mouth, by Michael Oldsworth* (London, 1649), p. 3.

¹⁷⁹ *ibid*, p. 3.

¹⁸⁰ *ibid*, p. 3.

¹⁸¹ *The last VVill and Testament of Philip Herbert, burgesse for Bark-shire, vulgarly called Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, who dyed of foole-age, Jan 23, 1650 with his life and death, and severall legacies to the Parliament and council of state: also his elegy, taken verbatim in time of his sicknesse, and published to prevent false copies by Michael Oldsworth,*(London, 1650), p. 2.

¹⁸² *Last VVill and Testament*, p. 2.

Member of Parliament would receive said item. Cromwell had already trained fierce hounds, much like his army. Henry Vane, like Pembroke himself, needed to cover his knavery.

Rebells Warning and *Life & death of Philip Herbert* both follow Herbert on his journey into the next life. In *Rebells* he is mocked as 'Philip the crab-fish earl of pembrok' and that 'in his sickness dreamed he was in heaven, where he saw the king, who fell upon him and kick'd him out, asking him, what he made there?'¹⁸³ Herbert was positioned against the sainted king as a man who had not earned his place in heaven, all he deserved was to be mocked by the king whom he had helped to kill and to be sent to Hell. *Life & death of Philip Herbert* completed as a mock obituary to the earl, again followed the same tone as the previous pamphlets especially around his character. When Herbert meets Charon the ferryman of the dead, Charon referred to 'Pembroke, on our chief champions: For damning, sinking, swearing and cursing, all the inhabitants of Hell can hardly equal him'.¹⁸⁴ He was damned due to his character, as supported by comments which were made in the personal sources of his wife and Clarendon. The parting lines are 'A tragick park amongst those treachous knaves, Who spilt their sovereigns blood, made subjects slaves, If our of regicides were him there, Thrice happy, happy, then this England were.'¹⁸⁵

An alderman of London named Rowland Wilson also died in early 1650 and his death was linked to those of Hoyle and Pembroke through *Rebells Warning*. Bulstrode Whitelocke, who married Wilson's widow, confirmed that he died of a deep decline and had what was tantamount to a public funeral.¹⁸⁶ Whitelocke described how the funeral was attended by members of the counsel of state, many army officers and how all gave testimony of their affection for the gentleman. There were crowds who came to see the ceremony and Wilson was given full respect and

¹⁸³ *Rebells Warning*, p. 3.

¹⁸⁴ *The Life and Death of Philip Herbert, the late infamous knight of Barkshire, once Earle of Pembrock, Mounghomerie. Who departed from this life to another January 23 1649. Having, by a degenerate basenesse, betrayed his nobilitie; and entred himselfe a commoner, amongst the vere scum of the kingdom. Likewise a discourse with Charon in his voyage to Hell. With his araignement, tryall and condemnation, before the three judges, Æacus, Minos and Raddamanthus. Also the entertainment and welcome made by his brethren, Pym, Dorislaus, Raynsborough, with an ample testimonie of their rejoycing at his Lordships arivall* (London, 1650), p. 3.

¹⁸⁵ *Life and Death*, p. 5.

¹⁸⁶ Alfred Beaven, *The Aldermen of the City of London Temp. Henry III-1908: With Notes on the Parliamentary Representation of the City, the Aldermen and the Livery Companies, the Aldermanic Veto, Aldermanic Baronets and Knights* (London: E. Fisher Ltd, 1913), pp. 55-62; Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs: Or, an Historical Account of What Passed from the Beginning of the Reign of King Charles I, to King Charles II. His Happy Restauration* (London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1682), p. 398.

honour. Wilson's good character and reputation was then starkly compared by Whitelocke to John Bradshaw whom he was walking beside. He noted that 'some of the king's party cried out loud as we passed by them, there is Bradshaw, there is that rogue, that traitor, that condemned the king'.¹⁸⁷ Bradshaw was also hit a few times in this procession. Whitelocke positioned the noble Wilson who played no part in the regicide against Bradshaw the man who tried the king. The people, according to Whitelocke, could not forget or forgive this act. As Whitelocke had married Wilson's widow he would have had the motive to acknowledge his good characteristics and reputation. Whitelocke also provided a reason why he had died, it was not due to any guilt of conscience but because he had 'done gallant service' for the commonwealth and this active service was responsible for his death.

Rebells Warning states that 'Row Wilson, a perjur'd revolted alderman of London, so soon as he had taken the new ingagement fell desperately mad ... And now seeks ... to hang himself'.¹⁸⁸ Like Hoyle and Pembroke, his guilt had made him so mad to cause his death. Wilson had taken a much more active part in the Civil War than Pembroke and Hoyle, he had fought at Newbury and helped to capture Newport Pagnell. He retained his Commons seat after Pride's Purge and was named as one of the commissioners for Charles I's trial, yet he never attended the proceedings and refused to sign the death warrant.

Using suicide as a tool to undermine the commonwealth continued into the 1650s. Colonel Thomas Mince, who was part of Edward Whalley's regiment, had committed suicide in 1653 and a pamphlet which conveniently included his note was published. In his suicide note, he confessed that for the past nine years he had lived with evil spirits. This time began with the start of the Civil War, his confession was tantamount to confirming that 'evil spirits' had been responsible for the Civil War, regicide, and creation of the commonwealth.¹⁸⁹ It could have only been evil

¹⁸⁷ Bulstrode, Whitelocke. *Memoirs, Biographical and Historical, of Bulstrode Whitelocke*, ed. R.E. Whitelocke (London: Routledge, 1878), p. 282.

¹⁸⁸ *Rebells Warning*, p. 7.

¹⁸⁹ *The Troubled-spirited mans departing: or, a wonderful relation of the wilfull murder committed by Thomas Mince, late of Collonel Whaley's regiment, upon his own person, in the parish of Saint Giles Cripplegate, London, on Thursday the 17 of March. With the true copy of a letter written by his own hand, left with his wife immediatly before he committed the fact, directed, to all the saints of the most high God. Wherein he makes known unto them some reasons of his discontent & laboureth to justify the fact, with his strange opinions, the act of killing himself, and other things very observable, as they were proved upon oath before the coroners inquest on Friday the 18 of March* (London: Printed by John Clowes, 1653).

intentions that would have allowed these horrendous things to happen. This pamphlet genre continued with the more famous and researched cases of Sindercombe and Arthur Capel, Earl of Essex.¹⁹⁰ The genre is powerful as it works by undermining the individual in two ways, as already discussed committing suicide was an abhorrent act in the early modern period and then the perceived reasons for the self-murder, what had led them to do this. Both elements would be powerful in that they would on one hand commit this crime but were forced into this act due to their own actions.

What was the aim of these pamphlets? The pamphlets sought to cast major doubt on those who had supported the regicide and the new regime. To provoke an emotional reaction from the readers: these men were guilty and died due to their troubled conscience. A year on the regicide was a mistake. Without a suicide note, Hoyle's death was forever linked to the regicide: he did kill himself a year after the event and therefore links between the two events were made. The importance of Hoyle is not the reason for his suicide but that in both public and personal sources it was assumed his conscience could not allow him to live after the regicide. The appeal of these pamphlets would have been gossip; they provided an insight into some prominent figures and their actions. They provided titillation in how educated men at higher levels in society were fallible and could give into weakness. This was not deviant behaviour but the corruption of good men. These good men who had held important roles from alderman, colonels and nobles could be corrupted into playing a part in the regicide. The new regime had looked to build a reputation for themselves based on rational argument so they could be trusted. These pamphlets looked to counter this through a focus on how the regicide still held emotional power a year after.

The examples of Hoyle, Pembroke and Wilson illustrate how the regicide was not easily forgotten. These three men were not the most prominent who pushed for

¹⁹⁰ Anon, *Great News from the Tower, or, A True and perfect relation of the dreadful end of the Earl of Essex lately committed prisoner to the Tower, an account of the horrid phanatical plot against His Sacred Majesty, His Royal Highness and all lovers of monarchy, giving an account how he was found murdered in the tower about ten of the clock this instant Friday the thirteenth of July, 1683* (London, 1683); Robert Ferguson, *An enquiry into and detection of the barbarous murder of the late Earl of Essex, or, A vindication of that noble person from the guilt and infamy of having destroy'd himself* (London, 1683); Anon, *A True Narrative of the Bloody Murder of the Earl of Essex upon himself being now Prisoner in the Tower* (London, 1683) as examples.

the regicide, yet they were tarnished with this act and were used in printed material as men who had died due to their conscience. Personal sources indicate a different picture that is one of pragmatism, after the initial shock of the regicide many returned to their normal routines. The regicide may have been an act that many did not call for, however, it had happened, and the clock could not be turned back. For many, the choice would have been to rebel against the Commonwealth and feel the consequences or submit to the new order. For many, the path of least resistance was the path they chose.

iv - Conclusion

William Reddy argued that 'emotional control is the real site of the exercise of power'.¹⁹¹ As explored in this chapter, both royalist and parliamentary writers looked to establish and control emotional responses before and after the regicide. Government supporters, through newsbooks and pamphlets, aimed to control the printed word and legitimise the new regime. They began to set the narrative in newsbooks such as *The Moderate* from November 1648 to create a sense of fear that Charles needed to be brought to justice, if not the war and bloodshed would continue. People had been fighting for seven years and the fear that Charles represented ongoing conflict was a powerful image. Sean Kelsey has analysed the new regime's attempts to establish themselves after the regicide, using official documents such as writs and coinage to control the new image of the Commonwealth. The sole aim of these official items was to gain support and provide an alternative and legitimate government.¹⁹² However, as argued by Reddy, to control and maintain an emotional regime they needed to engulf all modes of culture; the new regime failed to do this. By limiting their engagement with certain modes of public discourse they failed to foster and maintain supportive public opinion. The Rump's propaganda campaign proved unsuccessful.¹⁹³

Initially, the royalists were able to use wit and rhyming verses through newsbooks to remain defiant in the face of the death of the king. In late 1648 they

¹⁹¹ Reddy, *Feeling*, p. 169; Ahmed, *Cultural*; Barbara Rosenwein, 'Worrying about Emotions in History', *The American Historical Review*, 107:3 (2002), pp. 821-45.

¹⁹² Sean Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic: The Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649-1653* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997); Sarah Barber, *Regicide and Republicanism: Politics and Ethics in the English revolution, 1646-1659* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998).

¹⁹³ Peacey, 'Reporting a Revolution', pp. 161-80.

evoked fears and anxiety by suggesting that the king would be killed. The death of Charles meant that the nation would end in ruins, they argued; the death of the king meant the death of England. By projecting Charles as a stabilising figure, they manipulated his image to suit their narrative. Although by the end of 1649 only two royalist newsbooks survived, in the first months after the regicide they were able to create an emotional regime that countered the Rump's rational self-defence. We can also identify an arc of emotions in royalist printed works, where defiance turned to mourning and self-reflection. Royalist newsbooks remained defiant, but growing tensions and emotional conflict created two emotional communities. In pamphlets, self-reflection and mourning were the primary emotion. Again, with Charles as martyr at the heart of their programme, royalists were able to control an emotional response to the regicide. Through use of the printed word and oral traditions to maintain a view of Charles as martyr and that God's judgement was on their side. Emotions presents a new perspective on power and authority, and the formation of identities.

The deep emotions evident in personal sources quickly became shaped by the emotional regimes as described above. This chapter has tried to move the current historiography forward by looking at the reactions to the regicide, as much of the recent work by post-revisionists has focused upon the experience of living through the Civil War and how experience linked to radicalism and creativity.¹⁹⁴ Up to now, the history of emotions and the emotional response to these events has not been explored.¹⁹⁵ The emotional response allows us to explore this chapter in English history through a different lens.

¹⁹⁴ Michael Braddick, 'Mobilisation, Anxiety and Creativity in England during the 1640s', in *Liberty, Authority, Formality: Political Ideas and Culture, 1600-1900*, eds. J. Morrow and J. Scott (Exeter, Exeter University Press, 2008) pp. 175-193.

¹⁹⁵ Hunt, *First hand and Bennett, Experienced*.

Chapter 2 - Politics and the Regicide during the Restoration

Let us look forward, and not backward; and never think of
what is past, except Men put us in mind of it, by repeating
faults we had forgot.¹

So spoke Charles II to the House of Lords as he urged them to not look back at the last twenty years of division. When Charles II ascended the throne in 1660 there had been decades of turmoil.² He was presented with a difficult political situation as he had men who held prominent positions in the Commonwealth regime to thank for the Restoration rather than those who had remained loyal to the Stuart monarchy. For men like Monck, it would be convenient to forget their loyalty to the Commonwealth. For those who had remained loyal to the Stuarts the tables had turned, and, for some, revenge was sought. Charles II was faced with the balancing act of competing impulses of retribution and the need to move forward. How Charles would position himself in this tension would reveal the man beneath the Merrie Monarch. Tim Harris commented that 'Restoration England was a society that desperately wanted to be able to forget its past, but which forever remained haunted by it'.³ This chapter will examine a condensed period of politics around the Restoration to show how the regicide was moulded to legitimise Charles II's rule. In both public and personal sources, the new Restoration regime looked to reinterpret the previous decades and the regicide of Charles I. Charles II attempted to use the tactics of emotional governance to control perceptions of the Restoration, his relationship with his father and his right to govern. He used commemoration to sustain this emotional response through memorial days and his own coronation, where the regicide was remembered and used as a warning against rebellion. Ultimately looking to control what people did with their memory of the regicide.

The chapter will also explore how these tensions were navigated by a range of people who had supported the interregnum regimes and their attempts to use printed material to absolve themselves of any role in the regicide. The themes of collaboration and guilt will be examined. How men who held prominent positions

¹ *JHL*, Vol 11, pp. 169-170.

² Peters, *Commemoration*, p. 3.

³ Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685* (London: Allen Lane, 2005), p. 12.

during the interregnum reacted to the Restoration of the monarchy is telling. The sin and blood guilt of the regicide came to the fore during this intense period, men such as aldermen and judges were seen as collaborators who had allowed the regicide to take place. The chapter will examine how these prominent men used public sources to denounce the regicide even though they had ‘collaborated’ with the republican regimes. In Scotland one man, the Earl of Argyll had been positioned as the lead collaborator and the need for retribution would lead to his death. The regicide became a shared common language in political discourse.

i - Charles II and use of Emotional Governance

Barry Richards has looked at how modern regimes have used emotional governance to influence mass populations.⁴ Richards defined emotional governance as a ‘deliberate and sophisticated attention, through mass-mediated communications, to the emotional dynamics of the public.’⁵ Through emotional governance politicians and the media create a concerted long-term emotional reaction to an issue. For example, in the war on terror in the early twenty first century, Tony Blair and George W. Bush used their media engagements to focus on the danger presented by terrorist leaders such as Osama Bin Laden. The media reported these fears in their outlets and fuelled the concerns of the public. It was a hearts and minds operation and attempted to cultivate and control the public perception on a particular issue. Using Richards’ framework, the focus of this chapter will be to identify how Charles II used these tactics to create emotional governance around the regicide.

Richards outlines three elements that need to happen to create emotional governance. Firstly, an event needs to happen that can provoke an emotional response, as seen in the outpouring of grief following Princess Diana’s death in 1997. This spark was not just her untimely death but the way she died, hounded by the press. The next element that influences public feeling is statements from public figures. Continuing with the Diana example, the terminology used by Prime Minister Tony Blair’s initial statement following her death, where he called her ‘princess of

⁴ Richards, *Governance*, p. 1.

⁵ Richards, *Governance*, p. 5.

our hearts', was used throughout different mediums, including flower tributes and cards left by the mourners. *The Observer* reflected the way Buckingham Palace's failure to articulate the 'public grief' that followed the death of Diana 'left the Queen looking dangerously out of touch'. Blair, according to this verdict, saved the day with an emotional tribute, in a way which was 'the first example of his gift for capturing the national mood'.⁶ Certainly, Blair's tribute anticipated and shaped the dominant media representation of the popular reaction as one characterised by unity and intense adulation for Diana.⁷ As such, the Queen eventually broke convention and used the media to publicly illustrate that she understood the mood of the nation. The final step of Richards' framework is mediations: the input from the media. What is being created and published? What narratives do we see being created in the media? For Princess Diana her narrative was a romanticised princess who was compassionate and ground-breaking, who had torn down the rigidity of the monarchy. How does the burgeoning media in the Restoration period position both Charles II and the regicide?

The last decade has seen a surge in studies of the contested memories surrounding the Civil Wars and Interregnum.⁸ Matthew Neufeld's work provides a thorough examination of the contested legacy of the Civil Wars, as they were fought over in print from the Restoration of monarchy in 1660 to the end of the reign of Queen Anne.⁹ Neufeld scrutinised a variety of sources ranging from 'official' printed histories to the manuscript petitions of disabled Royalist soldiers. An important aspect of the book's argument is that this public remembering of the conflict was not concerned with fighting the Civil Wars anew in different party uniforms, but rather with justifying or undermining the Restoration settlement itself.¹⁰ Edward Legon, following in the footsteps of Neufeld's research, charts the 1660's landscape of seditious memories and how these illustrate more than just alehouse chatter. By looking through a range of materials, such as authorised histories to court hearings,

⁶ James Thomas (with revisions by Elizabeth Barry), 'From People Power to Mass hysteria Media and Popular Reactions to the Death of Princess Diana', *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 11:3 (2008), pp. 362-376.

⁷ Thomas, 'From People Power', pp. 362-376.

⁸ This includes Peters, *Commemoration*; Legon, *Revolution*; Imogen Peck, *Recollection in the Republics: Memories of the British Civil Wars in England, 1649-1659* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).

⁹ Neufeld, *Public Remembering*.

¹⁰ Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, p. 85. There has been much written about contested memories. This chapter is not about this but the way in which Charles II and his regime used the regicide in creating a narrative during the Restoration.

he unearthed those who resisted attempts of government control and censorship. Legon briefly assessed the regicide through the indifference of those towards commemorating the anniversary. He did not examine the role the regicide itself played within the contested memories of the Civil Wars.¹¹ Erin Peters sought to uncover the ways in which the Restoration regime and its supporters navigated the tension of commemoration and forgetting. She did so by focusing on the various attempts to use printed materials to prescribe which aspects of the recent past should be remembered and which were best consigned to oblivion.¹² However, Peters' research is based solely on Royalist print and therefore has little consideration for alternative narratives. By using Richard's framework, we can better understand how memories of the regicide were leveraged in public discourse as Charles II's regime sought to establish its rule.

To examine and understand how Charles II looked to cultivate emotional governance we need to analyse Richards' framework. The 'event', to imitate Richards' terminology, was the restoration of Charles and the Stuart monarch over the three kingdoms. It was not the regicide as that had happened 11 years before but the Restoration as the event that vindicated of the Stuart line: 'Miraculous Restoration of the crown ... no nation under heaven can ever be so happy.'¹³ On 1 May 1660 Charles Stuart was formally proclaimed King of England, Scotland, and Ireland. According to David Ogg, with the Restoration came a general feeling of thankfulness that the age of experiment and anarchy was over.¹⁴ Many historians, from Ronald Hutton to John Miller, attest to the general initial response to the Restoration was one of relief and celebration. Bonfires were seen as the symbol of this response.¹⁵ However, the Restoration created a multitude of emotional responses. Those who had supported the Stuart monarchy throughout the Civil Wars were hopeful for the new regime; some who were close to the commonwealth

¹¹ Legon, *Revolution*.

¹² Peters, *Commemoration*, p. 33.

¹³ Edward Hyde, *History of the Rebellion and Civil War in England begun in 1641*, Vol 3, Part 3 (Oxford: Theatre, 1807), p. 773.

¹⁴ David Ogg, *England in the Reign of Charles II* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956).

¹⁵ There has been much written concerning the joy of the people at the Restoration, this chapter will not explore how genuine this is. Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); Jenny Uglow, *A Gambling Man: Charles II's Restoration Game* (London: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009); John Miller, *After the Civil Wars: Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Harlow: Longman, 2000); Antonia Fraser, *King Charles II* (London: Book Club Associates, 1979).

government were concerned about their own future; many wanted stability in whatever form that took. The hope for impending peace was repeatedly stressed in printed media in the early 1660s. The Restoration itself, 'setling without blood the three great nations', was positioned in stark contrast to the bloody Civil Wars.¹⁶ The return of Charles was depicted as the sole way of achieving an end to the past 20 years of turmoil. One facet of the Restoration was how Charles II tried to harness his own emotional response to the regicide, which others could imitate. The Restoration was the ultimate Stuart vindication: Charles's return was the symbol of justice set against the unlawful regicide. Only Charles' return meant stability and justice. A single sheet ballad illustrated this point:

For so long as there is one of the Race of Stuarts (which God
long preserve) ... we must never look for peace or plenty, but
... always live in a posture of war and ever expect Foreign
Nations to come in, and swallow us up, who account it (and
indeed it is) the greatest piece of justice under the sun, to
revenge (with our Bloods, and utter destruction) the bloody
murder of Charles the first, and the unnatural Banishment of
Charles the second, our only lawful sovereign.¹⁷

Charles II's reaction had changed over the 11 years from the death of his father to his own Restoration. This is not surprising, for as we saw in the first chapter the regicide did provoke an immediate emotional response. Charles' initial reaction however was very different to the emotional tenor that would be seen in the Declaration of Breda (1660). We gain some insight into his initial response in two letters written at the time. On 17 July 1648 he wrote to the mayor of Kingston upon Hull to beg the restoration of the 'King our royal father to his liberty ... redeeming of the whole kingdom for those heavy pressures which now lie upon it'.¹⁸ On 13 January 1649 writing to General Fairfax he begged to know what was happening to his father and to prevent the 'taking his life: the mere thought of which seems so horrible and incredible'.¹⁹ What was more expressive was the blank sheet of paper at the bottom

¹⁶ J.G.B., *Royall Poems Presented to King Charles II* (London, 1660).

¹⁷ *Englands Redemption: or, A path Way to Peace: Plainly Demonstrating, that we shall never have any settled state, until Charles II (Whose Right It Is) enjoy the crown* (London: printed for Charles King, 1660), p. 6.

¹⁸ Arthur Bryant, *The Letters, Speeches, and Declarations of King Charles II* (London: Cassell, 1935) p. 5.

¹⁹ Bryant, *Letters*, p. 7.

of the letter to Fairfax which had Charles' signature at the foot. This left room for the parliamentarian leaders to complete it with their terms to release Charles. The appeal was in vain. Charles II used printed material to petition for his father too. Just before the regicide in 1649 he produced a pamphlet called *A Fountain of loyal tears*. This included an introduction from Charles urging his readers to use the enclosed prayers to help bring about the destruction of his enemies and the Restoration of his father. The prayer asked for loyal and obedient hearts and to give him strength that he would regain his rights and enjoy a prosperous reign.²⁰ He was positioned as the pious son concerned for his father. The prayers for his father could not protect him and as soon as the axe fell Charles used print to communicate his reaction. *The Declaration and Resolution of His Highnesse the Prince of Wales* lamented 'I cannot excuse those who falsely accused my father whose blood can't be washed out of their souls'.²¹ Charles used emotional language to denounce those who committed this horrid act. He decried their 'cruelty in imprisoning him' and 'their audassioness in bringing him to unjust tryall' and in their 'barbousness in condemning him'.²² 'It was sufficiently knowne, that my royall father ... was always willing and active to subscribe and consdescend to anything conducing to the peace of welfare of the Kingdome.'²³ For Charles his father was the injured party. 'Did not they promise to make my royall Father a glorious King, whom they have inhumanely murdered with new borne authority.' The declaration carefully crafted the image of his father as a just and kindly king. It ends with a promise from Charles that 'I am free from the thoughts of inducing any tyrinical or arbitrary government' and 'hopes that 'god would prosper our designs' and be in a 'land in peace and unmolested tranquility.'²⁴ Through the regicide Charles had positioned himself as the natural successor, a clear juxtaposition to those now in power.

Prince Charles had left England in 1646 and needed to reintroduce himself to his potential new subjects. He was quick to harness fatherhood as an emotional

²⁰ Charles Stuart, *A Fountain of Loyal Tears Poured Forth by A Sorrowful Son, for the Untimely Death of his Royal Father Being a Form of Prayer to be used by all those that yet Retain a spark of Religion to God, or Loyalty to their Prince: Recommended by King Charles the II, to be used by all His Faithful Subjects throughout his Dominions, in these times of War, Sicknesse, Famine, Trouble, and Adversity* (Paris, 1649).

²¹ Charles Stuart, *The Declaration and Resolution of His Highnesse the Prince of Wales, upon the death of his Royall Father* (1649).

²² Stuart, *Declaration*, pp. 1-2.

²³ Ibid, p. 3.

²⁴ Ibid, pp. 1;3.

tactic within public sources. The relationship signalled Charles II as the rightful heir and a man who had the key character traits to lead the divided country. The symbols of political fatherhood were crucial in European monarchies. The court was a major theatre of power in medieval and early modern states, and royal families figured prominently, indeed centrally, in courtly drama. James I of England and VI of Scotland was not the first or last monarch to write on this topic, but he was particularly prolific in print and passionate about his paternal ruling role. In *Basilikon Doron*, James I describes himself as a 'nourish father' who succors his subjects with 'nourish milke'.²⁵ In his work *Trew Law of Free Monarchies* he held up kings as nurturing fathers. 'And as the Father of his fatherly duty is bound to care for the nourishing, education and vertuous gouernment of his children; euen so is the king bound to care for all his subjects'.²⁶ Rachel Trubowitz has argued that James I, Charles I and Oliver Cromwell all used the nurturing father as a trope in their writings, speeches and portraiture. For Trubowitz James I utilised this image of a nursing father, as he then appropriates the nourishment, love, and charity attributed to the new nursing mother and extends them to his subjects.²⁷ Although nurturing father was an image used throughout Europe there was a particular story that the Stuart monarch had created here. *Eikon Basilike* highlighted the noble sacrifices Charles I had made in his reign to nourish and care for his subjects. He remained their Christ-like nursing father, despite his own terrible afflictions. He was a self-sacrificing martyr, who remained wholly devoted to 'my own children's interests'; he sought only to 'preserve the love and welfare of my subjects'.²⁸ Thomas Herbert's memoirs and *Eikon Basilike* helped to position Charles I as a devoted father. As Erin Peters has argued, 'the mythologisation of Charles I ... was an important part of the Restoration' and that 'it was put to use repeatedly to gain support for the return of Charles II'.²⁹ Charles II had to balance being a good son, looking to exact revenge but also that of a just king.

²⁵ C.H. McIlwain, *The Political Works of James I* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918), p. 24; James Stuart, *Basilikon Doron, or, King James's instructions to his dearest sonne, Henry the Prince* (London, 1603).

²⁶ Christopher Durston, *James I* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 138.

²⁷ Rachel Trubowitz, 'Nursing Fathers and National Identity: James I, Charles I, Cromwell and Milton.' In *Nation and Nurture in Seventeenth-Century English Literature*, ed. Rachel Trubowitz (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) pp. 94-146.

²⁸ *Eikon Basilike: The portraiture of his Majesty King Charles 1st* (London: D. Stewart, 1879), p. 4.

²⁹ Peters, *Commemoration*, p. 70.

Before and throughout the Restoration Charles II continued to use printed material to signal his intention for his new kingdom. His early public declarations make explicit and implied references to the regicide. As the Restoration began to look more likely his declarations took a conciliatory note and differed greatly to his written word immediately after the regicide. At this time Charles used these printed sources as a negotiation tactic; he wanted to present himself to his new kingdom and illustrate his credential as potential ruler. This is evident in a pamphlet published on 26 March 1660 titled *Speech to six eminent persons*. 'Though the innocent blood of our Royal Father is a great grief to Our Self, yet the desire of Revenge is so Far from Our Heart.'³⁰ Charles made the loss of his father a personal one. He again used emotional language such as innocent and grief to provoke a reaction and position himself as a just leader. This narrative continued in his next public declaration published on 30 March 1660. It confirmed that 'we do hereby offer a free pardon and indemnity to all such of Our Loving subjects'.³¹ Charles promised to be a loving and magnanimous king who wanted to move past the actions of the past eleven years and create a new future for his three kingdoms.

During the tense months of early 1660 Charles faced the challenge of harnessing and managing emotions to provide surety of what his restored monarchy would stand for. The official proclamation of Charles' intention came in the form of the *Declaration of Breda* on 4 April 1660. The 'Declaration of Breda was a beautiful package: it seemed to contain something for everyone'.³² Charles continued with his consolatory approach as he promised a general pardon for crimes committed during the English Civil War and the Interregnum for all those who recognised Charles as the lawful king.³³ The declaration confirmed that 'no crime whatsoever, committed against us or our royal father before the publication of this, shall ever rise in judgement.'³⁴ The declaration presented Charles as the rightful heir to the crown of the three kingdoms but through the use of the regicide positioned himself as a considered ruler who wanted to heal the wounds caused by the Civil War. The

³⁰ *King Charles his Speech to the Six Eminent Persons vvho lately arrived at Brussels, to Treat vvith his Majesty touching his Restoration to the Royal Throne and Dignity of his Father* (Antwerp, 1660), p. 1.

³¹ *The Kings Declaration to all his Loving Subjects* (London, 1660).

³² Barry Williams, *Elusive Settlement* (London: Nelson Thornes Ltd, 1984), p. 115.

³³ Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 12.

³⁴ *King Charles II his Declaration to all his Loving Subjects of the Kingdom of England. Dated from his Court at Breda in Holland, the 4/14 of April 1660* (London, 1660).

declaration was Charles' public face to his new subjects; this was his manifesto. The regicide was not omitted but was used to calm any concerns of those who had fought on the side of parliament and to create an impression of the character of the new king. As will be seen with pamphlets produced at this time, authors were quick to create a character profile of Charles as he had been absent for 14 years.

Charles II continued to utilise printed material to position himself as a grieving son who would heal the wounds of the nation. The relationship between Charles II and his father was key to this positioning. Philippe Ariès argued that the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries witnessed a radical transformation in the institutional function of the family and the relations between parents and children. The family, Ariès maintains, 'ceased to be simply an institution for the transmission of a name and an estate, it assumed a moral and spiritual function: it moulded bodies and souls.'³⁵ For Ariès, the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries represent that threshold moment when the family became modern and familial ties were much more than just transmitting your name. As Heal and Holmes have articulated, as children moved into adulthood their relationships with their parents changed. The most important relationship between father and heir was paramount.³⁶ Fathers expected their sons to devote themselves loyally to the interests that they defined as central for the family. James I argued that the optimal way for a king to command the love of his subjects was to protect and enshrine the legacies of his predecessors. So crucial was it for a monarch to safeguard the sacred memory of his parents that he wrote on the king's dual role as both judge and lawgiver. James ranked 'the false and unrepentant writing or speaking of malicious men against your Parents and Predecessors' as chief among 'unpardonable crimes'.³⁷ The continuity and legitimacy of the royal family formed the bedrock of power relations and underwrote the stability of rule itself. For a monarch, sustaining these images and relations of rule entailed being seen to subsume and control the royal family-household and, by metaphorical extension, the entire kingdom or empire. The promotion of Charles II as the father of the country had cast him as the embodiment

³⁵ Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*, translated by Robert Baldick (New York: Random House, 1962), p. 142.

³⁶ Clive Holmes and Felicity Heal, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), p. 81.

³⁷ C.H. McIlwain, *The Political Works of James I* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918), p. 24.

of his father. That Charles II had taken his father's role positioned him within his Stuart past. As Jonathan Sawday has shown, 'the father figure killed in 1649 by the English people reemerges unsullied in 1660. Charles I and Charles II become one.'³⁸

On 6 June a proclamation regarding the regicides was announced. It confirmed that those who had signed the death warrant of Charles I had committed the 'most horrid and execrable treason ... against life, crown and dignity of Our Late Royal Father'.³⁹ It then listed the names of these wicked men. Although Charles had proclaimed tolerance, killing his father was an act that he was unable to truly forgive. As chief advisor it had been assumed that this act was written by Edward Hyde (later Earl of Clarendon), that all who had been immediately concerned in his father's death should be punished, and even while at a disadvantage, while professing pardon and favour to many, he had constantly excepted the regicides. As we will see below, Charles II had a hand in the creation of this Act. Once Charles was restored to the throne, on his behalf Hyde steered the Indemnity and Oblivion Act through parliament. The act pardoned most who had sided with parliament during the Civil War, except the regicides, two prominent unrepentant republicans, John Lambert and Henry Vane the Younger, and around another twenty who were forbidden to take any public office or sit in parliament.⁴⁰

Forgiveness was formalised in the Act of Indemnity which became law on 29 August. As Charles balanced his roles as king of the nation and son of a martyr, this act is an example of how those who collaborated with the Commonwealth would be forgiven apart from the regicides. We can see this in Charles's letters. Writing to his brother-in-law the Prince of Orange in April 1650, 'I am willing ... to consent to free act of oblivion and indemnity In the Kingdom of Scotland (excepting only ...murderers of the late sovereign)'.⁴¹ Charles wrote this in hope of securing the Scottish throne, but it was a clear indication that ten years before he was restored he understood the importance of forgiveness; with upholding the Stuart family honour as the new royal head. This was reaffirmed in a letter to his brother the Duke of York in July 1659: 'I shall offer a pardon to all men, except only those who sat actually

³⁸ Jonathan Sawday, 'Re-Writing a Revolution: History, Symbol and text in the Restoration', *The Seventeenth Century*, 7:2 (1992), pp. 171-199.

³⁹ Bryant, *Letters*, p. 31.

⁴⁰ *CJ*, Vol 8, pp. 138-42.

⁴¹ Bryant, *Letters*, p. 16.

upon the murder of our father and voted for it.’⁴² Clarendon reminded the House of Lords in September 1660 that Charles II ‘hath given us noble and princely example by opening and stretching his Arms to all who are worthy to be His subjects ... to find all His subjects at once in His Arms’.⁴³ Hyde noted in his memoirs that when he and Charles had discussed the Act of Indemnity Charles was clear that it was to be issued to all who had taken part against the monarchy except, the regicides. Hyde remarked that the king’s tone changed when they discussed the regicides from the businessman like debate to one of high and majestic authority: ‘it is not consistent with my honour nor my conscience’, he said, ‘that those who have condemned my father to be murdered should be removed from this act of pardon.’⁴⁴ In this act Charles had positioned himself as the natural healer of the nation, even if natural honour required him to vindicate his father.

The second element of Richards’ framework is communications from public figures and the next section will look at how Charles II used commemoration as public communications to his new kingdom. On 25 January 1661 Charles had a proclamation published establishing 30 January as a day to commemorate his father. Much like with the Declaration of Breda Charles was asserting emotional governance through this commemoration; he was strategically linking the Restoration to the death of his father. The two events were interlinked, of course: his father had been murdered and he had only been restored to the throne due to the nature of his father’s death. Through annual commemoration Charles II wanted to ensure that the day of the regicide was ingrained in the psyche of his public. The proclamation confirmed that:

That the execrable murder of Our Royal Father CHARLES the First, of ever Blessed and Glorious Memory, hath been committed by a Party of wretched men, desperately wicked and hardened in their Impiety, who having first plotted and contrived the ruine and destruction of this Excellent Monarchy.⁴⁵

⁴² Bryant, *Letters*, p. 19.

⁴³ *JHL*, Vol 11, pp. 169-170.

⁴⁴ Hyde, *History*, Vol 3, Part 2, p. 366.

⁴⁵ Bryant, *Letters*, p. 21.

The proclamation outlined the horrors that had been committed during the Civil Wars. The regicide was, for the people of England, the most insupportable shame and infamy.

To redeem for these sins the thirtieth day of January should be for ever thereafter set apart to be kept and observed, as an anniversary day of Fasting and Humiliation. To implore the Mercy of God, that neither the guilt of that Sacred and Innocent Blood, nor those other sins by which God was provoked to deliver up both them and their King into the hands of cruel and unreasonable men.⁴⁶

By marking this day Charles and his regime were creating a new vision and narrative concerning the regicide. David Cressy has demonstrated that there was an increase in the level of attention paid to important anniversaries during the seventeenth century; the new regime was keen to harness this.⁴⁷

Historians have often noted Charles II's shrewd understanding of the power of ceremony, which he used effectively across his reign. This was evident on his return to London.⁴⁸ His procession took him around the city where he made one of his last stops at the Palace of Whitehall and proceeded to address the assembled members of parliament before engaging in a feast at Banqueting House.⁴⁹ The feast was the final celebration of the day, and it would not have gone unnoticed that this was the same building where the regicide had taken place. Clement Walker, in his *The History of Independency*, noted that when Charles arrived at Banqueting House 'it struck an expression of grief into his sacred heart ... as almost burst forth'.⁵⁰ Where one monarch was removed of his kingly right by the sword, the other regained it. The Banqueting House, as Anna Keay has noticed, remained a public forum for Charles to exhibit his kingly powers through touching the King's evil ceremonies. In 1649 he touched eleven people in Jersey and just before his return to

⁴⁶ Danby Pickering, *The Statutes at Large from the Thirty-Ninth Year of Queen Elizabeth, to the Twelve Year of King Charles II Inclusive*, Vol. 7 (Cambridge, 1763), p. 492.

⁴⁷ David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989).

⁴⁸ Anna Keay, *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* (London: Continuum, 2008).

⁴⁹ *CSPD*, 1660-1661, p. 7.

⁵⁰ Clement Walker, *Anarchia Anglicana: Or, The History of Independency. With Observations Historicall and Politique Upon this Present Parliament, Begun Anno 16. Caroli Primi., Anno Domini 1640. Together with the Rise, Growth, and Practises of that Powerfull and Restlesse Faction*, Vol 1 (London, 1648), p. 107.

England he held three days of healing at the Hague.⁵¹ Within a month of returning he held mass healing ceremonies at the Banqueting House. According to Keay in 1660 he touched almost 7,000 subjects.⁵² These mass ceremonies were noted in both the diaries of Rugg and Pepys and showed the king in his full glory as a man physically healing his subjects after just healing the nation with his return.⁵³ To substantiate the semi-divine nature of kingship, Charles spent two June days touching nearly a thousand sufferers from scrofula, who were presented with gold pendants and assurances of miraculous recovery. The court ceremonial of Charles I was resumed.⁵⁴ Early modern courts were theatres for rituals of monarchical power. Charles II used the king's touch to exert divine right monarchy at the place where his father had been killed.

ii - Mediations

The final aspect of Richard's framework is to analyse outputs from the media. As seen in chapter 1 the output from the media did have an influence and it is crucial to understand what themes around the regicide emerged at this time. In the next section a range of newsbooks and pamphlets are used to illustrate how the regicide was utilised as a form of emotional governance. From the earliest days of the Restoration, Charles II and his regime looked to control any potential opposition and alternative narratives by controlling print production.⁵⁵ Sir John Berkenhead became Official Licensor for the press in November 1660 and was succeeded by Roger L'Estrange who became Surveyor of the Presses in February 1662. In the consideration and proposal for the regulation of the Press in 1663, the first subject that should be suppressed was that the execution of Charles was justified.⁵⁶ Trying to regulate what was said in more public material was a central area of activity, one in which Charles himself was very active.

How Charles II was positioned was paramount to the ability to control the narrative of the regicide. Charles needed to be seen as a legitimate leader who had the ability to lead the fractured kingdom. This was, as Hutton has shown, one of the

⁵¹ Keay, *Magnificent*, p. 70.

⁵² Keay, *Magnificent*, p. 103.

⁵³ Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 1, p. 182; Rugg, *Diary* p. 93.

⁵⁴ Staffordshire RO, D868/8/53b and as argued by Anna Keay.

⁵⁵ Jenkinson, *Court*, p. 13; Peters, *Commemoration*, p. 45.

⁵⁶ Ogg, *Reign*, p. 515.

failures of Richard Cromwell's Protectorate, which led to the Restoration.⁵⁷ For Richards, mediations includes the way in which the media brings in statements from public figures to frame them and contextualising them.⁵⁸ We see this process in concerted public media outputs from March–May 1660. This two-month period is when the Restoration was negotiated, agreed and formalised with Charles proclaimed King on 1 May. In a series of pamphlets, the father and son relationship were used to garner an emotional response of sympathy. In the *Last Counsel of a Martyred King to his Son* the relationship between father and son was symbolised through the last letter written by Charles I. Written on 26 November Charles I counselled his son to 'shew the greatness of your mind rather to conquer your enemies by pardoning then by punishing'.⁵⁹ Here Charles I, magnanimous as a martyred king should be, guides his son to forgive rather than seek revenge. By publishing this letter in 1660, Charles II signified that he was the natural, and legitimate royal successor.

A key theme that emerged in the printed sources was guilt of the regicide. A series of pamphlets were published in March 1660 which harnessed the emotion of the guilt felt by the nation for the death of Charles I while also arguing that only the Restoration of his son would heal the previous breach. This is evident in a pamphlet called *Avvake O England*. Printed, according to Thomason, on 26 March. Through its title it signalled 'the people's invitation' to Charles, and it advised the English 'to return to obedience of their kings, under whom they ever flourished'.⁶⁰ It positioned Charles as the stability that the country needed after the last eleven years of turmoil and suffering. The regicide was the most unlawful act of the wars, one so terrible that it could not be forgiven. 'We are murtherers, king-killers ... for the blasphemous people amongst us who committed treason'.⁶¹ The people of England were contrite and sorry for the sins of those who committed this crime but in calling back Charles II it hoped for the redemption of the country.

⁵⁷ Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 32.

⁵⁸ Richards, *Governance*, pp. 57-8.

⁵⁹ *The Last Counsel of a Martyred King to his Son. Never publisht before by J.D. Esq; a loyal subject and servant to His Majesty* (London: printed for J. Jones, 1660), p. 1.

⁶⁰ Anon, *Avvake O England or, The Peoples Invitation to King Charles being a Recital of the Ruines over-running the people and their Trades; With an opportune advice to return to Obedience of their Kings, under whom they ever flourished* (London, 1660), p. 1.

⁶¹ *Avvake O England*, p. 7.

Also printed for Prince Charles on 21 March 1660 was *The King advancing, or Great Brittain's Royal Standard*, which contained an elegy called the ghost of Charles the great king and martyr.⁶² This was a three-page view from the ghost of Charles, a pious king who did not deserve his fate. The martyrdom of Charles and other royalists was another device used to control and manage the emotions of the Restoration. Once Charles II returned to the throne discourse about the men who had died in the name of Charles I increased. By signalling to men who had died in the futile war and had been so committed to the Royalist cause writers were sanctifying these men and their actions. *List of Royal Martyrs* is a long list of men who had died from the Civil War through to the Commonwealth.⁶³ *The State Martyrologie* published on 23 May 1660 was a broadsheet which provided an overview of the innocent blood shed from 1648 to 1660. The cover had five images which included Lord Capell and Earl of Montrose, well-known martyrs to the royalists' cause. In outlining royalist martyrs who had died in service to the Stuart cause it began with the most prominent death that of Charles I:

to the end that monstrous Guilt which hath so infamed our times
and Nation, may be palpably detected and imputed onely to the
parties engaged about, and conspiring in it; to the discharge of the
Kingdome from the wickednesse of that unparalle'd Regicide. ⁶⁴

Guilt, as seen in the pamphlet *Awake*, was a powerful emotion. These men were mourned and remembered for their stoic performance on the scaffold and their loyalty to the crown.

In the months of April and May 1660 another curious media of production appeared. A series of pamphlets was published that focused on the character of Charles II. Apart from his coronation in Scotland and the Battle of Worcester, Charles II had been in exile for over a decade. The *Character of King Charles II* looked to introduce Charles to a nation who had had little interaction with him. When his

⁶² Anon, *The King Advancing, or Great Brittain's Royal Standard, with His Majesties Gracious Speech to His Loyal Subjects; and the Investing Him in His Royal Throne, Crown and Dignities* (London, 1660).

⁶³ Anon, *The Royal Martyrs or, a list of the Lords, Knights, Commanders, and Gentlemen, that were slain in the Late Wars, in defence of their King and country. As also of those Executed by the High Courts of Justice or Law-martial* (London, 1660).

⁶⁴ Anon, *The State Martyrologie. Or, innocent blood speaking its Mournfull Tragedy. In the History of the Late Anarchy since 1648 to this Present Time* (1660), p. 1.

grandfather James I was the clear successor to the throne of England in 1603 his own work *Basilikon Doron* and *True Law of Free Monarchies* was published in England as a device to introduce the likely new ruler to his people.⁶⁵ *A Character of King Charles II* published in May 1660 presented a positive view of Charles's wisdom. The sixth item listed about his character states that:

his Majesty retired himself in his Chamber or Closet, where he Fasted every Tuesday in Memorial of his Royal Father, (that day of the Week forced out of his Life by the hands of Violence) which day weekly he reserved himself, as much as he could, from all company and business, whether Publick or Private.⁶⁶

By venerating his father through weekly pious fasting Charles II symbolised the saintly devotions described in the *Eikon Basilike*.⁶⁷ Charles II was equally devoted. He was not a rake or a rogue but a pious and righteous ruler. There are no sources that would substantiate that Charles actually did this. However, to promote Charles and his right to be king they used his father and his unlawful death as a device to highlight his key character traits. Another pamphlet, *A Character of Charles written by an Impartial Hand*, followed the same pattern of providing a positive account of his character and again the regicide was used to promote his right to the throne:

His majesties clemency is confirmed by his veneration for his fathers memory, who left his commands to pardon his enemies (even those enemies who mingled their hands in his innocent blood) as his last legacy.⁶⁸

The pamphlet was printed before the proclamation concerning the regicides but again it was a simple device to use the regicide to juxtapose Charles and his forgiving nature. A king must be just and by signalling that his love for his father would mean he would not seek revenge was aimed to prove this very point. This man was largely

⁶⁵ James I, *Basilikon Dōron, or, King James's instructions to his dearest sonne, Henry the Prince*, London (1603) and *The Trve Law of Free Monarchy, or, The Reciprocall and Mutuall duty Betvixt a Free King and his Naturall Subjects by a well affected subject of the Kingdome of Scotland* (London, 1642).

⁶⁶ Terry Edward, *A Character of King Charles II* (London, 1660), p. 11.

⁶⁷ Lacey, *Cult*, pp. 129-171.

⁶⁸ *A Character of King Charles II Written by an Impartial Hand and Exposed to Publick view for Information of the People* (London, 1660), pp. 10-11.

unknown and by utilising his father and his strength of character was able to create a positive image of the would be king. This is another example where the memory of Charles I provided legitimacy to his son's reign.

Johnson defined character as a 'representation of personal qualities.'⁶⁹ As seen in the pamphlets published at the time the need to publicise Charles' character was important. In 1658 following the death of Oliver Cromwell his character was much discussed. What personal qualities did the man who had fought in the wars and then became king in all, but name possess? Discussion of his character was a way to make sense of what had happened over the past decade and the personal qualities of leaders. In *The idea of His Highness Oliver, late Lord Protector*, a whole section of this book was devoted to his character. He was the 'stickler for the liberty conscience, excellent in both civil and military affairs and was a man better to make a prince of'.⁷⁰ In *The history of the life and death of his most serene Highness, Oliver, late Lord Protector* his lineage back to Thomas Cromwell (Henry VIII's chief minister) was highlighted as he had inherited his great qualities and it was noted that resemblance of children to their parents.⁷¹ Cromwell was just, well read and a good father who had been loved by his children. These qualities had become important to understanding the personal nature of the leader in question. It signalled their personal governance: how would they lead the nation and could they lead in a just way. The leader encapsulated both the political and spiritual body of the nation and therefore their personal qualities was of paramount concern.

However, the balancing act that Charles tried to navigate during his Restoration was not always successful. As part of the coronation celebration there were four triumphal arches created. Matthew Jenkinson, who analysed the court culture of Charles II, noted that these arches were created to provide legitimacy to Charles' reign.⁷² One of the arches depicted both James I and Charles I as the image of legitimacy of the Stuart line. However, on 3 May 1661 Ralph Josselin visited the

⁶⁹ Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of The English Language*, Vol I (London: Plummer & Brewer, 1825), p. 291.

⁷⁰ Richard Fleckno, *The Idea of His Highness Oliver, late Lord Protector, with certain brief reflexions on his life* (London, 1659), p. 132.

⁷¹ Samuel Carrington, *The History of the Life and Death of His most Serene Highness, Oliver, late Lord Protector. Wherein, from his cradle to his tomb, are impartially Transmitted to posterity, the most weighty transactions, Forreign or Domestique, that have happened in his Time, either in matters of Law, proceedings in Parliaments, or other Affairs in Church or State* (1659), p. 241.

⁷² Jenkinson, *Court*, p. 35.

capital and rode past the arches that had been created for the coronation. He wrote in his diary that he had been 'troubled' by the arch, specifically its depiction of Charles I and James I and the inscription 'to the divine James, to the divine Charles, I give endless power.'⁷³ Josselin also referred to himself being troubled in relation to family issues such as his son's shop being broken into, political issues such as the prorogation of parliament or his own health issues including aches, his gums and naval.⁷⁴ The term troubled was not one he used in a casual fashion and as seen in chapter one the regicide had troubled him too. Context is everything and, in this context, he was troubled whilst reflecting on the political propaganda which he had seen. He was not sharing in the joyous mood of the coronation and spoke of his sad reflections of the vain flattery and he prayed that 'the lord to prevent villainous wickednes, but if surely it will not sine fine.'⁷⁵

As with the immediate weeks around the regicide there was also a clear arc of emotions during this intense period. As the Restoration looked more likely in later 1659 and early 1660 the shift of output moved from cries for free parliament and a leader to emerge from the commonwealth regime to more emphasis on Charles II, his character and how he was the natural successor to his martyred father. The clear comparison is made between Cromwell and Charles, the range of pamphlets produced in honour of Cromwell's character in 1659 is moved to Charles II in early 1660. In line with Richards's framework of emotional governance, Charles II had been framed through meditations from the media, the section has shown in a campaign across two months how Charles and his father had been positioned.⁷⁶ The regicide became a key component of the literature, this heinous act created Charles as martyr and this act needed justice.

iii - Guilt and the need for Retribution

Many of his Majesty's enemies are now trying to curry favour with him by excuses and justifications ... Two aldermen of London who were

⁷³ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 112.

⁷⁴ Ibid, p. 160; p. 175; p. 77; p. 81.

⁷⁵ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 113.

⁷⁶ Richards, *Governance*.

judges and signed the King's death warrant now defend their impious action by unsubstantial pretexts.⁷⁷

Istvan Deak has examined the need for retribution after World War II and how there was widespread approval to prosecute Nazi collaborators. 'It was as if the Europeans hoped to rid themselves of the memory of their compromises and crimes by decimating their own ranks.'⁷⁸ The need for retribution was also present at the time of the Restoration. The next section examines how this need was positioned in two very different ways. The first illustrated how men who were closely associated with the Commonwealth government and regicide used the public sphere to proclaim their innocence in collaboration with that most heinous act of regicide. The aim was to show their loyalty to the new regime and to reconcile those disaffected to the new government. The second example is how one-man was used to symbolise the guilt of a nation. The Marquis of Argyll was viewed as the key collaborator who had allowed Charles I to be returned to parliament in 1647, which enabled the path to regicide. His trial was a focused retribution which Scots used to rid themselves of the memory of their crimes.

As seen above with the campaign to position Charles II to the public sphere, there was another public campaign also fought at the same time. Rumours were rife that Charles Stuart would return; on 12 March the militia looked to pass the law to confirm that 'the War, undertaken by both Houses of Parliament, in their Defence, against the Forces raised in the Name of the late king, was just and lawful.'⁷⁹ As shown with the army there began a campaign by many to distance themselves from the actions of the Civil Wars and more importantly from the regicide. These campaigns, from the end of March 1660, took place in the form of advertisements in weekly newsbooks. Joad Raymond has noted that pamphlets were 'sharp-edged weapons' and this is clear in a series of declarations made by members of the commonwealth regime denouncing the regicide and confirmation that they had no part to play in it.⁸⁰ The fact that public sources was being used to legitimise people's

⁷⁷ Razzell, *Contemporary Account*, Vol 5, pp. 231-32.

⁷⁸ Istvan Deak, 'Introduction' in *The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and Its Aftermath*, eds. Istvan Deak, Jan T. Gross and Tony Just, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), p. 3.

⁷⁹ *CSPD*, 1660-1661, p. 371.

⁸⁰ Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

actions illustrate the influence and power that was seen in making these public declarations.

Mercurius Politicus on 28 March 1660 published an advertisement concerning John Fowke.⁸¹ An advertisement was a section of the newsbook where people could pay to advertise their business or make a public statement. For example, in the same edition underneath Fowke's is an announcement from the mayor of London banning unauthorised pamphlets. Advertisements were a way to share important messages like an early form of public broadcast. Fowke may not have fought during the Civil Wars, but he helped to persuade the City of London to yield to the army in 1648.⁸² In January 1643 Charles I described him as 'notoriously guilty of schism and high treason'.⁸³ He was named as a commissioner for the king's trial, though he joined other prominent city parliamentarians in refusing to attend or sign the death warrant. With Cromwell's backing he was elected lord mayor in 1652. His closeness to Cromwell remained as in 1653, the year Cromwell was chosen Lord Protector, he dined at the Guildhall and knighted Fowke.⁸⁴ He was the chairman of the Committee of Safety. He signed the Common Council petition of 24 December 1659 for the return of the secluded members and the convening of a free parliament, and was a member of the delegation to present it.⁸⁵ During the final days of the protectorate Fowke was one of the city delegates sent on 9 December 1659 to confer with Colonel Fleetwood and on 17 January 1660 to convey thanks to Monck.⁸⁶ 'Then there went out of the city, by desire of the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen, Alderman Fowke and Alderman Vincett, alias Vincent, and Mr. Broomfield, to compliment General Monk, who lay at Harborough Town, in Leicestershire'.⁸⁷ Fowke held visible and prominent roles in London, as alderman and mayor. It was clear that Fowke understood that vengeance was being sought for anyone tainted with the regicide and wanted to be exonerated for any part in this crime.

⁸¹ *Mercurius Politicus*, 613 (22nd-29th March 1660), p. 1199.

⁸² Keith Lindley, 'Fowke, John (c. 1596–1662)' ODNB, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/10003>> [accessed 28 June 2018].

⁸³ *HOP, 1660-1690*, Vol 2, p. 352.

⁸⁴ Walter Thornbury, *Old and New London: A Narrative of its History, its People and its Places*. Vol 1 (London: Cassell, Petter & Galpin, 1878), pp. 396-416.

⁸⁵ Godfrey Davies, *Restoration of Charles II, 1658-60* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 294

⁸⁶ *HOP, 1660-1690*, Vol 2, p. 352.

⁸⁷ Rugg, *Journal*, p. 29.

The advert stated that in several printed books John Fowke had been identified as someone who had been a judge at the trial of Charles I as well as one of the judges to the sentencing of his death. The advert gave 'notice to all men' that this 'is most false and scandalous.'⁸⁸ To provide legitimacy to Fowke's innocence, it confirmed that the legal proceedings of the trial were diligently searched and Fowke's name was not to be found. In essence, he was innocent in the legal proceedings of the regicide. To provide further gravitas, the advert was signed by Henry Scobell, clerk of the parliament. Scobell had been removed as clerk in August 1659 but was not officially asked to give up the parliamentary papers until April 1660.⁸⁹ Scobell had been the Clerk throughout the commonwealth regime and therefore his name did carry weight as he had been present at the trial. Perhaps this advertisement worked, for in 1661 Fowke was elected MP for the city of London.⁹⁰

In *The publick intelligencer*, there was another advertisement following the same theme as Fowke's. Thomas Atkin, previous mayor of London and alderman, who was accused of being a judge at the trial and a signatory of the death warrant, confirmed that by reading the journal of proceedings Atkin's name was not there. Atkin had not seen the king since he left Whitehall in 1643. Therefore, he desired that these false allegations were published so all could see his innocence.⁹¹ He did not serve in any of the protectorate parliaments but was sufficiently close to the regime to be knighted by Cromwell in 1657. Again, like Fowke he did not renounce his role of alderman or mayor but wanted to ensure that the public knew he had no part in the regicide. Around this time period the Declaration of Breda was published on 4 April as Charles II's manifesto. In it he pardoned those who had a hand in the death of his father, but he did confirm that 'any persons as shall hereafter be excepted by parliament.'⁹² This meant that although there was a tenor of forgiveness it would be for parliament to decide who was really guilty of the regicide.

⁸⁸ *Mercurius Politicus*, 613 (22nd-29th March 1660), p. 1199.

⁸⁹ *JHL*, Vol 11, pp. 3-4.

⁹⁰ Alfred Beaven, *The Aldermen of the City of London Temp. Henry III-1908: With Notes on the Parliamentary Representation of the City, the Aldermen and the Livery Companies, the Aldermanic Veto, Aldermanic Baronets and Knights* (London: E. Fisher Ltd, 1913), p. 123.

⁹¹ *The Publick Intelligencer*, 225 (2nd April-9th April), p. 1131.

⁹² Anon, *His Majesties Gracious Letter and Declaration, sent to the House of Peers, by Sir John Greenville, Knight, from Breda: and Read in the House the First of May, 1660. Ordered by the Lords in Parliament assembled, that his Majesties Gracious Letter and Declaration be forthwith Printed and Published* (London, 1660), p. 12.

Monarchy was officially restored on 8 May 1660. On 17 May another advertisement appeared, following the same structure as Fowke and Atkins. It was confirmed that his name was not in the official trial journal. The individual was none other than John Gauden who was most famous for being the reputed writer of *Eikon Basilike*.⁹³ Bryan Spinks described Gauden as rather chameleon-like during the 1640s and 1650s, who due to his ambitious nature played both monarch and parliament.⁹⁴ However, he had no real connection to the regicide, though he still felt it necessary to publicly confirm his innocence. As argued by Richard Cust, public reputation and honour was a cornerstone of the character of Seventeenth century elite men.⁹⁵ This can be seen in the public nature of these declarations. They wanted people to know that their hands were clean of Charles' blood.

Blair Worden describes Luke Robinson as a man who was committed to the Rump Parliament and a most fierce man against the king who was actively engaged with the parliamentary cause.⁹⁶ After the regicide he was one of the members who set up the committee for absent members.⁹⁷ However, on 7 June 1660 in *Mercurius Politics* confirmed that he had been discharged from the house for being one of the judges in the trial. But Robinson was keen to ensure that his innocence was known and used print 'to inform that he was none of the judges, nor named in the Act for trial of the King'.⁹⁸ The timing was key as 26th May was the first time parliament had debated what would happen to regicides and that to begin with all their goods would be seized.⁹⁹ A report written on 28 May 1660 stated that 'seven of the most guilty ... are to lose their lives as an example and reward for this barbarity. Of the rest half will be exiled and the others to live in the country' with their goods confiscated.¹⁰⁰ This was the time when the debate around the regicides really began in earnest. Robinson therefore needed a public display of innocence, and it was reported that before he left parliament 'he made a recanting speech at the bar of very near half an

⁹³ Hugh Trevor-Roper, "'Eikon Basilike': The Problem of the King's Book", *History Today*, 1:9 (1951) pp. 211-220.

⁹⁴ Spinks, Bryan D. 'Gauden, John (1599/1600?-1662), bishop of Worcester.' ODNB <<http://DOI/10.1093/ref:odnb/10456>> [Accessed 2 Dec. 2019].

⁹⁵ Richard Cust, 'Honour, rhetoric and political culture: the earl of Huntingdon and his enemies', in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays presented to David Underdown*, eds. Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 84-112.

⁹⁶ Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament 1648-53* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), p. 219.

⁹⁷ Worden, *Rump*, p. 177.

⁹⁸ *Mercurius Politics* (7 - 13 June 1660), p. 1256.

⁹⁹ *CSPD*, 1660-1661, p. 321.

¹⁰⁰ Razzell, *Contemporary Account*, Vol 5, p. 241.

hour long, all bathed in tears.’¹⁰¹ Robinson used both the verbal and written printed material to denounce the regicide. Like Fowke and Atkins, he did not sign the death warrant, but due to his proximity to the Commonwealth regime was seen as guilty by association. His emotional performance in parliament was a public manifestation of his innocence. Not everyone was convinced. Whitelocke noted that Robinson, ‘formerly a most fierce man against the king, did now first magnify his grace and goodness’.¹⁰² This was all part of a campaign against the regicides that emerged in late March 1660 where the Restoration was all but assured. The campaign that emerged for retribution then shaped how these men responded to the discourse being produced and then needed to respond publicly to their potential accusations.

The final example of men who used printed sources to denounce the regicide was Oliver St John. St John, a Commonwealth judge married to Oliver Cromwell’s second cousin, published his defence on 30 July 1660.¹⁰³ St John had been appointed Chief Justice of the Common Pleas in 1648 but he took the advantage of a commons resolution of October 1648 of judges not attending parliament.¹⁰⁴ However, as Jonathan Fitzgibbons has shown, St John’s name was brought into the centre of those who were guilty of the regicide debate through the publication of *Monarchy Asserted*.¹⁰⁵ This pamphlet was published in 1660 and reported the debates in 1657 over whether Cromwell would take the title of king. Oliver St John’s name appeared on the title page as a member of the committee. St John did not take part in these debates but the association between him and the regime was suggested. On 13 June 1660, the commons had voted St John as one of the twenty people excepted from the Act of Oblivion.¹⁰⁶ Therefore within six weeks he had published his rebuttal to denounce the regicide.

In the pamphlet St John confirmed that he could not have been a judge for the trial as he only returned into political life in 1651. He did not know ‘of any intent to

¹⁰¹ HMC, Fifth Report, p. 199.

¹⁰² Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs: Or, an Historical Account of What Passed from the Beginning of the Reign of King Charles I, to King Charles II. His Happy Restoration* (London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1682), p. 702.

¹⁰³ W. Palmer. ‘St John, Oliver (c. 1598–1673), lawyer and politician’. ODNB, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/24504>> [accessed 17 Dec. 2018].

¹⁰⁴ Worden, *Rump*, p. 178.

¹⁰⁵ Jonathan Fitzgibbons, ‘Recording, reporting and printing the Cromwellian ‘Kingship debates’ of 1657’. *Historical Research*. 89:245 (2016), pp. 486-509.

¹⁰⁶ *CJ*, Vol. 8, p. 63.

try him, nor of the matter, or manner of his trial, or Execution', he had no hand in the King's death.¹⁰⁷ To remain as chief justice St John used the echoes of today's political rhetoric that he did so in the national interest and meant no interruption of 'public justice between country and party.'¹⁰⁸ A man with such a duty for the nation could never be guilty of such an immoral act. It was clearly important for St John to have his hands washed clean of the king's blood. His pamphlet was an eight-page rebuttal of his actions during the Civil Wars and Commonwealth, which he referred to as the 'troubles'. It began with a list of alleged crimes relating to the king's death.¹⁰⁹ Beginning with this subject clearly illustrated that he believed this was the most important crime he needed to defend. The first was to rebuff that Cromwell had not shared his lodgings and bed during and after the trial. He wanted to distance himself from not only this time but also from Cromwell himself and the power making decisions.

The pamphlet continued with this narrative. As he did not engage with or agree with the regicide and therefore, he would not have helped someone produce words to justify it. 'I humbly tender in answer to the Rumours spread up and down, which if true would make me guilty of the king's death, and of alterations of the governments, from King, Lords, and Commons, all which with due humility I do deny.'¹¹⁰ The power that the public sphere had can be seen here, St John had spent time producing and then publishing this rebuttal. He wanted it to be known in a very public way that the rumours that had been made concerning him was untrue.

There are some indications that St John's rebuttal was not entirely sincere. Whitelocke noted in his *Memorials* that St John did not advocate the Stuarts but agreed that something of 'monarchical power' was essential to preserve 'the foundation of our laws and the liberties of people'.¹¹¹ In his diary Pepys he noted on Tuesday 7 February 1660, 'This day Mr. Crew told me that my Lord St. John is for a free Parliament, and that he is very great with Monke'.¹¹² On Friday 2 March 1660 'Great is the talk of a single person, and that it would now be Charles, George, or

¹⁰⁷ Oliver St John, *The Case of Oliver St John, Esq. Concerning his actions during the late troubles* (London, 1660), p. 2.

¹⁰⁸ St John, *Case*, p. 6.

¹⁰⁹ *ibid*, p. 1.

¹¹⁰ *ibid*, p. 8.

¹¹¹ Whitelocke, *Memorials*, p. 492; Worden, *Rump*, p. 293.

¹¹² Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 1, pp. 44-5.

Richard again. For the last of which, my Lord St. John is said to speak high.’¹¹³ St John clearly still hoped for some sort of reduced power in one man and his first choice was Richard Cromwell. His rebuttal therefore could be seen as a cynical way to not only distance himself from the regicide but to try to win favour with the new regime. It would appear that his apology fell on deaf ears as in 1662 he sailed to Europe and remained there until his death in 1673.¹¹⁴

These prominent men were viewed as commonwealth collaborators as they all held important roles such as aldermen, mayor or judges during the regime. These men paid for a public declaration of their innocence and suggested they felt this was this most effective way to absolve themselves of any guilt of the regicide, the one act that Charles II could not forgive. There was clear preservation tactic here, they may have danced with the devil and worked in the Commonwealth regime, but they were not traitors to the Stuart line. There was a need for retribution for the regicide as the murder of a king could not go unpunished. Therefore, these public declarations highlighted how retribution for the regicide had been sought.

I entered not upon the work of reformation with any design
of advance for myself, or prejudice to the king and his
government.¹¹⁵

This was part of the scaffold speech made by Archibald Douglas, Marquis of Argyll on 27 May 1661. His execution followed those of the regicides, but Argyll was neither a judge at the trial nor is his signature on the death warrant. Yet, he had been tried and convicted for treason with the regicide at the heart of his conviction. Argyll and his actions during the Civil Wars and beyond made him guilty of crimes against the monarchy and in the public sphere. Argyll became the symbol of Scottish guilt. His experience illustrated the need for retribution for that one act. Deak argued that post World War II that there had been a desire to place the blame on specific individuals, even when in reality there had been large scale accommodation with the

¹¹³ Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 1, p. 74.

¹¹⁴ Palmer, ‘St John’. ODNB.

¹¹⁵ Archibald Campbell, *The Speech of the Late Marquiss of Argyll upon the Scaffold, May 27, 1661 being a true and perfect copy* (Edinburgh, 1660), p. 3.

enemy.¹¹⁶ Argyll was such a figure head, and he symbolised a targeted retribution where all the perceived 'sins' of the Scottish people were embodied into this one man.

Scotland and its relationship with the Stuart monarchy had been long-standing but fraught. Argyll himself noted that the nobility in Scotland have always bickered with their princes.¹¹⁷ Many historians have argued that the seeds of discontent which sparked the Civil Wars began in Scotland 1638, when it had risen in revolt against Charles I's religious policies. His supposed 'Laudian' religious settlement roused suspicion from the protestant Kirk and tensions began to mount between Charles I and governors of Scotland. Argyll himself was one of these, a man born into the influential Campbell clan. During the war in the three kingdoms, he had fought against Charles and in 1646 was sent to Newcastle to negotiate with Charles.

Charles had suspicions concerning Argyll and noted him to be 'very civil and cunning'.¹¹⁸ On 25 June committees of both houses of the English parliament met with the Scottish commissioners to discuss parliament's proposed terms for a settlement. These were vague about English church government, and in a speech, Argyll denounced 'lawless liberty'. On political issues, he urged that the two kingdoms, so closely allied, should be amalgamated, and that monarchy be maintained, though regulated as 'The safety of the people is the supreme law'.¹¹⁹ On these bases, the Scots would accept the terms parliament proposed to submit to the king. However, at the same time Charles I and Covenanted conservatives covertly signed the Engagement for the Restoration of monarchical authority in the three kingdoms. This double dealing meant that the Covenantors transferred the king into the custody of the English Parliament in January 1647. This led to a conservative reaction in Scotland headed by James Hamilton, first Duke of Hamilton and his brother William, first Earl of Lanark. This faction, known as the Engagers, sent an

¹¹⁶ Istvan Deak, 'Themes for a social history of war experience and collaboration' in *The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and Its Aftermath*, eds Istvan Deak, Jan .T. Gross and Tony Just, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 39-73.

¹¹⁷ Archibald Campbell, *Instructions to a son by Archibald, late Marquis of Argyle; written in the time of his confinement* (London: Printed for J. Latham, 1661), pp. 4-5.

¹¹⁸ Allan McInnes, *The British Confederate: Archibald Campbell, Marquess of Argyll, c1607-1661* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2011), p. 189.

¹¹⁹ John Willcock, *The Great Marquess; Life and Times of Archibald, 8th Earl, and 1st (and only) Marquess of Argyll (1607-1661)* (London: O. Anderson & Ferrier, 1903), p. 193-4.

army to England to try to restore Charles I in 1648. However, it was routed at the Battle of Preston.¹²⁰

With the king in their custody, parliament brought him to trial. The execution of the king was met with universal horror in Scotland, and the exiled Prince of Wales was immediately proclaimed King (of England and Ireland as well as Scotland) in Edinburgh. On 1 January 1651 when Charles was crowned king at Scone, Argyll placed the crown on his head and installed him on his throne. However, Charles I's death also increased the bitterness of political divisions in Scotland.¹²¹ Many blamed the new regime, set up with the help of Cromwell's armies, for permitting the execution to take place, and rumours circulated that haunted Argyll for the rest of his life: that in his talks with Cromwell the previous autumn he had agreed that the king should die. Charles II was almost certainly offended by Argyll's uselessness to him in 1650–1, and infuriated when Glencairn rose and the Marquis, far from helping as his monarch asked, joined the Cromwellians. It was said that Charles' anger was fanned by some who told him that Argyll had expressed approval of the regicide.¹²²

Pamphlets such as *Devilish Conspiracy* were clear in their condemnation of the Scots and their part in the regicide. The Scots, like Judas, had sold the martyr king back to parliament who, due to their traitorous nature, sacrificed the King.¹²³ This action of 'selling' Charles back to the parliament enabled the regicide to occur and even though they had not signed the death warrant this act was positioned on par with this act. Archibald Campbell was portrayed as the man most complicit in this act. Wishart in his memoirs noted that 'by 1648 Argyll had entered as accursed company with Cromwell to root out monarchy throughout Britain.'¹²⁴

Clare Jackson argued that the Restoration period witnessed the apogee of Royalist sentiment in Scotland.¹²⁵ This widespread popular Royalism accompanied

¹²⁰ Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), pp. 14-45.

¹²¹ Jackson, *Scotland*, p. 18.

¹²² Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 235.

¹²³ John Warner, *The Devilish Conspiracy, Hellish Treason, Heathenish Condemnation, and Damnable Murder, Committed, and Executed by the Lewes, against the anointed of the Lord, Christ their King And the just judgment of God severely executed upon those Traytors and Murderers. As it was delivered in a sermon on the 4 Feb. 1648. being the quinquages. Sunday, out of some part of the Gospel appointed by the Church of England to be read on that day* (London, 1648).

¹²⁴ George Wishart, *Memoirs of the Most Renowned James Graham, Marquis of Montrose* (Edinburgh, 1819), p. 23.

¹²⁵ Jackson, *Scotland*, p. 1.

Charles' return in 1660. James Kirkton, minister of Toolbooth, noted that 'nothing altered the disposition of the people more than the arrival of news proclaiming Charles II'.¹²⁶ The sins of the Civil Wars needed to be paid and Argyll was no exception. He travelled to London with his son (who had supported Charles II) and looked for an audience with the king; he was submitted only to be arrested and charged with treason. Argyll and his role in the regicide was played out in the public sphere. Even being arrested publicly was the first step in making public Argyll's guilt. He was the symbol of the guilt of Scottish ministers for the part they played in the regicide. Argyll was not a 'regicide' as he had not signed the death warrant but was guilty due to his close relationship with the Commonwealth regime. As seen in the examples above a campaign began in the public sphere against Argyll. In a series of pamphlets, a discourse for retribution was created. *Argyles Arraignment*, published in July 1660, noted that:

Whose every action was a heinous crime
 'Gainst King and Countrey; We may justly crave
 Vengeance on him ...
 His curs'd designs, whose royal blood he split
 Which now at last serves to enhance his guilt.¹²⁷

This verse provided an insight into how the trial was viewed by contemporaries. Argyll's every action was a crime against his king. Argyll was unable to be tried in England as he only held lands in Scotland. On 21 February 1661 he was brought to Edinburgh to hear his charges. As the radical leader of the Covenanting movement Argyll's head was especially sought after; but while successful in refuting the fourteen charges against him, he was convicted spuriously as an active Cromwellian collaborator.¹²⁸ In *Argyles Arraignment* he made a long discourse where he protested his innocence of Charles' death and that of Huntly, Montrose and Hamilton.¹²⁹ Argyll was being positioned here against Royalist martyrs; he had a hand in killing Charles and also men who were loyal to the Stuart monarchy.

¹²⁶ James Kirkton, *The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland: From the Restoration to the year 1678* (Edinburgh: James Ballatyne & Co, 1817), p. 34.

¹²⁷ Anon, *Argyles Arraignment; or, Treachery Displayed. In verse* (London, 1660).

¹²⁸ McInnes, *British Confederate*, pp. 294-303.

¹²⁹ This is repeated word for word in the Rugg, *Journal*, p. 153.

This blood guilt was illustrated in a newsbook entry on 21 February 1661. It communicated how on 15 February an Act was brought to the Scottish parliament to recant the act of Jan 1647 for the delivery of the king to the English, 'Whereby they vindicate their nation from the guilt of that act'.¹³⁰ The person who brought this act to parliament and made the motion was John Sinclair, 9th Lord Sinclair who had been loyal to the Stuarts and was captured after the Battle of Worcester and kept prisoner at Windsor.¹³¹ He provided the authenticity of the sorrow of the Scots for their part in the Civil Wars and regicide. He was in stark contrast to Argyll and asked parliament to turn back time and erase the act of the Scots. The act asks that no one who had any correspondence with any of his majesty's enemies for his delivery can benefit from this clause. Argyll himself was being held for his dealings with Cromwell and the Commonwealth and therefore he was exempted from the pardon. The Act confirmed that the regicide was 'not to be looked upon as the deed of the kingdom, but is the act of a few disloyal and seditious persons ... screwed themselves into the government ... and from the conscience of their own guiltless, being afraid of his majesty's government, did violently carry on that act.'¹³² As seen with Fowke and Atkins the regicide itself was the only acceptable form of public retribution, so it became the focus of public discourse in the first year of the Restoration.

On the scaffold on 27 May Argyll observed 'I resolve to disappoint many; for I came here not to justify myself, but the Lord who is holy'.¹³³ In his speech he repeatedly emphasised that he had had no part in Charles I's death, for though formally cleared of that charge he feared many still thought him guilty of it. 'I am free from any accession by my knowledge, concerning counsel or any other way to his late majesty's death'.¹³⁴ Argyll highlighted this point by placing it as the final piece of his speech. Baillie in his diary noted that 'his dignified conduct during the trial and execution redeemed his public standing. His death was much regarded by many and by none insulted over.'¹³⁵ As seen with Charles I there was great power in the

¹³⁰ *Publick Intelligencer*, 217 (21 - 28 Feb 1661), p. 3.

¹³¹ R.P. Wells, 'Sinclair, John, ninth Lord Sinclair (bap. 1610, d. 1674), nobleman and army officer'. ODNB, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26525>> [accessed 29 Jan 2019].

¹³² *Publick Intelligencer*, 217 (20-27 Feb 1661), p. 3.

¹³³ Sir George Mackenzie, *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland from the Restoration of King Charles II* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1830), p. 41.

¹³⁴ W. Cobbett, *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials*, Vol 5 (London: T.C. Hansard, 1810), p. 1507.

¹³⁵ Baillie, *Letters*, p. 18.

scaffold performance and Argyll was able to in part to redeem himself. Argyll had been compared with the Marquis of Montrose, who was declared a traitor and was executed in 1650 for raising an army in the name of the King of Scots. On 11 May 1661 the 'scattered body of immortal Montrose were brought together, and all were in deep mourning'.¹³⁶ The severed limbs of the great Marquis were reunited with the torso in a solemn burial in St Giles's Kirk at public expense, upon royal orders.¹³⁷ This is in stark contrast to Argyll who at the same time was being brought to trial and found guilty.

iv - Conclusion

This chapter has looked at a condensed period from late 1659, when talk of a return of monarchy began, to the execution of Argyll in May 1661. The aim was to examine how the regicide fit into this intense period of politics around the Restoration of the monarchy. There is clear evidence that Charles II and his new government tried to create emotional governance and control how the Civil Wars and Restoration were remembered and misremembered. Through the use of the regicide Charles II was able to create a narrative concerning his father and his death. By using Barry Richards' thought provoking framework, I have argued that Charles II was a politically savvy individual who before, during and after the regicide continued to use the public sphere to influence how the regicide and Charles I was discussed and remembered.

Charles' longer-term tactic was to commemorate the regicide and the Restoration. These two events were forever interlinked: only through the death of his father could the monarchy be restored. He marked 30th January as a day of formal, annual commemoration for his martyred father. The evidence suggests that Charles' campaign was initially effective. Peters argued that from the beginning of the Restoration Charles I became a martyr and therefore 'the nation was required not only to welcome his son as rightful monarch, but also to embrace the new myths

¹³⁶ John Nicoll. *A Diary of Public Transactions and Other Occurrences, chiefly in Scotland, from January, 1650, to June, 1667* (Edinburgh: T. Constable, 1836), p. 316.

¹³⁷ William Daniel, *History of the Abbey and Palace of Holyrood* (Edinburgh: Duncan Anderson, 1852), pp. 113–114; There had been a rumour that his right arm was in possession of a Yorkshire man but J.C. Robbie argued in 'The Embalming of Montrose', *Book of Old Edinburgh Club*, vol 1 (1908), pp. 31-46, his whole body was returned. John Nicoll in his diary made no mention of any missing limbs; John Nicoll, *A diary of public transactions and other occurrences, chiefly in Scotland, from January 1650 to June 1667*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: T. Constable, 1872), pp. 330-332.

... instructing people how they were to commemorate the memory' of Charles I.¹³⁸ To introduce Charles II to his new kingdom various pamphlets outlined and promoted his character. To legitimise his right to the throne his dedication to his father was highlighted. He was a man who sought justice against the regicide and not vengeance. The Declaration of Breda was the legal proclamation of this. However, the murder of a king could not go unpunished, and the Act of Oblivion forgave all except those regicides. However, the reactions from those seen as Commonwealth collaborators signalled how the guilt of the regicide had permeated the public discourse. Men who held roles in the Commonwealth, such as aldermen, mayors and judges, felt the need to use the public sphere to absolve themselves of the guilt of the regicide. In terms of Scotland their guilt surrounded on their perceived action in selling Charles I back to parliament in 1647. Through using Argyll, they symbolised their guilt in one man. However, when we turn to a longer view of Charles I we will see that the emotional governance that Charles II looked to create did not sustain.

¹³⁸ Peters, *Commemoration*, p. 72.

Part Two: Enduring Memories of Charles I and the Regicides

Chapter 3 - Enduring memories of Charles I, 1649-1715

According to Bishop Gilbert Burnet, 'Charles's ... death made all his former errors be entirely forget and raised a compassionate regard ... and drew a lasting hatred towards the actors'.¹ This view of Charles as a man who sacrificed his body for the longevity of monarchy was locked in, or so many early histories and studies of the *Eikon Basilike* would make us believe. Burnet, who wrote the influential *History of my Own Time* in 1694 which covered the Civil Wars, regicide, and Restoration, was seen as an authority of this time period. He even confessed that he had been 'bred up with a high veneration' of the *Eikon*, claimed that 'the piety of the prayers made all people cry out against the murder of a prince, who thought so seriously of all his affairs in his secret meditations before God'.² Even in the earliest of histories, narratives of Charles I were dominated by the *Eikon*, and it continues to shape perceptions about the popularity of Charles the martyr. The book's portrayal of Charles as a moderate, peace-loving ruler transformed opinion of his execution so that it came to be viewed by many as an act of martyrdom. What might be surprising, based on these studies, is that there is little other indication of widespread interest in venerating the troubled king, outside the *Eikon*. The history of his legacy is far more ambivalent than sales of the *Eikon* suggest. In 2012 Robert Wilcher stated that the book achieved its explicit aim: 'to place the living image of the dead King in the hearts of all his "loyall Subjects" and convert them to the Stuart cause'.³ This chapter will show how the efforts to commemorate Charles I trailed off as many wanted to forget the man who took them to war.

This image of Charles as a martyr was reliant, more than anything else, on the *Eikon Basilike*. *Eikon* was ghost-written by John Gauden and portrays the recollections of Charles on the years of the Civil Wars. The penultimate chapter is dedicated to his eldest son, ending with the last farewell: 'let my memory ever with my name live in you, as of your father that loves you, and once a King of three

¹ Gilbert Burnet, *History of His Own Time: From the Restoration of K. Charles II to the Conclusion of the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne. To which is Prefixed, a Summary Recapitulation of Affairs in Church and State, from King James I. to the Restoration in the Year 1660, Together with the Author's Life and Some Explanatory Notes*, Vol 1 (London: R. H. Evans, 1809), p. 69.

² Burnet, *History*, p. 87.

³ Robert Wilcher, 'Eikon Basilike: The Printing, Composition, Strategy, and Impact of "The King's Book"', in *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 302.

flourishing kingdoms ... Farewell, till We meet, if not on Earth, yet in Heaven'.⁴ Although the Commonwealth government attempted to suppress the book, it became the bestseller of its time, spreading Charles I's image as a just, peace-loving and pious king, giving him the status of a martyr. Thirty-five editions of the *Eikon* were issued in the first year of printing alone, their format often small, enabling the reader to conceal the book if necessary.

For Kevin Sharpe, the *Eikon* is a clear example of the power a well-crafted image has in creating a lasting legacy, and there can be no doubt that *Eikon* dominated the public discourse for the next decade.⁵ He has argued that, due to the strength of *Eikon*'s image, the Commonwealth needed to respond. They enlisted Milton to write *Eikonoklastes*, which tried to blacken the king's reputation and strengthen his depiction as a tyrant. However, not even Milton could turn the tide of *Eikon* and the image of Charles it represented. For Woolrych the popularity of *Eikon* laid bare a significant weakness in the young Commonwealth: a general lack of positive commitment or affection towards the new regime.⁶ Lacey argued that Charles I knew his role as a royal actor which he turned into an art form as shown on the scaffold. For him '*Eikon* was another such performance on a public stage and, if the number of editions is an indication, a highly successful one.'⁷ There is no denying that *Eikon* was popular and therefore did have an influence on how Charles I was viewed. *Eikon* was not just a means of influencing public opinion in the king's favour, it was also intended to create a significant cult. It presented a selective image of Charles I in the hope of restricting Charles II to a course of action at the outset of his reign that might honour his father's memory. Elizabeth Skerpan Wheeler argued that *Eikon* established an impression of Charles I's character that still remained. The image of a man who was sinned against more than sinned and a victim of injustice. The popularity of *Eikon* as Wheeler argues was not just a single text and was even translated into other forms of media including ballads.⁸ This chapter will not contest

⁴ *Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of his Majesty King Charles 1st* (London: D. Stewart, 1879), p. 207.

⁵ Kevin Sharpe, 'So Hard a Text'? Images of Charles I, 1612-1700', *The Historical Journal*, 43:2 (2000), pp. 383-405.

⁶ Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 452.

⁷ Lacey, *Cult*, p. 85.

⁸ Elizabeth Skerpan Wheeler, 'Eikon Basilike and the Rhetoric of Self-Representation', in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 122-40.

that *Eikon* was popular, but intends to look beyond it, to understand the longevity of the martyr cult beyond literature.

Jerome DeGroot, who examined royalist identities, believes that Charles I's image was the guarantee of stability, validation, and security.⁹ Royalists had created Charles I as the centre of their world, and he was the social order. The regicide had been such a traumatic event and through the martyrdom of Charles they were able to cement this lasting image. However, the image and memory of Charles was not univocal. The distance of time and the emergence of a generation that had not experienced the regicide meant that Charles was a text to be read for. David Cressy argued that for the Restoration generation the martyred monarch became 'the sun of firmament, the light of our eyes ... the greatest of kings, even the best of kings since Christ.'¹⁰ This chapter will argue that this is not the case and that Charles I was a problematic figure even to those who did not know him. This will be more evident in chapter four when the regicide generation is examined. Therefore, taking a *longue durée* view of the strength of the image of Charles as a martyr, this chapter will assess Charles' popularity by looking beyond the *Eikon* at a variety of other mediums. The analysis of diaries, letters, memorial sermons, seditious speech, monuments, and church dedications will show that Charles remained a problematic figure throughout the Restoration and that contemporary remembrance was inconsistent. A small number of people revered him, but even their attempts undermined the view of him as a martyr. His son, who tried to build this image in the afterglow of the Restoration, neglected his father once the attempt to sustain this image had failed. Therefore, the popularity of the cult of Charles the martyr hinged on the text of *Eikon*.

i – 30 January, Commemorating the Regicide

In 1661, Charles II officially made 30 January a day of 'Yearly Anniversary of Humiliation ... for ever'.¹¹ The new regime set out how the day would be observed and what would be expected of the population. It confirmed that the 30 was a day of fasting and humiliation. 'All persons ... [were] to abstain from all Works and Business

⁹ Jerome DeGroot, *Royalists Identities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 5.

¹⁰ David Cressy, *Charles I and the People of England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 306.

¹¹ John Raithby (ed.), *The Statutes of the Realm*, Vol 5 (London: S.L., 1819), pp. 288-290.

... and meekly and orderly to repair to the publick place for divine worship.’¹²

Through examination of diaries and letters, we discover whether individuals lived up to these expectations. Edward Legon has termed the actions those who failed to live up to the expectations of behaviour, as outlined in the acts and proclamations concerning the 30 January, as ‘mis-commemoration’.¹³ There is much more to the non-commitment of the day than just mis-commemoration: how people emotionally engaged with the events was critical. The evidence will illustrate that people did not attend or mourn the 30 January beyond the first years of commemoration as the emotional governance which Charles II looked to create around the regicide was not sustainable. Charles I was a problematic figure for many as he had engaged in a war with his people. The Civil Wars were a traumatic event and Edkins, who has examined trauma and the memory of politics, argued that the essence of trauma is precisely that, it is too horrible to be remembered.¹⁴ Through the Act of Oblivion Charles II ordered what people should do with the memory of 1649. As Edkins notes, traumatic narratives take shape after a lapse of time or a change in the political landscape. Events are named, memorials and museums set up and the identity of victims established.¹⁵ This chapter will examine what narratives emerged around Charles I through the actions people took to sustain and shape his memory, through physical memorials and monuments.

That none may be so malicious as to think we calculate our sermons merely for the present circumstances, as if the pulpit were but a kind of weather glass.¹⁶

So preached William Payne the rector of Whitechapel church on 30 January 1683. Payne was quick to assure his congregation that his sermons were produced long before the Rye House Plot had been discovered. The messages that focused on reason were purely a matter of scripture and not political discourse. However, there has been much examination of the role of the 30 January sermons that would

¹² Charles Stuart, *By the King. A Proclamation, For Observation of the Thirtieth day of January as a Day of Fast and Humiliation according to the late Act of Parliament for that purpose* (London, 1661), p. 2.

¹³ Legon, *Revolution*, pp. 142-171.

¹⁴ Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p.1.

¹⁵ Edkins, *Trauma*, p. 58.

¹⁶ William Payne, *The Unlawfulness of Stretching forth the Hand to Resist or Murder Princes with the Principal Cases about Resistance, Considered, in Two Sermons: The First Preacht upon the Last Thirtieth of January, the other, upon the Day of Thanksgiving, for the Deliverance of the King and Kingdom from the Late Treasonable Conspiracy* (London, 1683).

indicate that quickly after the initial focus on Charles as a martyr, the observations and tone of the sermons quickly became more politically charged with the regicide as a warning of further treason. Sermons were preached on 30 January for 198 years until an Act of Parliament removed it from the liturgical calendar. Helen Randal, in her extensive research on the regicide sermons, noted there were over three hundred regicide day sermons published between 1649 and 1914 and provided a clear view as to what the sermons contained and the changing nature of the sermon from a day of prayer to the martyr to a device used for political purpose.¹⁷ Charles became obsolete in his day of martyrdom.

When the day's observance was made official in 1662, the preaching of the fast day became the principal expression of the martyr cult. Lois Potter has argued that the regicide sermons' important aim was to unite a whole congregation into a cathartic experience of grief and humiliation.¹⁸ To meet this aim early Restoration preachers focused on the retelling of the regicide alongside biblical comparisons. In the early sermons, Charles was pitched as the Protestant martyr. He was compared to Christ: both were kings, and had been rejected, betrayed, imprisoned, and died for their people.¹⁹ In Salisbury in 1669 Thomas Lambert preached and drew the parallel between the Jews' murder of Christ and the regicide.²⁰ For Lambert, his role was to ensure that he 'left this glorious martyr's memory in your mind ... and convinced you that Charles blood was enough to sink a kingdom'.²¹ The sermons became an opportunity to defend the restored order in church and state and the cult needed to support this status quo.

The Restoration symbolised the recovery of the foundations of government and church. Preachers taught the duty of submission and a warning against the disaster that another rebellion would bring. This double aspect of duty and warning was key to the regicide sermons. For Andrew Lacey, who has extensively researched the cult of Charles' martyrdom, there was a consistency across different mediums,

¹⁷ Helen W. Randal, 'The Rise and Fall of a Martyrology: Sermons on Charles I', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 10:2 (1947), pp. 135-167.

¹⁸ Lois Potter, 'The royal martyr in the Restoration' in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 265.

¹⁹ Lacey, *Cult*, p. 15.

²⁰ Thomas Lambert, *Sad Memorials of the Royal Martyr, or, A parallel betwixt the Jewes murder of Christ and the English murder of King Charls the First being a sermon preached on the solemnity of His Majestie's Martyrdom in the Cathedral-Church of Sarum, An. Dom. 1669* (London, 1670), Title page.

²¹ Lambert, *Sad*, p. 4.

including sermons and books. In each of these mediums, one encounters a discussion of the Civil Wars, and the king emphasises the parallels between the collective sufferings of the nations and the personal suffering of the king.²² Charles symbolised a man who died for the ultimate goal of healing the nation. The yearly sermons were used as a political mouthpiece; the early years of the Restoration saw the regicide at the centre but over time the themes of the sermons change to warnings of treason and good government in response to external factors such as foreign policy and the rise of popery.

Helen Randal argued that between 1670 and 1688 preachers translated the 30 January sermon into an instrument of political education.²³ Samuel Rolles, who preached a sermon on 30 January 1678, noted that 'I look upon the 30 January to be the most proper in all the year to preach up loyalty, and to preach down rebellion.'²⁴ In 1679 Evelyn noted that the sermon preached before Charles II at the height of the Exclusion crisis focused on the 'perils of the last times' where treasons were committed under a form of reformation and godliness.²⁵ Peter Kenyon has argued that due to the Glorious Revolution and the overthrow of James II, the sermons' themes had to change. For example, if the regicide was wrong, it was difficult to resist the conclusion that the overthrowing of James II was also wrong. Therefore, if the revolution was justified, so was the regicide.²⁶ Ultimately after the Glorious Revolution, the regicide sermons had just become an ambivalent public exercise. As seen in the printed sermons, Lacey has argued that the person of Charles was lost as epideictic rhetoric went out of fashion. Therefore, the sermons moved away from presenting Charles as the tragic figure on the road to his death. Charles became a 'pretext for a dissertation on government.'²⁷ Charles was removed and remodelled in his own story.

²² Lacey, *Cult*, p. 208.

²³ Randal, 'Sermons', pp. 135-167.

²⁴ Samuel Rolles, *Loyalty and Peace, or, Two seasonable discourses from I Sam. 24, 5 viz., David's heart smote him because he cut off Saul's skirt: the first of conscience and its smitings, the second of the prodigious impiety of murdering King Charles I, intended to promote sincere devotion and humiliation upon each anniversary fast for the Late King's death* (London, 1678) pp. 197-8.

²⁵ Evelyn, *Diary*, Vol 4, p. 52.

²⁶ J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 61-82.

²⁷ Andrew Lacey, 'The Office for King Charles the Martyr in the 'Book of Common Prayer', 1662-1685'. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 53 (2002), p. 526.

Examination of diaries and letters will unearth whether people adhered to the behaviours set out in the 30 January proclamation. As the king's proclamation, attendance was expected as part of the duty to the monarch, however, it was not a legal requirement. The proclamation confirmed all churches and chapels would observe the day to implore God's mercy for the guilt of the sacred and innocent blood,²⁸ but that did not mean that people felt such a devotion to the martyred monarch as to attend. Contemporary diaries reveal that those who regularly attended the commemoration services had a connection to the Charles I before his death and felt a personal connection to the martyr, but there was not as much devotion illustrated as had been assumed in the republication of *Eikon*. A longue durée view of the adherence of the day illustrates how the regicide retained the potential to speak to political moments, which will be explored later. The first case studies examined here – John Evelyn, Countess Warwick, and Philip Henry – all had personal links to Charles I, and their emotional responses are not surprising.

John Evelyn kept his diary from 1640 to his death in 1706 and remained loyal to the Stuarts. He even visited the king when he was imprisoned at Hampton Court in 1648 and kissed his hand.²⁹ A devotee of the martyr cult, his devotion was the exception and not the rule. His solemn observance of 30 January sermons each year confirm his loyalist credentials. In 1661 he observed the day as the first one of solemn fast and humiliation to deplore the sins of the murder of Charles I.³⁰ On 30 January 1666, Evelyn reported attending a sermon in which 'the vile treachery of his late Majesties Enemies' was expounded, with reference to 'the simple meaning of some, & [the] abominable treason & malice of others'.³¹ Evelyn related that the minister had also 'proved exceedingly well' that 'no pretence of doing good, by evil meanes was justifiable'.³² As Charles I moved from contemporary gaze into the Restoration generation, the themes of sermons preached changed. Evelyn was vitriolic about the sermon he heard on 30 January 1680, where the Bishop of Rochester preached 'very pathetically', or, two years later, when Ralph Cudworth related how the 'Treasons' of the 1640s and 1650s had been committed 'under a

²⁸ *Statutes*, Vol 5, pp. 288-290.

²⁹ Evelyn, *Diary*, Vol 2, p. 7.

³⁰ *ibid*, Vol 2, p. 158.

³¹ *Ibid*, Vol 2, p. 429.

³² *Ibid*, Vol 3, p. 201.

forme [i.e. pretence] of Reformation & Godliness'.³³ Evelyn was clearly horrified at any diversion from the theme of Charles as a martyr. In 1700 he attended the House of Commons sermon and was appalled that the preacher confirmed the day was not about the horror of the murder but rather a lesson to other kings about how they should behave, or they will come to the same end. This was a not too subtle attack on the behaviour of monarchy.³⁴ Evelyn's final reference was in 1704. He wrote, 'The fast on the Martyrdom of King Charles I was observed with more than usual solemnity.'³⁵ Queen Anne's reign had brought in the height of Toryism and the higher attendance is suggestive of the current political climate. The Tories have been described as the ancestors of the royalists and at the core of their ideals was loyalty to the monarchy.³⁶ By attending the 30 January sermon, they upheld these ideals and illustrated the wrongs of the past: rebellion against your monarch led to the destruction of the crown and stability.

Mary Rich, Countess of Warwick and a lady-in-waiting to Henrietta Maria, wrote of her devotion to the king in her diary. Mary had ties to both royalists and parliamentarians; her father had been Lord Treasurer in Ireland and became a Privy Councillor in 1640 and died in 1643.³⁷ Her father-in-law and husband both supported parliament through naval roles, but neither were considered key players in parliamentary circles.³⁸ In her memoir, Warwick, who was battling smallpox at the time of the regicide, noted that when she heard the news, 'I had a great abhorrence of that bloody act, and was much disordered at it.'³⁹ There are only brief glimpses in her diary about political events, such as the siege of Colchester, which happened close to her Essex home. Warwick had a religious conversion when her son contracted smallpox and vowed to become a 'new Creature' if her son was restored to health. Her diary provided insight into how she transformed into a paragon of piety with regular church attendance.⁴⁰

³³ Ibid, Vol 3, p. 192.

³⁴ Ibid, Vol 3, p. 347.

³⁵ Ibid, Vol 3, p. 401.

³⁶ Tim Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715* (London: Longman, 1993), p. 124.

³⁷ Barnard T. Boyle, 'Richard, first earl of Cork (1566–1643), landowner and administrator'. ODNB, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/3133>> [accessed 9 June 2021].

³⁸ Rich, *Diary*, p. 110.

³⁹ Rich, *Diary*, p. 136.

⁴⁰ Sara H. Mendelson, 'Rich [née Boyle], Mary, countess of Warwick (1624–1678), noblewoman.' ODNB, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/23487>> [accessed 9 June 2021] ;BL, Add. MS 27357, fol. 19v.

On 30 January 1667, Warwick fasted all day, offered God her broken heart and attended a sermon about 'touch not mine anointed.'⁴¹ In April the same year, she visited the Banqueting House and amid that great place, her mind turned to the regicide,

which thought did strike me with some seriousness, and
made me consider in what glory I had in that very place seen
the late king, and yet out of that very place he was brought to
have his head cut off.⁴²

On 30 January the following year, she begged for forgiveness. She also linked the regicide with the nation's sins and guilt, turning to 'beg of God to take away from the land, the guilt of the innocent blood of the last king'.⁴³ This theme continued in 1669 and 1670 when she mourned for the sins of the nation and wrestled with God for the mercy for poor England.⁴⁴ However, her devotions had a double edge. She viewed the national misfortunes that occurred during Charles II's reign, notably the Great Fire of London, as a sign of God's displeasure. She prayed for 'Poor England' and the 'abominations of the land' and the nation's sins for which God was punishing all.⁴⁵ Therefore Warwick's devotion to the 30 January can be interpreted as asking God for his aid for the nation's misfortunes, rather than a pure devotion to Charles I. She had a deep belief that God would answer her prayers and therefore these prayers were deeply personal. Her emotions permeate her diary pages, although after 1670 she does not mention any further devotion to the regicide. This could reflect that the sermon's moved away from Charles the martyr and towards political ideologue. As Charles was not portrayed as a martyr, she lost the connection with the power of prayer in pleading for God's intervention for the country.

Mary Rich was not the only person to link the regicide to the nation's sins and guilt and the need for absolution. In his diary, Thomas Rugg detailed that 30 January 1660 was 'the day to be kept a fast and humiliation forever, that God would pardon

⁴¹ Rich, *Diary*, p. 142.

⁴² *ibid*, p. 143.

⁴³ *ibid*, p. 145.

⁴⁴ *ibid*, p. 145.

⁴⁵ *ibid*, p. 167

the sines of the nation for killing their king.’⁴⁶ The nonconformist minister Philip Henry, a childhood classmate of Charles II, noted on 30 January 1667 that God might forgive the sin that is called to remember this day. Just like Countess Warwick, he hoped that God would let the ‘innocency of the innocent be cleared up’; he asked for absolution for their implicit involvement in the regicide.⁴⁷ Unlike Pepys, who also attended the regicide, Henry remained constant in his horror of the event and his prayer for the martyr and the sins of the nation. In 1671 this is echoed in his prayers for God to deliver the nation from blood guiltiness.⁴⁸ In 1673 he remembered the day with grief and prayer that God would please to forgive it.⁴⁹ Guilt, as we saw in chapter 2, was an emotion that Charles II looked to harness at the time of the Restoration. Countess Warwick, Philip Henry and Evelyn all had personal links to Charles I, and the emotional response as shown in these diaries are therefore not surprising. However, their prayers went beyond the regicide, calling for the nation to be delivered from guilt.

The above diaries attest to the popularity of the cult of Charles the martyr, but they do not reflect the majority of personal sources analysed in this research: many diaries make no mention of 30 January at all. Bryon Stewart argued that ‘all but two of the fifty-three diaries consulted had at least one entry concerning the anniversary, and most commented on the strictness with which the day was observed.’⁵⁰ However, as will be explored with Pepys, a person may attend the first sermon, but many personal sources make no consistent reference to the attendance of the sermons. I disagree with Stewart’s assertion and that after 1661 there was little reference to Charles I. The diarist Samuel Pepys worked for the Restoration government and was secretary to Earl of Sandwich before working in the navy during the 1660s.⁵¹ As his rise within the Stuart government continued, in his diary he noted his closeness to this regime and personal connections and conversations with Charles II. On 30 January 1661, Pepys attended church where he heard a sermon upon ‘Lord,

⁴⁶ Elizabeth R. Clarke, ‘Rugg, Thomas (d. 1670), diarist.’ ODNB, < <http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/24261> > [accessed 20 Oct 2020] and Rugg, *Diary*, p. 142.

⁴⁷ Henry, *Diary*, p. 166.

⁴⁸ *ibid*, p. 236.

⁴⁹ *ibid*, p. 260.

⁵⁰ Bryon S. Stewart, ‘The Cult of the Royal Martyr’, *Church History*, 38:2 (1969), pp. 175-187.

⁵¹ C.S. Knighton, ‘Pepys, Samuel (1633–1703), naval official and diarist.’ ODNB, < <http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/21906> > [accessed 20 Oct 2020].

forgive us our former iniquitys'.⁵² His devotion quickly waned, however, as the following year he confessed that 'we were forced to keep it more than we would have done, having forgot to take any victuals into the house.'⁵³ Pepys does not mention attending another church service on 30 January; in fact, he worked on that most sacred of days in 1663, 1664, 1665, and in 1667 his wife admonished him for singing in his garden on a day that should be set aside for prayer.⁵⁴ In 1668 he spent three hours with the Auditor of the Imprests in the Exchequer before having lunch at the Crown and then worked at the Navy Office. As a government official who had worked several regicide days, this could be indicative of others in similar positions in government and provides an insight into how important this day was. Pepys was present at the regicide as a schoolboy and therefore had a personal link to the 30 January. He noted how ashamed he felt of his original boyish reaction but showed no real loyalty or reverence for the day. Charles II proclaimed 30 January as a day to commemorate his father, yet Pepys does not indicate that any pressure was put upon members of government to exhibit loyalty to his father by attending the martyr sermons.

Another fine example of a seventeenth century diary is that of puritan minister Ralph Josselin, who kept his diary until his death in 1683. This diary provides a view of those who preached on the day and potential reaction from the congregation. He noted in 1661 that there was a fast to lament the king's death,⁵⁵ but the following year indicated a lack of devotion to the day as there were 'not above 70 persons or yr abouts' hearing him preach.⁵⁶ That same year when he gave the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, although only twelve attended they showed 'great devotion and brokenness of heart.'⁵⁷ Unlike the earlier 30 January sermon, Josselin suggested there was an emotional engagement with the sacraments from his congregation. In 1677 he preached, but his diary is full of his frustration at the current government. He questioned why money was being spent on the war with France, or on harlots and petticoats. He noted that it was strange that only now,

⁵² Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 2, p. 26.

⁵³ *ibid*, Vol 7, p. 37.

⁵⁴ *ibid*, Vol 4, p. 29.

⁵⁵ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 137.

⁵⁶ *ibid*, p. 139.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, p. 146.

after twenty nine years, there was talk of a monument to Charles I.⁵⁸ The final mention of regicide sermon attendance is in 1682. There are many years that he does not mention presiding or attending the 30 January sermons, suggesting an inconsistent devotion and delivery of a regicide sermon. In his diary, Josselin indicated frustration at the current regime and a lack of engagement from his congregation at the regicide sermons. It is suggestive that the sermons were not universally observed across the country.

Other diaries also provide a picture of non-commitment to attending the regicide fast day. Bulstrode Whitelocke, who served as Lord Keeper of the Great Seal under the Commonwealth, recorded his own failure to attend church on anniversaries throughout the period between the Restoration and his death in 1675. On one of these occasions, in 1661, he recorded that 'he went not abroad'.⁵⁹ On the same day in 1662, he also 'did not goe abroad'.⁶⁰ Remarkably, Whitelocke's attendance at church was recorded on only two of the anniversaries through which he lived.⁶¹ Given that Whitelocke had been so close to the machinations of the commonwealth government, this failure to attend sermons during this time perhaps reflects personal guilt he may have felt towards the regicide or in fact shows he still stood by the decisions he made during the Civil War. Other diaries suggest that Whitelocke was not alone in his absenteeism. Despite his opinion that 30 January 1662 was 'a day of darkness in regard of the wrath of God on thes lands', eighteen years passed before Alexander Brodie, who had been a commissioner sent to the Hague in 1649 to meet with Charles II, referred to observing the fast.⁶² Between these occurrences, his diary entries on 30 January are characterised by references to visits.⁶³ Brodie noted that he had been adverse to Cromwell's usurpations and lamented the corruptions of church and state but this dislike for Cromwell did not mean that he lamented the death of the Charles I.⁶⁴ The Presbyterian Oliver Heywood wrote on 30 January 1680 that he 'stayd at home [and] studied' rather

⁵⁸ Ibid, p. 173.

⁵⁹ Whitelocke, *Diary*, p. 625.

⁶⁰ Whitelocke, *Diary*, pp. 642; 649.

⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 683; 810.

⁶² Alexander Brodie, *The Diary of Alexander Brodie of Brodie, and of his son, James Brodie of Brodie, consisting of extracts from the existing manuscripts* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1863), pp. 239; 420.

⁶³ See for instance, Brodie, *Diary*, pp. 287;325.

⁶⁴ Brodie, *Diary*, p. 8.

than attending church, 'except that I visited John Learoyd, [and] went to Alice Holts at Cockil.' Heywood was thus able to conclude that 'God made me of use.'⁶⁵ On 30 January 1664, the *Kingdomes Intelligencer* reported that, 'this day was both Usher'd in and Enterteyn'd with seditious Practices against his most Sacred and Merciful Majesty'.⁶⁶ This indicated that people did not see it as an important event for them and even just four years after the Restoration people did not adhere to the rules as outlined by the Act of Oblivion.

A longue durée view of the adherence of the day illustrates how the regicide lost its lustre quickly but retained the potential to speak to particular political moments. For example, the day was used as a mouthpiece to speak at certain political events. Thomas Rugg confirmed that in 1661 '30th January was kept a very solemn day and prayers observed in all the churches in London.'⁶⁷ That same year, the Venetian ambassador noted that 'by the King's command by proclamation was observed as a fast throughout England, Scotland and Ireland in commemoration of the death of Charles I twelve years ago, and to implore the Divine blessing on this nation to prevent similar horrid spectacles, and the day was kept in all three kingdoms in an exemplary manner'.⁶⁸ The following year 'the anniversary of the King's execution was spent in devotions in church and in fasting according to the use of the country ... imploring Heaven to bless the nation and preserve it from similar evil influences'.⁶⁹ The early fast days focused on a reminder of the horrific events that had led to the regicide as a warning of future evils and would appear to have been attended across the country as indicated by preachers such as Josselin. However, this consistency of attendance declined. After 1662, the ambassador did not note any further regicide sermons in his dispatches.⁷⁰ Instead they remained focused on foreign relationships with France and Holland and the regicide is not even a footnote. Unlike Josselin, who noted no emotional engagement among his congregation with the regicide sermons, William Hampton preached twice on 30

⁶⁵ Heywood, *Diary*, Vol 2, p. 115.

⁶⁶ *Kingdomes Intelligencer* (1st February 1664); Legon, *Revolution*, p. 135.

⁶⁷ Rugg, *Journal*, p. 145.

⁶⁸ Allen. B. Hinds (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice*, Vol 32, 1659-1661 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1931), pp. 244-252.

⁶⁹ *Venice*, Vol 32, pp. 244-252.

⁷⁰ Allen. B. Hinds (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice*, Vol 33, 1661-1664 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1932), pp. 101-112.

January 1661 and tells of being in tears and also drawing tears from the listeners. Potter argues that it is likely that this experience happened in many churches across the country, although the personal sources researched in this thesis do not illustrate this.⁷¹

Through an examination of the personal sources, the first ten years of the Restoration would indicate some commemoration of the 30 January. There is clear, albeit inconsistent, devotion, as illustrated by Pepys and Whitelocke, but what impact did this have on attendance as the regicide moved from the present into history? Henry Hyde, the 2nd Earl of Clarendon was the eldest son to Charles II's Secretary of State. He became Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in 1685 and was loyal to the Stuarts, but actively opposed the succession of William of Orange and his niece Mary after his brother-in-law James II was deposed. In 1686, he noted that he went to church for the anniversary of the murder of king Charles.⁷² On 6th February 1687, he attended the anniversary of the king coming to the crown 'which was extremely empty.'⁷³ In 1688, he attended church because the House of Lords did not organise a regicide sermon, although the Dean of Norwich preached before the House of Commons.⁷⁴ In 1690 he attended a sermon at Ely House by Mr Leslie. 'I believe there might be about threescore people present; a great auditory at this time.'⁷⁵ Such a high number of attendees could be due to the service being a private one for nobles at the Bishop of Ely's chapel. This entry is significant, as in June 1690 Hyde was arrested and charged with plotting against William III.⁷⁶ Hyde continued to rebel as shown when, on 24th February 1693, Hyde was present at the ceremony where the nonjuring bishops, William Lloyd and Thomas White, consecrated George Hicke and Thomas Wagstaffe as suffragans, the object being to continue a succession in the Jacobite interest. Thus, the higher attendance at the 1690 regicide sermon indicates this was due to the contemporary political climate, with those who were opposed to

⁷¹ Potter, 'The royal martyr', p. 240.

⁷² Henry Hyde, *Correspondence Of Henry Hyde, Earl Of Clarendon, And His Brother Laurence Hyde, Earl Of Rochester; With The Diary Of Lord Clarendon From 1687 To 1690, Containing Minute Particulars Of The Events Attending The Revolution And The Diary Of Lord Rochester During His Embassy To Poland In 1676*. Vol 2 (London: Henry Colburn, 1828), p. 150.

⁷³ Hyde, *Correspondence*, Vol 2, p. 158.

⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p. 201.

⁷⁵ *Ibid*, p. 303.

⁷⁶ W.A. Speck, 'Hyde, Henry, second earl of Clarendon (1638–1709), politician'. ODNB <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14329>> [accessed 8 July 2022].

the new regime gathering under the guise of commemoration; the regicide moving from a personal, emotional event to one of political discourse.

As the content of the 30 January sermons moved from a retelling of the evils of the regicide and warning against the future revolution to reflections of the current political situation, personal sources indicate that by the 1690s the fast day was not being widely observed. Bishop Nicolson of Carlisle noted those who attended the official commemoration at the House of Lords. The average attendance across the sixteen years from 1687 just hit double figures. The largest attendance at twenty one in 1711 followed the Sacheverell affair.⁷⁷ As with the large attendance at Ely House, it followed a political situation. The Sacheverell affair is an important case study as it highlights how the sermons spoke to the political moment. Holmes argued that with the rise of the Whig and Tory political parties, you also saw their church counterparts; high church and low church vying for position.⁷⁸ Sacheverell was a controversial preacher and rumoured son of a regicide.⁷⁹ He had built a reputation for being a firebrand preacher and the Lord Mayor had chosen him to address the city fathers at St Paul's on 5 November in 1710.⁸⁰ At the time the Whig party was in power and the Whig tradition was that the sermon followed a theme of thanking God for deliverance against popery via the gunpowder plot and the arrival of William of Orange at Torbay. Instead, Sacheverell compared the gunpowder plot not with the revolution of 1688, but with 30 January 1649. Both were:

indelible monuments of the irreconcilable rage and
bloodthirstiness of both the popish and fanatic enemies of
our Church and Government ... These TWO DAYS indeed are
but one united proof and visible testimonial of the same
dangerous and rebellious principles these confederates in
iniquity maintain.⁸¹

⁷⁷ William Nicolson, *The London Diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle, 1702-1718*, eds. Clive Holmes and Clyve Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), pp. 30-31.

⁷⁸ Geoffrey Holmes, *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1973), p. 41.

⁷⁹ W.A. Speck, 'Sacheverell, Henry (bap. 1674, d. 1724), Church of England clergyman and religious controversialist.' ODNB, < <http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/24440> > [accessed 22 Oct 2020].

⁸⁰ Holmes, *Trial of*, p. 60.

⁸¹ Henry Sacheverell, *The Perils of False Brethren, Both in Church, and State: Set Forth in a Sermon Preach'd Before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London, at the Cathedral-Church of St. Paul, on the 5th of November, 1709* (London, 1709), p. 3.

In doing this he turned the anniversary of the gunpowder plot into an attack upon Catholics and dissenters. Sacheverell published the sermon without permission. Toleration, he argued, threatened to revive the fanaticism which had brought about the Civil Wars and the execution of Charles I. 'I pray God we may be out of danger, but we may remember the king's person was voted to be so at the same time his murderers were conspiring his death.'⁸² The sermon had caused a stir. It was sensational as it broke the norms of the times and argued that the church had a part to play in the political discourse. Sacheverell was impeached and the trial began in Westminster Hall on 27th February 1710. As the case began there were riots on the streets and several chapels were attacked, confirming the government's viewpoint that Sacheverell had encouraged violence. In 1710 at the time of the trial, there was an avalanche of sermons about non-resistance.

The Sacheverell affair was an example how since the turn of the eighteenth century there had been a concern over growing dissent. In 1705, Sir John Pakington said in the House of Commons that dissenting schools have poisoned the youth against the church and 'I take them to be nurseries for rebellion.'⁸³ Sacheverell was an example of this perceived dissent from the church. 'He taught that presbytery and republican go hand in hand and noted that they were the same hand that ... once divided the King's head. He marvelled at how the justification of this was now printed in the press and his role was to prepare the nation to act over the same bloody tragedy again?'⁸⁴ Chandler, who preached before the Lords in 1715, used the Fast Day as a reminder of what can happen if there is no government at all and how George I's reign reflected settled government.⁸⁵ The longer-term view provides evidence that soon after the Restoration the memory of the regicide became normalised; it no longer retained the emotional engagement that was seen on the first anniversary. This move then turned the regicide into a political event that could be shaped to speak to a certain political event such as rebellions or high-level cases such as Sacheverell.

⁸² Sacheverell, *Perils*, p. 37.

⁸³ *HOP, 1690-1715*, Vol 3, pp. 62-68.

⁸⁴ *HOP, 1690-1715*, Vol 3, p. 52.

⁸⁵ Henry Chandler, *A Sermon Preached for the Funeral of that Humble and Faithful Servant of Jesus Christ, Mr. Nathanael Smith late of Malmesbury, in the county of Wilts: With a brief account of his life, in an epistle to Dr. Annesley* (London, 1691), p. 28.

The nature of our sources place real obstacles in the way of measuring how popular Charles I was throughout the latter seventeenth century. The personal sources already examined are by nobles, preachers or men in office, and Edward Legon in his work on seditious memories was able to utilise the seditious words spoken as a gauge of public sentiment.⁸⁶ An examination of a broader range of sources such as those who were investigated with sedition will help to further understand the support, or lack of, for Charles I. 30 January was meant to be a day of prayer and humiliation, through attending church services or fasting at home, yet as has been seen, attendance at the services was very inconsistent even with those most loyal to the royal cause, and the refusal to close places of business was a cause of especial anxiety for governors. On 30 January 1664, a government newspaper reported with alarm that York's dissenters had '[kept] open their Shops, and make it a day of Common Business'.⁸⁷ Reporting on the failure of York's Dissenters to close their shops on 30 January 1664, as argued by Legon Sir Roger L'Estrange, the Licensor of the Press, drew attention to these moments of mis-commemoration as illustrative of fanatics who refused to follow the Restoration regime's rules.⁸⁸ This kind of behaviour continued into the 1670s; on 30 January 1676, for instance, Samuel Fox, a Quaker living in Rochester in Kent, refused to shut his shop windows, despite being told to do so repeatedly by the town's aldermen, common councillors, and a constable.⁸⁹ That observance of the anniversary was a more widespread issue in Kent is hinted at by the palpable relief with which solemnities were reported by a government correspondent at Deal in the same year.⁹⁰ In 1689 Roger Morrice noted in his entering book that most London shops were open for business.⁹¹ These instances would suggest that some people resisted and opened their shops and that some did not and reported them. However, the instances indicate that people were willing to go against the behaviour as prescribed in the proclamation of the martyr day.

⁸⁶ Legon, *Revolution*, pp. 17-46.

⁸⁷ *Newes* (4th February 1664).

⁸⁸ Legon, *Revolution*, pp. 153-4.

⁸⁹ *CSPD*, 1675-76, p. 536.

⁹⁰ *CSPD*, 1675-76, p. 536.

⁹¹ Roger Morrice, *The Entering Book of Roger Morrice, 1677-1691*. Vol 4, ed. Mark Golding (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), p. 364.

While the 30 January appeared to be solemnly observed in the early years of the Restoration, there was an inconsistent observation of the day, possibly a reflection of Charles II's contradictory early government policy towards the regicide. In his examination of the contested memories post-Restoration, Legon has argued that where sedition and treason were to an extent defined by what one said and wrote, what they did can also tell us what they thought.⁹² There are many accusations of people speaking seditious words following the Restoration and using Legon's theory we can gain insight into what they thought. Charles could only be seen as a martyr if the people believed he had died for a just cause, but in the words of sedition, both Charles' trial and his death were seen as legitimate. On 24 December 1660 Richard Prickett and Thomas Briggs heard Simon Oldefield confirm 'that the late king had a fair trial, and he was against kingly government'.⁹³ Four years later the trial was still being discussed as, on the 21 March 1664 John Lyley defended the court of justice that tried the late king.⁹⁴ William Lawson, who was a labourer, noted that 'it was justly done that the late king was beheaded.'⁹⁵ For George Taylor 'it was a good day when the king's head was cut off.'⁹⁶ In August 1662 Charles North, who was a gentleman, confirmed that 'he was one of those men that had murthered the late king ... that the last king did deserve the death he had.'⁹⁷ Even by the later part of Charles II's reign support for the regicide was still uttered. Edward Appleby in November 1682 made comments 'justifying the death of the late King'.⁹⁸ To these men, Charles was not a martyr, as he died through a just legal process and was therefore guilty of the crimes levelled at him, that of a tyrant and a danger to his people. The authorities were concerned about this lack of devotion to the martyr, as demonstrated in Worcester, where, on 16 October 1682, Charles I's effigy was found to have been defaced. The mayor held an inquiry and a reward of 5/ was offered to find out what happened. The case was heavily investigated and a report made in parliament. It transpired that the damage was accidental, caused by the installation of fireworks near the effigy. William Hoare wrote in his account to

⁹² Legon, *Revolution*, p. 4.

⁹³ *CSPD*, 1660-1661, p. 8.

⁹⁴ Frances Andrews (ed.), *Depositions from the Castle of York, relating to 12 offences committed in the Northern Counties in the Seventeenth century* (Durham: Frances Andrews, 1861), p. 118.

⁹⁵ *ibid*, p. 88.

⁹⁶ *ibid*, p. 94.

⁹⁷ *ibid*, p. 101.

⁹⁸ *Ibid*, p. 266.

the Earl of Craven: 'suppose that this base actions had a more vile intent.'⁹⁹ This incident and the subsequent thorough investigation suggest that the authorities had been concerned that there was in fact little love for the martyr king. The evidence shows that there was opposition to the image of the martyr king as positioned in *Eikon*, but it is difficult to say how widespread it was.

ii - Memorials of Charles I

Monuments are nothing if not selective aids to memory: they encourage us to remember some things and to forget others.¹⁰⁰

Physical monuments have been used as a method to create a lasting image of an individual for centuries. Pierre Nora has argued that monuments are an intersection, where geography, history, identity and memory run into and through each other; they are created in physical form at specific sites to evoke a certain public narrative.¹⁰¹ In the thirteenth century the Eleanor crosses were created to memorialise Eleanor of Castile and even today statues are commissioned outside parliament to commemorate those who uphold the virtues of democracy from Churchill to Pankhurst. These monuments have the ability to link people with national narratives and the ongoing legitimisation of the state. Therefore, commissioned monuments can provide an insight into the narratives that a regime tries to tell. This section will show that there was no clear strategy from the Restoration government or by Charles II to commemorate Charles I through monuments, and when attempts were made, they were piecemeal in nature.

A clear example of this is Charles' statue at the Royal Exchange. On 30 May 1648, an inscription was written underneath the statue: 'Exit tyrannorum ultimus' (The last tyrant of Kings). Rugg noted in his diary on 15 March 1660 that these words were washed out and the painter who covered up the inscription was proud to proclaim that 'it should never doe him any more service, it [in] regard it had the honour to put out rebells hand wrightinge out of the wall'.¹⁰² Much has been written

⁹⁹ CSPD, January-June 1683, p. 466.

¹⁰⁰ Brian Ladd, *The Ghosts of Berlin: Confronting German History in the Urban Landscape* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2018), p. 11.

¹⁰¹ Pierre Nora, 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire', *Representations*, 26 (1989), pp. 7-24.

¹⁰² Rugg, *Journal*, p. 60.

about this act and how it represented loyalty towards Charles I and commemoration to his memory. Physical monuments held power and as such the statue at the Exchange was a public symbol of history and power. Sean Kelsey has shown how the Commonwealth regime used a range of traditional methods to legitimise the new regime. This included the role of spectacle through presentation of prestige and authority through parades, art, and the treatment of visiting European diplomats, and how the new regime was concerned with fostering identity through the use of icons, including flags, arms, maces, maps, and seals.¹⁰³ When the painter removed the words below Charles I's statue this physical act symbolised the end of the Commonwealth and the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660.

Nigel Llewellyn points out that 'the health of the state was signalled by the strength and weakness of the monarch, and royal monuments acted as an index of the confidence of, or in, the lineage.'¹⁰⁴ Charles II's grandfather, James I, secured his lineage by erecting a monument dedicated to his ancestor, Elizabeth I. Although the inscription gave an account of Elizabeth's virtues, it emphasised James I as her rightful heir and patron of her monument.¹⁰⁵ James wanted to build his legitimacy to the throne and used the reputation of his predecessor to do this: he was the natural successor to the great queen, and he had inherited much of her greatness. He also used the opportunity to legitimise the legacy of his mother Mary Queen of Scots who had been beheaded in 1586 for treason. As argued by Llewellyn, James carefully reconstructed her legacy through alabaster.¹⁰⁶ When James' Queen Consort, Anne of Denmark died, she had a splendid funeral, but no monument commemorated her honour. His dynasty was already secure.¹⁰⁷ When James I died, his son dutifully accorded him with the proper obsequies, but no memorial was built in his honour. Charles did, however, commission a different type of monument to his father and to the Stuart legacy: the great ceiling painting by Rubens at Banqueting House.

When Charles II ascended the throne in 1660, he used different mediums to create emotional governance around his father. With the formal commemoration of

¹⁰³ Sean Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic: The Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649-1653* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).

¹⁰⁴ Nigel Llewellyn, 'The Royal Body: Monuments to the Dead, for the Living', in *Renaissance Bodies. The human Figure in English Culture c.1540-1660*, eds. L. Gent and N. Llewellyn (London: Reaktion, 1990), p. 224.

¹⁰⁵ Llewellyn, 'Royal Body', p. 225.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, p. 225.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, p. 228.

30 January, he wanted people to remember the sins that had been committed against his father and his legacy. Edkins explores how we remember traumatic events such as wars, famines, genocides, and terrorism, and questions the assumed role of commemorations to reinforce state and nationhood. For her, 'memorials and memorialisation are among the ways people confront the challenge of responding to trauma ... Commemoration was and it remains a business in which sculptors, artists, bureaucrats, churchmen and ordinary people had to strike an agreement and carry it out.'¹⁰⁸ A monument to Charles I would enhance the official narrative which Charles II had initiated at the time of the Restoration. The contested nature of this era was notable in parts of the coronation where the arch commemorating Charles I had so horrified Josselin. There is little evidence of a concerted attempt by the new regime to create monuments in Charles I's honour.¹⁰⁹

Returning to the statue at the Royal Exchange it was illustrative of policy of Charles II in both remembering and forgetting. The Dutch painter William Schellinks kept a journal when he travelled around England. He observed the monument to Charles I when he visited the Royal Exchange in August 1661 noting it was 'adorned with statues of [all] English kings'.¹¹⁰ A new statue of Charles I had been commissioned shortly after the Restoration.¹¹¹ Schellinks noted the new statue confirmed Charles I as second King of Great Britain, a nod to the Stuart legacy of being the joint rulers of the three kingdoms since James I. There was also a new statue of Charles II which was inscribed with the word 'amnestia'.¹¹² Amnestia was Latin for amnesty and as Judith Pollmann has shown the Act of Oblivion offered a 'limited amnesty, as well as oblivion of things past'.¹¹³ The Act had two aims. The first was to put a stop to disputes about property and set rules by which such claims would be settled. Secondly, it stipulated 'that people should forget, ignore, keep silent about, and bury the injuries and the difference of the past'.¹¹⁴ It aimed to prevent the memory of the civil wars being used in legal actions and to prevent

¹⁰⁸ Edkins, *Trauma*, p. 57.

¹⁰⁹ Neufeld, *Public Remembering*.

¹¹⁰ Walter Thornbury, *Old and New London: A Narrative of its History, its People and its Places*. Vol 1 (London: Cassell, Petter & Galpin, 1878), pp. 494-513.

¹¹¹ Thornbury, *London*, pp. 494-513.

¹¹² William Schellinks, *The Journal of William Schellinks' Travels in England, 1661-1663*, ed. Maurice Exwood and H.L. Lehmann (London: Royal Historical Society, 1993) pp. 52-3.

¹¹³ Judith Pollmann, *Memory in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 143.

¹¹⁴ Pollman, *Memory*, p. 144.

people using memory in destructive ways.¹¹⁵ The Act was created to draw a line under the past twenty years of bitter religious, political and cultural divisions. Charles wanted to be viewed as a compassionate king who healed the nation, but he used the regicide to remind his people why he was a magnanimous leader.

Charles II was in his ascension at the beginning of his reign yet the statue at the Exchange was the only formal monument in the first years of his reign. It would only be when events presented themselves that Charles took any positive action in the creation of monuments to his father. After the Great Fire of London in 1666 there was much debate about the rebuilding of the city. The Temple Bar was a gate located in the heart of London and whether to save it caused a lot of discussion.¹¹⁶ Under the orders of Charles II, the Temple Bar was rebuilt. He provided £1,500 and urged the city to accept the money and that he would ensure that 'further [money] supplied... for carrying on and finishing that work.'¹¹⁷ Payments were made to John Bushnell and masons Joshua Marshall and Thomas Knight between 1670 and 1672 for the construction of four statues of Anne of Denmark, James I, Charles I and Charles II.¹¹⁸ The statue of Charles I was to depict him wearing flowing royal clothes. He looked towards the left, his beard very apparent and his long hair neatly groomed. He holds the royal sceptre in his left hand. Emily Mann argues that Charles II was keen for this work to be carried out as London had been a hot bed of disillusionment during the Civil Wars and in the previous decade had faced plague and the Great Fire.¹¹⁹ This monument was used as political theatre to illustrate the strength of the Stuart legacy. In 1636, Charles, I commissioned Inigo Jones to design a new Temple Bar, but the work never happened.¹²⁰ Therefore, Charles II was keen to highlight his credentials through the decisions made by his father, and the Arch is another example of this. For Mann this was an act of power from Charles II as he was executing his father's wishes and did so at the place where Charles I had died.¹²¹ Temple Bar also had monuments to his Stuart ancestors; much like with the Royal

¹¹⁵ *Statutes*, Vol 5, pp. 226-234.

¹¹⁶ Emily Mann, 'In Defence of the City: The Gates of London and Temple Bar in the Seventeenth Century', *Architectural History*, 49 (2006), pp. 75-99.

¹¹⁷ The records of the City Lands Committee are held at the LMA but copy of the accounts of disbursements are found at Guildhall Library MS 184/4.

¹¹⁸ Guildhall Library MS 184/4, fol. 30.

¹¹⁹ Mann, *Temple Bar*, p. 88.

¹²⁰ J. Harris and G. Higgott, *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings* (London: Zwemmer, 1999), p. 251.

¹²¹ Mann, *Temple Bar*, p. 89.

Exchange. Charles II also had a monument to himself, to create the image of the Stuart legacy. There does not appear to be a long-term strategy in honouring his father, rather opportunities arose where Charles II could commemorate his father and ancestors rather than a consistent concerted effort to create a sustained legacy to his father.

This lack of strategy is also seen in the story behind the famous statue of Charles I on horseback at the top of Charing Cross. The statue was originally cast in 1633 by Hubert Le Sauer for the lord treasurer, Lord Weston (afterwards 1st Earl of Portland).¹²² Horace Walpole noted that this had been sold by parliament to John Rivet, a brazier, with instructions to break it up.¹²³ Rivet, however, preserved the statue, producing some fragments of old brass to show that he had carried out his commission. At the Restoration the second Earl of Portland 'discovered where a brass horse is with his late majesty's figure upon it.'¹²⁴ Portland complained to the House of Lords as Rivet had failed to deliver the statue as per the Lords' request. 'That the said John Rivett shall permit and suffer the Sheriff of London to serve a Replevin upon the said Statue and Horse of Brass that are now in his Custody.'¹²⁵ The statue was returned to Portland, but the next news of the statue does not materialise until Charles II purchased it on 19th April 1675. It was confirmed that '1600l ... to William Richards in full satisfaction for a statue in brass of our royal father.'¹²⁶ In the following month appears a record of a payment to 'Robert Streeter, Serjant Painter ... for makeing 2 designes on paper for the King in order to ye setting up of ye Statue of King Charles the first upon a Stone pedestall by Mastr Surveyors Direction ijli xs'.¹²⁷ Charles II turned to Wren's workshop for the completion of the pedestal. Joshua Marshall, who also worked on Temple Bar, completed the work on the pedestal, the carving of which contained the royal Stuart arms along with a selection of martial trophies. The placement of the statue made significant reference to the story of Charles I and his death: it faced Banqueting House and looked toward

¹²² G.H. Gater and E.P. Wheeler (eds.), *Survey of London: St Martin-in-The-Fields I: Charing Cross*, Vol 16 (London: London County Council, 1935), pp. 258-268.

¹²³ Horace Walpole, *Horace Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting in England*, Vol 2, ed. by R. N. Wornum (London, 1888), p. 44.

¹²⁴ *Survey*, Vol 16, p. 266.

¹²⁵ *JHL*, Vol 11, pp. 96-98.

¹²⁶ William A. Shaw (ed.), *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1672-1675*, Vol 4 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office 1909), p. 733.

¹²⁷ TNA Works, 5/25.

the Houses of Parliament. There was no plaque, only the name of the original sculpturer under the left hoof. The opportunity to commemorate his father came through the Earl of Portland who Charles I had shown loyalty towards. In 1663, to help supplement his estates, he granted Coulson Manor in Surrey to Portland as he surrendered the President of Munster to Charles II.¹²⁸ The statue was in essence a quick win for Charles II: for minimal cost he was able to establish it in a place of significance.

However, in less than seventy years the statue was in a poor state. On 22 February 1721, the Office of Works reported to the Treasury:

the ruinous Condition of that fine Equestral Statue at Charing Cross, which is very much out of repair, the reins of the bridle being broke & wasted small, the joynts of the Pedistall wants to be stopt & Cleaned; the lower plint whereon the Pedistall stands, ye stones are forced out and broke; the upper Torus moulding is broke in many places; 40 of the Iron barrs are allready stole, and the rest in great dainger. The whole Iron worke is too small & Decaied & Cannot serve again. The Outward Curb of Stone is broke in many places, the upright Stones are all broke; The flanders brick, pibble & flint pavings are sunk into holes and broke and is in a very bad condition.¹²⁹

There was no evidence whether the damage was created by vandalism or neglect but either would suggest that after the death of Charles II the cachet which his son had tried to create had evaporated. The memory of Charles I and what he represented was something many did not want to remember or commemorate.

A keyway in which the dead were remembered and honoured was through a funeral memorial. Memorials are inevitably constructions of the perceived highlights of someone's life, whether mother, soldier or victor. The past twenty years have seen a resurgence in examining the importance of funeral monuments, their construction and the messages memorials attempt to convey. For Llewellyn,

¹²⁸ H.E. Malden (ed.), *A History of the County of Surrey*, Vol 4 (London, 1912), pp. 199-205.

¹²⁹ TNA, Works, 6/7, p. 349.

monuments reflect their patrons' ideological and cultural concerns: 'By supporting conventional preoccupations and values, they upheld the status quo'.¹³⁰ Monuments expressed norms of virtue and achievement, family honour, sovereignty and ancestry. They therefore personify the self-esteem and self-image of the ruling classes and aspirations of those entering those classes.¹³¹ Llewellyn's work also focuses on the aesthetics of the monument, their form and design. Funeral memorials also played an important role in conveying messages about the life of the person they were remembering. Where a memorial was positioned, the words and any ornamental constructions, were all used to carefully craft the ever-lasting story. The ultimate function of the memorial was to create the lasting impression of the individual. Monuments were a powerful form for communicating information through their position, size, inscriptions, heraldry, effigies, and materials. Furthermore, Llewellyn argues, royal tombs embody a particular sanctity and hold such symbolic power that even if there were no tomb, people needed a physical contact with something. For example, an altar constructed over the grave of Edward VI in Westminster Abbey has been accepted as his memorial.¹³² It is significant therefore that Charles II did not have a memorial to his father built. His ancestors before him had acknowledged the value in the creation of a legacy through this medium. This could suggest that he recognised that his earlier efforts to create emotional governance through references to his father had failed, with only a few devoted followers of the martyr's cult. Murmurs of discontent emerged in the 1670s due to the lack of funeral monuments to the martyr. Francis Sandford, a genealogist, working at the College of Arms and author of the *Genealogical History*, documented the history of British royalty dating from 1066 to Charles II, and lamented the current king had done nothing to commemorate his father.¹³³ He noted that it was a stark contrast to James I's monuments to Elizabeth and Mary Queen of Scots.

In the same year the *Genealogical* was published, parliament discussed the internment of Charles I. Previous Kings of England who had met a suspicious death,

¹³⁰ Nigel Llewellyn, *Funeral monuments in post-Reformation England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 362.

¹³¹ *ibid*, p. 377.

¹³² *Ibid*, p. 231.

¹³³ P. Sherlock, 'Sandford, Francis (1630–1694), herald and genealogist'. ODNB, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/24633>> [accessed 15 Sep 2020].

such as Richard II or Edward II, had been buried away from Westminster, and Charles I was no exception to this.¹³⁴ Edward Lake noted in his diary retold the tale of Colonel Tomlinson who was with Charles on his day of execution and Charles was clear that his son would honour him. 'Coll Tomlinson, I have you some memorandums last night about my buryall, but you have since thought better of it ... Charles himself will return and bury mee.'¹³⁵ This account was retold nearly thirty years after the regicide but confirmed that there was some debate about if Charles I had been buried with the necessary respect he was due. After his execution, Charles I's body was laid in a coffin covered in black velvet and was carried to St James Palace. It was housed there for seven days and although permission was sought to view the body, few were admitted.¹³⁶ On 7 February 1649 the body of Charles I was moved from St James to Windsor.¹³⁷ The Duke of Richmond, Marquis of Hertford, Earl of Southampton, and Earl of Lindsay undertook the funeral and burial arrangements. Due to the political climate and nature of his death, Charles I was not given a public funeral with the pomp and ceremony reserved for royalty. The fledging new regime did not want a further public display of his martyrdom. On 9 February 1649, his coffin was moved from Windsor Castle to St George's Chapel with the four servants and the four noble men as pall bearers. Nalson noted that 'in this manner ... without other solemnity than of sighs and tears committed to the Earth, the velvet pall being thrown into the vault over the coffin to which was fastened an inscription ... King Charles, 1649.'¹³⁸ Windsor was a sacred place that had housed the tombs of previous monarchs and it had not been closed off to visitors by the new regime. John Evelyn visited the site where he 'saw the Castle and Chapel of St George, where they have laid our blessed Martyr, King Charles, in the vault just before the alter.'¹³⁹ Charles' burial site was not hidden away but neither did the new regime actively promote the site of the martyr. There is no evidence of personal commemorations at his burial place. For example,

¹³⁴ Richard II had originally been buried at the friary in Langley, Hertfordshire and Edward II at Gloucester Cathedral.

¹³⁵ Edward Lake, 'Diary of Dr. Edward Lake, Archdeacon and Prebendary of Exeter, Chaplain and Tutor to the Princesses Mary and Anne, daughters of the Duke of York, afterwards James the Second, in the years 1677-1678'. *Camden Old Series*, 39 (1847), p. 24.

¹³⁶ Graham Edwards, *Last days of Charles I* (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), p. 188.

¹³⁷ Edwards, *Last Days*, p. 188.

¹³⁸ John Nalson, *A True Copy of the Journal of the High Court of Justice for the Tryal of K. Charles I as it was read in the House of Commons and attested under the hand of Phelps, clerk to that infamous court / taken by J. Nalson Jan. 4, 1683: With a large introduction* (London: Printed by H.C. for Thomas Dring, 1684), p. 114.

¹³⁹ Evelyn, *Diary*, Vol 2, p. 79.

no flowers were left on anniversary of his death. Even those most loyal to the Stuarts', such as Evelyn, did not note a creation of a shrine to Charles I as had happened with previous monarchs.

The question of Charles' reinternment was raised in parliament on 29 January 1677, when Lord O'Brien stood up and, as noted by Dr Edward Lake, made 'a passionate speech ... that the old king did yet probably want a Christian buryall, which perhaps was a main cause of those dreadfull judgements which have late befallen the nation.'¹⁴⁰ O'Brien's family was originally from Ireland and he became an active member of the Cavalier Parliament, with ninety-six committee appointments. He delivered about forty speeches and as a Protestant was appointed to the committee on the growth of Popery in 1671.¹⁴¹ The following day Sir Philip Warwick became the chair of the committee for the reinternment of Charles I. Warwick was a very sensible choice as he had fought at Edgehill and supported Charles I throughout the Civil War. This loyalty remained throughout the Commonwealth years. Hyde commended his loyalty, writing that 'the King knows very well Mr Warwick's affection and zeal for his service and his abilities to promote it'.¹⁴² He was an active member of the Cavalier Parliament, with 49 recorded speeches and 258 committees, including the committee of elections and privileges in every session.¹⁴³ The initial discussion focused upon cost and location. Sir John Ernley pointed out that 'late Kings burial may be desirable to the King and that 70,000l would cover the cost.'¹⁴⁴ Joseph Williamson noted that it should be at least an equal or superior monument to previous monarchs with a cost of 80,000l and to be built within four years. Sir Charles Harbord stated that it should be at Windsor alongside his ancestor Edward IV. This was agreed by Sir Thomas Meres who argued that the money should be spent on a monument and not a procession, as a procession just lasts a day. Warwick presented this to the house who confirmed that they agree 'that Two Months Tax be given to his Majesty ... for the Interment of his late Sacred Majesty; and for erecting him a

¹⁴⁰ Lake, 'Diary', p. 24.

¹⁴¹ *HOP*, 1660-1690, Vol 3, p. 167.

¹⁴² David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England, 1649-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), pp. 307-8.

¹⁴³ *HOP*, 1660-1690, Vol 3, pp. 675-677.

¹⁴⁴ Anchitell Grey, *Debates of the House of commons, from the year 1667 to the year 1694. Collected by the honble Anchitell Grey, Esq; who was thirty years member for the town of Derby; chairman of several committees; and decyphered Coleman's letters for the use of the House*, Vol 5 (London: T. Becket and P. A. De Hondt, 1769), p. 17.

Monument.¹⁴⁵ As noted by Lake, 'people were generally well pleased with this vote' and that foreign ministers at court could not but admire that this had been neglected for so long.¹⁴⁶ What is clear from this initial debate is that those on the committee wanted to ensure that the king was laid to rest in a suitable location where he could be remembered.

It is significant that the discussion for a mausoleum for Charles was initiated by parliament and not by Charles II. By 1675 the parliament had been in session since 1661 and, as argued by Annabel Patterson, while it began in eager compliance, gradual disillusionment with Charles' manoeuvres led to parliament demanding more control on policies.¹⁴⁷ John Reresby, who became an MP in 1673 and kept a detailed diary, noted this tension between Charles and parliament. 'They had given the King a very great revenue ... this began to weigh heavy upon the country and to make them repine ... stirred up ... to oppose the current'.¹⁴⁸ Parliament had been willing to grant many concessions as there was always the shadow of the Civil War and the regicide, many who were MPs were called 'pensioners' as many were receiving pensions due to loyalty to the crown.¹⁴⁹ Therefore Charles began parliament with their support and consent but as time progressed even the pensioners began to exert parliamentary authority. The discussion of the monument to Charles I in 1677 was during one of the longest sessions of the reign, which managed to prevent Charles II from aligning himself to France. For Patterson this laid the groundwork for the exclusion crisis, the greatest challenge to the crown.¹⁵⁰ By bringing the motion, parliament was exerting its authority and wanted to highlight the regicide and the potential power that parliament could possess. Much like Charles II had used the regicide at the beginning of his reign for emotional and political gain, this was parliament in turn doing the same.

Due to this tension with parliament Charles II felt compelled to provide a reason for the absence of the monument. William Coventry, on behalf of the king,

¹⁴⁵ *CJ*, Vol 9, pp. 428-429.

¹⁴⁶ Lake, *Diary*, p. 24.

¹⁴⁷ Annabel Patterson, *The Long Parliament of Charles II* (London: Yale University Press, 2008).

¹⁴⁸ John Reresby, *The Memoirs of the Honorable Sir John Reresby: Baronet, and last Governor of York. Containing several private and remarkable transactions, from the Restoration to the Revolution inclusively* (London: 1734), p. 90.

¹⁴⁹ Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

¹⁵⁰ Patterson, *Parliament*, p. 5.

confirmed that he had not already paid for a monument because of 'The great charge, and the Wars we have been in almost ever since ... the Restoration.'¹⁵¹ Raising the issue of a monument for Charles I was an act of great piety from parliament and a present to the king. This would suggest that parliament did initiate the discussion around the internment, and the speech from Coventry also hints that Charles II needed to make an explanation for waiting seventeen years before laying his father to rest in a way that was fit for the martyr king. Considering that Charles II made such a concerted effort at the time of his Restoration to avenge his father, it seems at odds that he made no attempt to have him reburied in honour. The diarist Ralph Josselin noted that this delay to bury Charles 'after twenty-nine years in the grave' was odd.¹⁵² 1677 was also a strange time to resurrect the martyr. John Spurr has termed the 1670s a masquerading age.¹⁵³ Charles' original chief minister Hyde, was replaced by Danby in 1667, but his own downfall would follow in 1678. Spurr asserts that this time saw a slump in the economy and some recent setbacks, such as an unsuccessful war with Holland.¹⁵⁴ Since the Restoration, there had been a long erosion of public trust in the king and his ministers and this erosion had begun to undermine the whole political system.¹⁵⁵ In 1677 Reresby spoke to Danby who said that all jealousies towards the king were groundless and all he wanted to do was to preserve religion and law.¹⁵⁶ This illustrated the tension that had occurred between the two, and that the monument to Charles had become a political statement that parliament initiated. Charles II noted his desire for his father to be remembered but since the Restoration he had done little to do this. There was a clear precedent with Richard II who had been moved from his original burial site and reinterred with his queen in Westminster Abbey. The reason for this was political: to provide legitimacy to Henry V's reign as his father had usurped the crown from Richard II. He wanted to draw a line in the usurpation and move on. Charles II was in a similar position but there is no evidence of his involvement in this endeavour to respect his father.

¹⁵¹ *HOP*, 1660-1690, Vol 2, pp. 157-8.

¹⁵² Josselin, *Diary*, p. 172.

¹⁵³ John Spurr, *England in the 1670s: This Masquerading Age* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), p. 5.

¹⁵⁴ *ibid*, p. 6.

¹⁵⁵ *ibid*, p. 241.

¹⁵⁶ Reresby, *Diary*, p. 110.

Relations between court and country became strained in the later part of the 1670s, due to the apparent whimsical nature of Charles II's ecclesiastical policies and the tensions in parliament between making peace with France or Holland. Parliament pressed for peace with Protestant Holland.¹⁵⁷ In the sessions of 1677 and 1678 the commons enlarged their focus on forging policy to the point of actually dictating to Charles how to extricate himself from the dangerous relationship with France and enter an alliance with the Dutch.¹⁵⁸ On 4 November 1677, the marriage between Charles II's niece Mary to William of Orange was celebrated and on 29 January 1678, the Commons thanked Charles for 'his great care of the Protestant religion, in marrying his niece with a Protestant prince.'¹⁵⁹ This union was also seen as a positive union as it brought together the royal blood and kingly virtues of the blessed martyr.¹⁶⁰ In the lead up to the Exclusion Crisis the tactics within parliament were to keep applying pressure to the king especially around proroguing them. As an example, on 14 May they adjourned a debate on supply for a week and this meant it was difficult for Charles to break up the sitting.¹⁶¹ These tactics meant a delay in debates and the growth in unease between king and parliament. The focus on foreign affairs did mean that the monument to Charles I was adjourned on several occasions but designs for the monument had been made.

Charles II commanded Christopher Wren to prepare designs. Robert Hooke, a member and curator of the Royal Society, noted in his diary that on 2 February he had a meeting with 'Sir Chr. Wren about the Kings chappell at Winsor.'¹⁶² Just a week later Hooke had seen Wren's 'Draught of [the] Mausoleum.'¹⁶³ Andrew Lacey argues that Charles had discussed the idea of a memorial with Wren before the debate in parliament and the speed at which the memorial was drafted could attest to this.¹⁶⁴ The note also confirmed that Charles had decided that the site of the memorial should be at Windsor and would take pride of place in the middle of the niche in the

¹⁵⁷ Grey, *Grey's Debates*, Vol 7, pp. 105-129.

¹⁵⁸ Patterson, *Parliament*, p. 25.

¹⁵⁹ *CJ*, Vol 9, p. 428.

¹⁶⁰ Andrew Browning, *Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds* (Glasgow: Jackson, Son, 1951), p. 324.

¹⁶¹ Reresby, *Diary*, p. 181.

¹⁶² Robert Hooke, *The Diary of Robert Hooke, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., 1672-1680* eds. H.W. Robinson and Walter Adams (London: Taylor & Francis, 1935), p. 343.

¹⁶³ Hooke, *Diary*, p. 344.

¹⁶⁴ Lacey, *Cult*, pp. 168-70.

front of the entrance.¹⁶⁵ It is curious to note that since Anne of Denmark's death in 1619, twelve members of the Stuart family had been buried alongside Mary Queen of Scots in Westminster Abbey. Charles I would be the only family member to remain outside of this Stuart legacy. It could be that Charles I would be made an exemption, or maybe it was just more pragmatic to avoid the additional costs it would take to move him from Windsor to Westminster.

Christopher Wren noted that architecture 'has its political use.'¹⁶⁶ Wren was the natural choice to create a monument to the martyr king. His father had been the Dean of Windsor and formal chaplain to Charles I. Wren was appointed as surveyor of the King's works on 29 March 1669 which gave Wren status, command of the largest building organisation in the country.¹⁶⁷ Based on his history of loyalty and his reputation for creating great buildings such as St Paul's, he was the most prestigious candidate to create a monument to the martyr king. The proposed design was 'a Rotundo, with a beautiful Dome and Lantern; a circular Colonnade without, of the Corinthian order, resembling that temple of Vesta.'¹⁶⁸ An upright statue of Charles I wearing armour, acknowledging his role in the war that led to his death, would take centre stage. An undrawn sword hanging at his side is, for Beddard, a sign of his innocence.¹⁶⁹ Charles was to be held on by four figures: Prudence, Temperance, Justice, and Fortitude, the 'heroick virtues' that the martyr upheld. Underneath these figures, being crushed under a large stone, are the four figures who symbolised the vices: Envy, Heresy, Hypocrisy and Rebellion.¹⁷⁰ Above Charles, seven winged cherubs lower a crown of martyrdom upon the king's head. The messages here are not subtle. These devices had been seen before: Charles exchanged a corruptible from an incorruptible crown. The monument is in perfect keeping to the image created in *Eikon*.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁵ Stephen Wren, *Parentalia Or Memoirs of the Family of the Wrens Viz. of Mathew Bishop of Ely, Christopher Dean of Windsor. But Chiefly of Christopher Wren Surveyor-general of the Royal Buildings* (Creative Media Partners: LLC, 2017), p. 332.

¹⁶⁶ R.A. Beddard, 'Wren's mausoleum for Charles and the cult of the Royal Martyr', *Architectural History*, 27 (1984), pp. 36-49.

¹⁶⁷ K. Downes, 'Wren, Sir Christopher (1632–1723), architect, mathematician, and astronomer'. ODNB, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/30019>> [accessed 17 Sep 2020].

¹⁶⁸ Wren, *Parentalia*, p. 331.

¹⁶⁹ Beddard, 'Wren's', p. 43.

¹⁷⁰ Wren, *Parentalia*, p. 332.

¹⁷¹ Anon. *Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of his Majesty King Charles 1st* (London: D. Stewart, 1879), Front piece.

However, the monument never materialised. After the initial debate in January 1677, the bill for the late king's interment was adjourned until the next discussion on 20 March 1677. The location was the main talking point, as Charles I was a martyr for church and laws, he deserved a great monument.¹⁷² It was not until 30 January 1678 that Philip Warwick took the chair again, noting that 'the committee had sat ... but made no progress'.¹⁷³ The house voted again to ratify that the monument should be commissioned for the sum of two months tax. A bill was requested to be brought in. The committee last met on 22 March 1678 where the bill was considered but was never passed. Charles II had approved Wren's design but he returned the designs to him and told him to keep them for the time being.¹⁷⁴ Wren's grandson noted that 'the whole design of the ... tomb, through incidents of the Times, or Motives unknown to the Publick, were laid aside.'¹⁷⁵

Why did the effort to create the memorial die? Beddard argues that it was swept aside by the exclusion crisis. In 1679 Charles II used his prerogative powers to dissolve parliament and then summon a new one. In 1681 Charles II dissolved the latest parliament because of the tension between both houses.¹⁷⁶ Knights argues that the regime was at virtual collapse and was characterised by internal rivalry between ministers.¹⁷⁷ However, for the last four years of his reign Charles II had regained some of the power he had possessed in 1660 but the reburial and monument to his father was never discussed again. Charles II had two opportunities where he had the power to implement the monument, one at the beginning of his reign and then another at the end, and he already had the design by Wren to do this. It could be it was down to money, but Charles II had showed with the Charing Cross statue that he had been willing to pay to honour his father and at the very least he could have paid for a more permanent monument to his father, even a simpler one in Windsor that clearly indicated where he was buried as a sign of respect. As time moved away from the regicide Charles I himself became side-lined in the narrative of his own death.

¹⁷² Grey, *Debates*, Vol 5, p. 265.

¹⁷³ *CJ*, Vol 9, p. 428.

¹⁷⁴ Beddard, 'Wren's', p. 45.

¹⁷⁵ Wren, *Parentalia*, p. 341.

¹⁷⁶ Grey, *Debates*, Vol 7, p. 340.

¹⁷⁷ Mark Knight, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 76.

The internment was mentioned in parliament for the final time in March 1678 and a monument and reburial of Charles I never happened. This episode illustrated that there was no strong political will to make this happen. With the growing divisions between king and parliament, the mausoleum was meant to represent the final part in forgetting the scars of the Civil War and regicide. It would have symbolised the coming together of king and parliament in a shared goal to commemorate the great martyred king. However, despite the agreed location and cost the monument never materialised. The Restoration meant to signal a new beginning and the Act of Oblivion requested amnesia towards the past, which even Charles II's statue at Royal Exchange boasted. Lacey argues that the Restoration Settlement left many important issues unresolved such as religious settlement. Despite the initial excitement in 1660, the Civil War and regicide could not be forgotten.¹⁷⁸ If the Mausoleum had been made, it would have cemented the image of Charles I as martyr.

iii - Churches dedicated to Charles I

Churches across the country had been dedicated to saints since the fourth century. This holds significance as it brings a sainted person into the local community.¹⁷⁹ Ten English Kings received church dedications, eight of those were martyred Kings. Arnold-Foster noted that kings as early as Saint Edwin (633 AD) had churches dedicated to them. He provides an overall picture of how many churches were dedicated to these sainted monarchs: Saint Oswald (642 AD) had sixty two churches, Saint Ethelbert (794 AD) fifteen churches, Saint Edmund had sixty one, Edward the Confessor (1066 AD) had fourteen and Charles I had six. On 5 January 1066, Edward the Confessor King of England died.¹⁸⁰ In 1161 he was to be the only king of England (not an Anglo-Saxon King) to be canonised with his sainthood based on his piety rather than martyrdom to a particular cause. Edward was popular among the elite, and he had both an elaborate funeral and was buried in his newly built Westminster Abbey. His reputation was further enhanced when Henry III rebuilt his tomb into a shrine in the new Westminster Abbey in 1269 that cemented his place as

¹⁷⁸ Lacey, *Cult*, p. 170.

¹⁷⁹ Frances Arnold-Foster, *Studies in Church Dedications or, England's Patron Saints*, Vol 2 (London: Skeffington & Son, 1899), p. 300.

¹⁸⁰ Arnold-Foster, *Church Dedications*, p. 300.

the sainted and pious Edward.¹⁸¹ Therefore Charles I was not the first king who had been placed on a pedestal and revered. Since the Reformation, according to Nicholas Orme, church dedications declined as the country moved away from revering Saints. Some churches remained dedicated to a certain saint but removed the word saint from their church's name.¹⁸² Charles would be the only protestant martyr to have any churches dedicated in his honour. This next section will examine why these churches were dedicated in his honour and what they unearth about the support for the martyr king.

There were six churches dedicated in the reign of Charles II, three of which were named in the early years following the Restoration, when there was a wave of enthusiasm for the Stuart cause. With Charles officially named as martyr this gave loyal devotees an opportunity to express this devotion through the dedication of churches. However, these churches were dedicated due to the influence of individuals rather than a strategy from the Restoration regime to honour the memory of Charles I. Falmouth is a prime example of the role of individuals spearheading dedication to Charles. In 1665 the church of King Charles the Martyr was consecrated in Falmouth by Bishop Seth Ward. The location should not be a surprise as Cornwall had a long association with the Stuart monarchy. Mark Stoye noted that Charles I had gained the loyalty of the Cornish through his appreciation of their cultural differences. He had created separate Cornish regiments and their own leaders, such as Bevill Granville, who exemplified the cavalier spirit.¹⁸³ In July 1643, Bevill joined Prince Maurice's army which marched into Somerset and attacked Sir William Waller on Lansdowne Hill. Here he was struck to the ground by a poleaxe and died the next day at Cold Ashton parsonage. The Cornish royalist army were seen as courageous and fought to the death for their king.¹⁸⁴ Clarendon spoke of 'the general influx and concurrence of the whole people of Cornwall' to the king.¹⁸⁵ On

¹⁸¹ Peter Furtado, 'The Cult of St Edward the Confessor', *History Today*, 11 (2005), pp. 21-27.

¹⁸² Nicholas Orme, *English Church Dedications: With a survey of Cornwall and Devon* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996), p. 42.

¹⁸³ Mark Stoye, *West Britons: Cornish Identities and the Early Modern British State* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002), p. 90.

¹⁸⁴ Stoye, *West*, p. 90.

¹⁸⁵ Edward Hyde, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, begun in the year 1641*, Vol 2, Part 2 (Oxford: Theatre, 1807), p. 148.

10th September 1643, Charles I wrote a letter thanking the Cornish for their support. The letter was placed in every church and chapel in Cornwall. It read:

We are so highly sensible of the extraordinary merit of Our County of Cornwall, of their zeale for the Defence of Our Person, and the just Rights of Our Crown, of their great and eminent Courage and Patience.¹⁸⁶

This close relationship meant that Cornwall would be an ideal location for a church dedicated in his honour. There were other, more specific, ties to Falmouth too. Falmouth had a close association with Pendennis Castle. The castle was under siege for over five months and Colonel John Arundell refused to surrender until August 1646. This was one of the last castles to surrender during the Civil War. Furthermore, Prince Charles escaped the Civil War by setting sail from Falmouth in 1647. On leaving he declared that he would build 'a chapel for public worship ... when the wars ceased.'¹⁸⁷ This church was a textbook example of royalist loyalty.

Two men were the driving force behind the creation of this church: Peter Killigrew, who provided the land, and Seth Ward, who consecrated the church. Both men had loyal ties to Charles and the Stuart family. The Killigrews were an established noble Cornish family with roots dating back to the thirteenth century. Many Killigrew family members had served previous monarchs, such as Sir Robert Killigrew who was vice chamberlain to Henrietta Maria, and William Killigrew who was groom to James I.¹⁸⁸ It was noted that 'the Killigrews had been remarkable for their attachment to the Stuarts.'¹⁸⁹ Killigrew also worked for parliament and was a cousin of General Monck who secured him a position as MP for Orkney. After the Restoration, Peter Killigrew became MP for Helston and remained close to Cornish affairs throughout the rest of his life. On 20 August 1660, Killigrew petitioned the Restoration government to rename the old town of Smithick since when it has been

¹⁸⁶ Charles Stuart, *To the inhabitants of the County of Cornwall a letter of thanks from King Charles I of ever blessed memory, dated Sept. 10, 1643 from Sudly Castle* (1643). ESTC suggests this was published in the 1650s but EBO confirmed it is 1643.

¹⁸⁷ Antonia Fraser, *King Charles II* (London: Book Club Associates, 1979), p. 41.

¹⁸⁸ *HOP*, 1660-1690, Vol 2, p. 679.

¹⁸⁹ Richard Thomas, *History and Description of the Town and Harbour of Falmouth* (Pub. at the Museum, by J. Trathan, 1827) p. 58; *CSPD*, 1660-1661, p. 63.

known as Falmouth.¹⁹⁰ This led to economic grants such as weekly markets and the creation of new civic structure of Aldermen. In 1661 Charles II explained why he granted these charters: 'Our special grace, certain knowledge ... in consideration of the good faithful and acceptable services by him ... as well to us as our most dear father.'¹⁹¹ As part of his petition for the new town of Falmouth, Killigrew offered land for a church, parsonage and churchyard if the king would sponsor the project. Owing partly, perhaps, to his diplomatic dedication of his new church to the King's martyred father, Killigrew succeeded in realising the royal vow and 'received much help ... through the generosity of Charles II and the Duke of York, and the liberal contributions of diverse honourable and worthy persons.'¹⁹² The foundations of the church were laid by Peter Killigrew on 29 August 1662 and on 22 August 1665 it was consecrated by Bishop Seth Ward.¹⁹³ In his biography it was confirmed that Ward was the man who built a stately church, in which he dedicated it to the blessed Memory of king Charles the Martyr.¹⁹⁴ Seth Ward did not take an active role in the Civil War and spent the Commonwealth studying astronomy. He was elected president of Trinity College, Oxford, on 14 September 1659, but resigned at the Restoration. At the king's gift he became the Vicar of St Lawrence Jewry. He was confirmed as precentor of Exeter Cathedral on 25 July 1660, as prebendary in September he was elected Dean on 26 December 1661 and consecrated bishop on 20 July 1662.¹⁹⁵ His role as Bishop of Exeter provided him with the opportunity to dedicate churches in his diocese to Charles the Martyr. He was 'very much in favour with the King, and the Duke of York ... who used to entertain him with the greatest kindness and familiarity imaginable'.¹⁹⁶

Falmouth is the only church that either of Charles I's sons contributed towards a dedication or had any part to play in the creation of a church in their father's honour. However, tensions about the payment for the church were quick to

¹⁹⁰ Thomas, *History*, p. 58.

¹⁹¹ Thomas, *History*, p. 67.

¹⁹² Walter Pope, *The Life of the Right Reverend Father in God, Seth, Lord Bishop of Salisbury and Chancellor of the most noble Order of the Garter with a brief account of Bishop Wilkins, Mr. Lawrence Rooke, Dr. Isaac Barrow, Dr. Turbervile, and others* (London: Printed for William Keblewhite, 1697), p. 58.

¹⁹³ Nikolas Pevsner, *The Buildings of England: Gloucestershire: The Cotswolds*, (Yale: Yale University Press, 1970), pp. 66-69.

¹⁹⁴ Pope, *Seth*, p. 59.

¹⁹⁵ John Henry, 'Ward, Seth (1617–1689), astronomer and bishop of Exeter and Salisbury.' ODNB; < <http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/28706> > [accessed 10 Nov 2020].

¹⁹⁶ Pope, *Seth*, p. 191.

surface. Peter Killigrew ensured that each house in the new church parish had to pay towards the new church, but members of various Nonconformist sects were unwilling to pay the rate; later rectors were 'glad to make arrangements for its final extinction.'¹⁹⁷ Even in the most loyal of counties did Charles I become a problematic figure with many unwilling to pay towards the church named in his honour.

Another dedication can be found in Plymouth, just fifty five miles from Falmouth. Although the West Country was largely loyal to the royalist cause, the port in Devon was an exception. Nichols Worth, who wrote the history of Plymouth, boasted that it 'enjoys the distinction of being the only town in the west of England what remained true throughout the whole of the wars'.¹⁹⁸ As the port was in the heart of a royalist stronghold, there were various attempts to secure Plymouth in the king's name. Worth noted that it rejected the overtures of Charles I and was exposed to continual assaults by the royalists, but Plymouth did not fall.¹⁹⁹ The most notable attempt was the siege of Plymouth in 1643 when the royalists were almost victorious. Sir Richard Grenville, a royalist commander, arrived in Plymouth in March 1644 to maintain a blockade, but it resulted in a stalemate. Robert Devereux, 3rd Earl of Essex, arrived in command of the parliamentary army and forced Grenville to retreat to Cornwall. Plymouth remained in parliament's hands throughout the Civil War.²⁰⁰

It was not only political but religious divisions that were significant in the creation of Falmouth church. Stoye argued that Plymouth was a chief puritan stronghold, with a puritan minster called Henry Wallis.²⁰¹ Religious divisions would appear to be a reason for the creation of the church dedicated to Charles. At the turn of the Seventeenth century, the Corporation of Plymouth employed a radical puritan and much beloved lecturer called John Barlow, although the hierarchy of the church viewed him as a radical and he was driven out. When Barlow died in 1631, the governors of Plymouth asked another radical called Thomas Ford to join them. Stoye argued this was an act of provocation as Ford was hostile to Laud (Archbishop of

¹⁹⁷ Oscar Blackford, *Cornish Church Guide* (Truro: Blackford, 1925) p. 94.

¹⁹⁸ R.N. Worth, *The History of Plymouth from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (Plymouth: W Brendon & Sons, 1987), p. 45.

¹⁹⁹ Worth, *Plymouth*, p. 46.

²⁰⁰ Worth, *Plymouth*, p. 47.

²⁰¹ Mark Stoye, *Loyalty and Locality: Popular Allegiance in Devon during the English Civil War* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1994), p. 196.

Canterbury) and Laud refused him the position. Their next choice of Alexander Grosse was also rejected, and Laud's appointment of Aaron Wilson was forced upon them in 1635.²⁰² Wilson wrote to complain that 'the vicarage is much wronged' and tensions between the corporation and church remained. To try to resolve these differences in 1637 a petition was presented to Charles I for permission for a new church in the growing town. Charles granted this via letters patent in 1641 on the condition the church would be named in his honour as Charles' Church. On 6 July 1641 the bill 'For dividing the Parish Church of Plymouth, and erecting a new Church there' was passed in parliament.²⁰³ Therefore the creation of this church had nothing to do with the regicide and even pre-dates the Civil War.

When Civil War broke out in 1642, Wilson was cast into prison on Drake's Island, in Plymouth's harbour. The town then appointed a Protestant vicar in Wilson's place. Work on the church was halted during the Civil War. After this, work began again, albeit slowly, possibly due to money problems. Money was raised £100 per annum in 1646 to pay the minister, £500 in 1656 to complete the church and in 1657, a local man Sir John Gayer left £500 for 'church glazing and further money to be given towards preaching that would be chosen by mayor and magistrates', but monetary problems seem to have been a problem throughout, because the tower was only half finished in 1652.²⁰⁴ Eventually the church was finished in 1657 although a spire was not added until 1708 and the tower covered in a cap of wood instead. At this time there is no reference to the church as Charles's church; it was referred to as the new church and this would only change due to the intervention of Seth Ward.

The Restoration saw an acceleration in the completion of the church. In August 1665 wine merchant, William Warren, gifted 'land for burial' near what was 'commonly called the chancel in Charles church'.²⁰⁵ The only other mention of Warren is that he became a councilman after others refused the oath of alliance in 1662.²⁰⁶ The church was completed in 1665 and on 2 September 1665 was consecrated by Seth Ward.²⁰⁷ At the deed of consecration, he read 'We consecrate

²⁰² R.N. Worth, *Calendar of the Plymouth Municipal Records* (Plymouth: Willian Brendon & Son, 1893), p. 252.

²⁰³ *CJ*, Vol 2, pp. 200-201.

²⁰⁴ Worth, *Municipal Records*, p. 253.

²⁰⁵ Worth, *Municipal Records*, p. 253.

²⁰⁶ Plymouth Record Office, ref 1/14.

²⁰⁷ Worth, *Municipal Records*, p. 253.

the same church to the honour of God and to the sacred uses of the inhabitants therein now and the future of the church of Charles.'²⁰⁸ The consecration caused controversy as Seth Ward wanted to dedicate the church to 'Charles, King and Martyr'. However, leaders in Plymouth insisted that the church be named according to the letters Patent of 1641 signed in Charles' own hand. The church was therefore referred to as Charles' church. This illustrated that there was still division over Charles and how he was viewed; for those in Plymouth they would accept the church dedicated to Charles, but they did not believe that he had been a martyr.²⁰⁹ Even so close to Charles II greatest triumph of his Restoration he was unable to use this afterglow and establish his father as a martyr throughout the kingdom.

The biggest church built in the honour of Charles the Martyr was in Tunbridge Wells but even this case study unearths doubt as to the strength of the cult. The new spa town had close association with the Stuarts. Henrietta Maria visited after the birth of Prince Charles in 1630 to take the water and this visit encouraged others to visit.²¹⁰ The Chapel was built on 'on ground given for that purpose by lady Purbeck.'²¹¹ Unlike Killigrew, who had taken an active role in the church in Falmouth, there is no evidence of the Purbecks' involvement in the building of the church. Lady Purbeck had family ties to Tunbridge and helped in the construction of this burgeoning spa town. Margaret Bourke (later known as Lady Purbeck) was first married to Charles MacCarty, Viscount Muskerry, who came from Irish aristocracy. He was too young to fight in the Civil War, but he did fight against the Commonwealth at the Battle of the Dunes in 1658 under the Duke of York. They visited Tunbridge Wells in 1663 and stayed at her ancestral home.²¹² Her husband died at the Battle of Lowestoft and was buried at Westminster Abbey. Her second husband was Robert Villiers, the grandchild of a regicide, and his father had disclaimed any right to the title of Viscount Purbeck through his Villiers family line.²¹³

²⁰⁸ *ibid*, p. 254.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid*, p. 255.

²¹⁰ S.R. Gardiner, *A History of the Commonwealth to the Protectorate 1649-1656*, Vol 1, (Adlestrop: Windrush Press, 1903).

²¹¹ J. Sprange, *The Tunbridge Wells Guide; Or, An Account of the Ancient and Present State of that Place* (London: 1814), p. 40.

²¹² James Phippen, *Colbran's New Guide to Tunbridge Wells* (London: John Lane, 1840), p. 333.

²¹³ His grandfather was Sir John Danvers and his father took the Danvers name over his Villiers ancestry.

Robert restyled himself back to Villiers and in 1702 his son, John, petitioned parliament to return his Purbeck title but ultimately failed.

Work on the chapel did not begin until 1676, where it also doubled as a charity school. Fiona Greenwood has argued that this delay in the creation of the church following the Restoration was due to the slow growth of the town and religious tensions.²¹⁴ The subscription fund was opened in 1676 and the chapel was open for worship in 1678. At this time, Tunbridge Wells had a nomadic summer residence and many of the subscribers were from passing visitors. Among the subscribers were nearly 200 MPs from a wide spectrum of beliefs, from high churchmen to dissenters. Greenwood analysed these donors and argued that those who subscribed were not ardent royalists, but their social status prompted them to donate money.²¹⁵ The first catalogue of subscribers covers a period of eight years from 1676 to 1684 and lists 1,686 contributions. Apart from the MPs, the majority of the subscribers were merchants, traders and office holders. As Tunbridge Wells began to grow, subscribing meant you invested in the resort and not just the chapel. As the town grew in popularity, the chapel needed to be expanded to accommodate the increasing congregation, and in 1688 the vestry opened a new subscription book. The second list covers 1688-96 and had 937 donors which included Princess Anne, the Duke of Norfolk and Monmouth.²¹⁶ Therefore any direct connection to the royal family did not emerge until the later part of the seventeenth century.

Why was the Tunbridge Wells chapel dedicated to Charles I? The church opened nearly forty years after the regicide and the landowner does not appear to be the driving force behind the dedication. The land was formally granted in 1701, but there is no reference to dedication to Charles. A suggested theory is a link through Samuel Pepys, who came to the town before 1684 and appeared on the subscribers list. When Charles II married Catherine of Braganza, as part of her dowry she brought with her the ownership of the Morocco coastal town of Tangier. The town was garrisoned by English troops and the chapel of Sant Iago was rededicated to Charles the Martyr.²¹⁷ The Bishop of London, Gilbert Sheldon had jurisdiction at

²¹⁴ F. Greenwood, *The Foundation of the Church of Charles the martyr, Tunbridge Wells* (MA Dissertation: Cambridge University, 1992).

²¹⁵ Greenwood, *Church of Charles*.

²¹⁶ Phippen, *Tunbridge*, p. 87.

²¹⁷ Edwin Chappell, *The Tangier Papers of Samuel Pepys* (London: Navy Records Society, 1935), p. 376.

Tangier, and he had personal ties to the king. He had been close to Archbishop Laud, and he attended the king at Oxford and was said to be his chief confidante.²¹⁸ In 1683, Pepys travelled to Tangier as part of the operation to repatriate the troops, as Tangier was too costly to keep as an English garrison.²¹⁹ At this time, he would have attended a service at the church, and this sparked the inspiration for a church to be created back in Tunbridge Wells. This could be a coincidence or a gesture to the Queen. However, considering Pepys's own lack of attendance on 30 January commemorations and enthusiasm shown for the martyr, there is little evidence to uphold this argument.

Surprisingly, in the list of subscriber catalogues there is no mention of the dedication to King Charles, and the more that is uncovered about this church illustrates that its original purpose was not to celebrate the martyr at all. The Trust Deed of 1703 stated that it was to be used for 'rites and ceremonies ... and for no secular ... use or purpose'.²²⁰ The property deed transfer in 1703 also made no mention of Charles. The chapel needed a body to run it and in 1703 the Trust Deed vested the building in fourteen people who they deemed reliable. The deed came from Lady Purbeck's son, John Villiers and the first trustees included Thomas Sprat (Bishop of Rochester), Sir Edward Northey (Queen Anne's attorney general), three London clergymen and eight local gentry.²²¹ Even Daniel Defoe's contemporary description of Tunbridge Wells mentions the chapel, although not referenced as Charles' Chapel or any dedication to him. The first evidence of the dedication does not appear until 1733 in Willis's *Parochiale Anglicanum*.²²² This would suggest that the original design of the church was not as a church to honour Charles the Martyr but more generally as a church for a growing spa town. It could be that, as part of the deed transfer from John Villiers who was trying to obtain the title of Viscount Purbeck, Villiers wanted to show loyalty to the Stuarts and absolve his Danvers ancestors' role in the regicide. The new board of trustees were also those loyal to the

²¹⁸ Chappell, *Tangier*, p. 8.

²¹⁹ Knighton, 'Pepys', ODNB.

²²⁰ Alan Savidge, *The Story of The Church of King Charles the Martyr, Royal Tunbridge Wells* (The British Publishing Company Ltd, 1926), p. 5.

²²¹ Savidge, *Church*, p. 65-67.

²²² Browne Willis, *Parochiale Anglicanum or, the Names of All the Churches and Chapels Within the Dioceses of Canterbury, Rochester, London, Winchester, Chichester, Norwich, Salisbury, Wells, Exeter, St. Davids, Landaff, Bangor, and St. Asaph* (London: Gale, 1827).

Stuarts and they wanted to use the church to symbolise this loyalty. What is most profound is that this church was not part of a wider scheme to honour Charles in the wake of the Restoration and there is no evidence of any involvement from Charles II.

The churches in Shelland and Peak Forest are dedicated to Charles the Martyr and indicate personal devotion to the martyr. Derbyshire was an important county for both sides during the Civil War due to its tin mining operation and its ability to make and produce the weapons needed to fight the war. It was also a bridge between the royalists in the west and parliament in the north.²²³ The county was not staunchly royalist or parliamentarian according to Andy Wood and his extensive work on the Derbyshire mining community.²²⁴ This is exemplified by Sir John Gell who was the commander of the Derbyshire troop for parliament but ended up helping to restore Charles II to the throne.²²⁵ Unlike Plymouth, which had a strong link to the Stuarts, there can be no such boast from Derbyshire. Therefore, as seen in Falmouth and Plymouth, the building of the Peak Forest church and its dedication to Charles I is due to an individual rather than the Restoration regime.

The role of the individual was critical in the building of the church in the Peak Forest. For John Cox 'we have no doubt it [the church] was built by Christina, Countess of Devonshire.'²²⁶ Christina's father was Privy Councillor to James I and at the outbreak of the English Civil War, she was one of the most enthusiastic royalists. Her second son, Charles, was killed at the battle of Gainsborough on 28 July 1643.²²⁷ During the Protectorate, she kept up correspondence with the principal royalists on the Continent, and General Monck corresponded to her privately to make her aware of his intention to restore the king. She was known for 'her loyalty and the aid she gave in bringing about the Restoration.'²²⁸ Andrew Lacey, who assessed the cult of Charles, argued that the Countess had also been on good terms with Cromwell but always considered herself a royalist.²²⁹ The Charles chapel began in 1657 and there is

²²³ Brian Stone, *Derbyshire in Civil War* (Scarthin Books, 1992), p. 11.

²²⁴ Andy Wood, 'Social Conflict and Change in the Mining Communities of North-West Derbyshire, c. 1600-1700', *International Review of Social History*. 38:1, pp. 31-58.

²²⁵ T. Brighton, 'Gell, Sir John, first baronet (bap. 1593, d. 1671), parliamentarian army officer'. ODNB, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/10508>> [accessed 26 May 2021].

²²⁶ John Charles Cox. *Notes on the Churches of Derbyshire: The hundreds of the High Peak and Wirksworth* (London: Bemrose and Sons, 1877), p. 278.

²²⁷ Thomas Pomfret, *The Life of the Right Honourable and Religious Lady Christian, Late Countess Dowager of Devonshire* (Printed by William Rawlins for the author, 1685), p. 53.

²²⁸ Pomfret, *Lady Christian*, p. 98.

²²⁹ Lacey, *Cult*, p. 165.

speculation that the original dedication was to St James and was only dedicated to Charles the Martyr after the Restoration, once the church was completed around 1666.²³⁰ The Countess of Devonshire remained close to the Stuarts and Charles II frequently visited her, therefore the church dedicated to his father would be personal.

This personal devotion is seen at the church in Shelland, Suffolk. The church was built during the Commonwealth by Thomas Cropley and dedicated to King Charles the Martyr.²³¹ The church is unusual as it is known as a donative, a church building erected by a landowner, under his patronage, and with the living in his gift. He died in 1659, never witnessing the restoration of the Monarchy. His body was interred in the nave. The memorial left for Cropley provided more information as confirmed that he generously built and created this church in the honour of Charles the Martyr.²³² The church still holds a patronal service on 30 January every year to remember the beheading of Charles I. Similarly, to the Peak Forest church, this is very much devotion from an individual to the Martyr king.

The shadow of the Civil Wars was the primary reason behind the church in Newtown, Shropshire. W.J. Farrow argued that 'Shropshire epitomised in a peculiar way the struggle of the whole English nation. Within the borders of this one county ... better perhaps than anywhere else ... can be seen the Great Civil War in miniature.'²³³ Shropshire was not unusual in divided allegiance and witnessed widespread fighting. In September 1642, King Charles arrived in Shropshire where his royalist army held sway. In January 1643, the first skirmish occurred between the two forces: the royalists were defeated at Whitchurch and Market Drayton. In September 1643 the first parliamentary garrison was stationed at the village of Wem. However, Shropshire remained in royalist hands, and they had a string of successes under Prince Rupert's leadership that by the end of April 1644 left the parliamentarians blockaded in Wem, their last stronghold in the county.²³⁴ Wem would remain in parliamentary hands throughout the Civil War. This is the

²³⁰ Lacey, *Cult*, p. 165.

²³¹ Nikolas Pevsner and James Bettley, *Suffolk, The Buildings of England* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 480.

²³² Pevsner, *Suffolk*, p. 480; Thank you to Shelland Church for the information regarding the memorial.

²³³ W.J. Farrow, *The Great Civil War in Shropshire, 1621-49* (Shrewsbury, 1926), Preface.

²³⁴ Jonathan Worton, *The Royalist and Parliamentary War Effort in Shropshire During the First and Second English Civil Wars, 1642-1648* (PhD Thesis: University of Chester, 2015), p. 45.

foundation of why a church was built in Charles I's honour. In the next village, Newtown, a chapel was dedicated to Charles the Martyr and consecrated in 1663.²³⁵ There are suggestions as to why it was located here. One theory is Newtown had remained loyal to the king during the Civil War and much like Falmouth, dedicating a church may have been the highest honour they could bestow their murdered king.²³⁶ The other theory focused upon neighbouring rivalry, and that due to Wem and its loyalty to the Commonwealth, their neighbours in Newtown wanted to clearly demonstrate their loyalty to the crown. In this they wanted to highlight how their neighbours had ultimately chosen the wrong side and that those in Newtown were justified in their decision to remain loyal. The primary reason for the dedication would indicate local rivalry and the shadow of the Civil War.

iv - Conclusion

The previous chapter focused upon the role that Charles II played in the creation of emotional governance around the murder of his father and his attempts to utilise a range of the media available to achieve this aim. In the glow of the Restoration, he did in part create this emotional governance. The aim of this chapter was to look across the *longue durée* and beyond *Eikon* to understand how popular the cult of Charles the martyr was. Through examination of a range of sources, it has been argued that beyond *Eikon* the strength of the cult is inconsistent. It was often even undermined by those who were loyal to Charles.

In the creation of marking the 30 January as a day to honour Charles, his son wanted to ensure that the regicide was not forgotten. Based on the evidence analysed in the early years of his reign there was some consistency in honouring that day. Both Thomas Rugg and the Venetian ambassador, highlighted that across the country in 1661 and 1662 churches commemorated and mourned the murder of the martyr king. However, across various other personal sources, even with men like Pepys and his role in the Restoration government, this initial enthusiasm for the regicide sermons quickly subsided. Pepys himself in 1667 needed to be reminded of the importance of 30 January which demonstrates that it did not become an integral part of many people's devotion. There is also no indication that people felt forced or

²³⁵ Samuel Lewis (ed.), *A Topographical Dictionary of England* (London: S. Lewis, 1848), pp. 415-416.

²³⁶ Arnold-Forster, *Church Dedications*, p. 347.

obliged to attend the sermons each year. The sermons themselves also tell a compelling story. Charles and his wrongful death were the central theme for the early sermons, which often compared his death to Christ's. However, as political crisis emerged such as that of Sacheverell, the themes of the sermons changed to warn against further rebellion.

Physical monuments to Charles are a significant but much neglected medium for historians. The physical monuments such as statues stand for centuries and therefore can help to sustain an image of an individual. The monuments that were created to honour Charles I illustrate that there had been no clear strategy from the Restoration government to consistently honour the martyr. There were opportunities which Charles II did take such as the work at Temple Bar and the statue at Charing Cross. These opportunities were easy to implement but they were piecemeal. There almost appears a reluctance to create physical monuments to his father. The burial monument to Charles I is the prime example of this. The evidence indicated that it was parliament who initiated the discussion around a formal monument. Even in the initial debate a member of parliament had to present the reason why Charles II had not himself built a monument to his martyr father. In 1677 they voted and agreed a sum and even had Wren create a design for the monument. However, the monument never materialised, there is no evidence of further debate in the House of Commons or that Charles II initiated any funeral memorial to his father. It would be convenient to argue that due to foreign affairs and the exclusion crisis that the monument was never built, but Charles II still had power to enact some monument to his father even if it was a less grand design than produced by Wren. This could indicate that Charles II was aware that his initial strategy to create emotional governance around the regicide had failed, and he no longer saw the value in continuing with this strategy.

The churches dedicated to Charles I also uncover a lack of consistent devotion to Charles the martyr. The church built in royalist Cornwall follows a traditional narrative. Charles I had a close connection to Cornwall and therefore it was a suitable location for a church dedicated in his honour. The church in Falmouth was built on the land given by a royalist landowner in Peter Killigrew and consecrated by Bishop Seth Ward. This church is the only one where either of Charles I's sons contributed to

a church dedicated in their father's honour. There is no evidence of a consistent strategy from the Restoration government in the creation of any of the churches. The churches in the Peak District and Shelland were very much created by local landowners who felt a personal devotion to the martyr king. The Duchess of Devonshire had close ties to the Stuart family but only dedicated the church in the martyr's honour when it was safe to do so after 1660. The churches in Wem and Plymouth highlight the divisions in the local community. The church in Plymouth was built due to divisions within the church hierarchy and they petitioned for a second church to be able to commission a more radical preacher. The patent issued by Charles I included the proviso that the church was named in his honour. When the church was finally built and consecrated, Bishop Seth Ward wanted it named the Martyr church. However, this was not acceptable to the locals as these did not want to commemorate Charles as Martyr. The church in Wem highlighted the neighbourhood rivalries with its local village Newtown who used the church as a symbol of their loyalty during the Civil War. The Tunbridge Wells church is revered as the pinnacle of the martyr churches. However, the title deeds and the subscription evidence does not indicate that the original design was for the church to be dedicated to the martyr. Again, on the face of it, these churches would indicate a strong cult around Charles, but further research unearthed that this is not the case and that these churches tell us more about individual devotion and divisions post the Civil War.

Charles I became a footnote in his own commemorations. After the initial excitement of the Restoration, people wanted to forget the regicide. There are those like Evelyn who remained devoted to Charles across his lifetime, but his devotion is the exception. As time moved on and we entered the *longue durée*, the devotion to martyr waned, the content of the sermons changed to reflect the contemporary political climate and attendance was patchy. There is no dispute that *Eikon* was popular as the various publications would attest to, but other forms of evidence suggest that devotion to Charles was complicated, inconsistent, and at times indifferent. Attendance to sermons varied and he even became a footnote in the sermon content. Historian's research has been clouded by *Eikon* and how it represented the martyr cult.

Chapter 4 - Enduring Memories of the Regicides, 1649-1715

Whereas commemorations of Charles I were inconsistent in the later Stuart period, memories of the regicides proved surprisingly resilient. This chapter will analyse a range of sources including diaries, funeral memorials and the scaffold performance of the regicides, to understand how the regicides were commemorated under a Stuart monarchy that had tried to demonise them. Fifty-nine men signed the death warrant of Charles I and the Act of Oblivion had singled out these king-killers for punishment. Plays, pamphlets and ballads established a dominant royalist narrative that vilified the regicides, yet subversive memories persisted. As we will see, an ever-present counter-narrative ensured that these men were far from forgotten in the later seventeenth century.

Research on the regicides has been hampered by the ignominy that was heaped upon the events of the Civil Wars and the act of the regicide by those who were victorious in 1660. This meant that few contemporaries publicly challenged the portrait of this villainous group. These caricatures, especially of the most prominent regicides, were fixed for a long time. Thomas Pride was regarded as Cromwell's Buffoon, Ireton was the trusted son-in-law who was involved 'in all his secret mackinations' and Cromwell was the man who pulled the strings.²³⁷ For centuries a willingness to explore the regicides had largely been confined to antiquarian biographies which focused on their low origins. The most notable example was Mark Noble's *Lives of the Regicides*, published in the wake of the French Revolution. It was a loyalist view of the men who were involved in the regicide, which focused on their lowly social position and potential sexual deviancy.²³⁸ Both illustrated their fanatical actions. Edward Vallance has argued that the tarnished regicides remained a subject that even antiquarians largely ignored for over 150 years after the regicide.²³⁹ Whigs, who were considered the ancestors of the parliamentarians, also avoided the topic as part of their larger avoidance of the regicide in general. They much preferred

²³⁷ *A New Meeting of Ghosts at Tyburn being a discourse of Oliver Cromwell, John Bradshaw, Henry Ireton, Thomas Pride, Thomas Scot, Secretary to the Rump. Major Gen. Harrison & Hugh Peters the Divells Chaplain* (1661, London).

²³⁸ Mark Noble, *The Lives of the English Regicides, and other Commissioners of the Pretended High court of justice, appointed to sit in Judgement upon their Sovereign, King Charles the First* (London: J. Stockdale, 1798).

²³⁹ Edward Vallance, 'Remembering the regicide in an Age of Revolutions: The case of Mark Noble' in *Remembering Early Modern Revolutions: England, North America, France and Haiti*, ed. Edward Vallance (Milton: Routledge, 2018), p. 47.

parliamentarian history up to May 1641 and then the Glorious Revolution, which were considered 'safe' and laudable parliamentary reforms. The turn of the twentieth century saw a small step-change where the events leading up to the trial and regicide was examined. The most notable example was Wedgwood's research on the period of 20 November 1648 to 30 January 1649.²⁴⁰ In the 1940s onwards there were a series of local historical society articles on individual regicides which would be considered in the antiquarian framework.²⁴¹ The ignominy of these men remained evident even in A.L. Rowse's 1994 *The Regicides*, a series of biographies permeated with distaste for the regicide and the men who were involved; Rowse referred to the regicide as 'unforgivable'.²⁴² These men were portrayed as fanatics and villains. More recently, however, research on the legal basis of the trial of the Charles I has renewed interest in the regicides themselves.²⁴³ At a conference commemorating the regicide's 350th anniversary, Jason Peacey noted how the regicides had 'failed to receive the attention they deserve, and too many things have been assumed uncritically by generations of scholars'.²⁴⁴ However, the mantle which Peacey set in 1999 has not seen an influx on research on the subject.²⁴⁵ Peacey's edited book based on the 1999 conference included chapters on the potential motives and the European reaction to the regicide. David Scott discovered that the potential motives for a small group of the regicides from the Northeast were due to personal grudges, regional grievances and godly fanaticism.²⁴⁶ Scott's chapter helped to bring into focus the differing and sometimes conflicting motives of the regicides. Hobson's recent research looks into the regicides' personal, political, economic and religious

²⁴⁰ C.V. Wedgwood, *The Trial of Charles I* (London: Collins, 1964).

²⁴¹ R. Howell, 'Newcastle's Regicide: the parliamentary Career of John Blakiston', *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 4th series, 40 (1964), pp. 207-3; H.L. Hubbard, 'Colonel Francis Hacker, Parliamentarian and Regicide', *Transactions of the Thornton Society*, 45 (1941), pp. 5-17; 'Sir Thomas Andrewes, Lord Mayor and Regicide, and his Relations', *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*, 3 (1939), pp. 151-65; Ivor Waters, *Henry Marten and the Long Parliament* (Chepstow; Chepstow society, 1973).

²⁴² A.L. Rowse, *The Regicides and the Puritan Revolution* (London: Duckworth, 1994), p. 1.

²⁴³ Sean Kelsey, 'The Death of Charles I', *The Historical Journal*, 45 (2002), pp. 727-754; 'The Ordinance for the Trial of Charles I', *Historical Research*, 76 (2003), pp. 310-331; 'Politics and Procedure in the Trial of Charles I', *Law and History Review*, 22 (2004), pp. 1-25; Clive Holmes, 'The Trial and Execution of Charles I', *Historical Journal*, 53:2 (2010), pp. 289-316; Jason Peacey, *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).

²⁴⁴ Jason Peacey, 'Introduction' in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), p. 3.

²⁴⁵ There has been some research since 2001: David Farr, *Henry Ireton and the English Revolution* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2006); Andrew J. Hopper, 'The Reluctant Regicide? Thomas Wayte and the Civil Wars in Rutland', *Midland History*, (2014) 39:1, pp. 36-52.

²⁴⁶ David Scott, 'Motives for King Killing', in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 138-155.

motivations, yet even 350 years later many of those who signed the death warrant are under-researched and often viewed collectively as a group, rather than as individuals.²⁴⁷

This chapter will focus on three key themes. Firstly, it will consider the scaffold performances of the regicides by drawing parallels to Charles's speech in 1649 and analysing reactions from those who witnessed the executions of 1660 and 1662. Secondly, through the themes of retribution, leniency and memorialisation, it will evaluate how Charles II reacted to the regicides. Through examination of how the men considered regicides were treated and if they were shown leniency or retribution from the new king. There are examples where regicides were commemorated through funeral memorials and that there are any speaks volumes of Charles' potential indifference. Thirdly, one of the main objectives of this research is to build upon the emerging interest into how ideas were transmitted across generations. Were the ideals that the regicides fought for in the 1640s and 1650s continued by their children and grandchildren? These children were caught in a difficult position after the Restoration as their ancestors were considered traitors. How this regicide generation reacted in these circumstances will provide an insight into the transmission of ideas and allegiances. Edward Legon's recent work on seditious memories provides an account of how these memories were adopted, continued and transmitted through social, religious and familial networks to a generation that had no actual experience of the Civil War and Commonwealth.²⁴⁸ Many within the regicide generation sustained the memories and ideas of their ancestors through plots and commemoration.

i - Role of the scaffold performance

When Charles I stood on the scaffold before he went to the block, he said to Archbishop Juxon 'Remember'.²⁴⁹ His conduct created a martyr image and those who saw it would never forget it. In 1660 and 1662 ten regicides were sentenced to a traitor's death. The traitor's death was a public ritual where the condemned were

²⁴⁷ James Hobson, *Charles I's Executioners: Civil War, Regicide and the Republic* (London: Pen and Sword History, 2020).

²⁴⁸ Legon, *Revolution*, pp. 172-198.

²⁴⁹ William Juxon, *Memoirs of Archbishop Juxon and his Times: With a Sketch of the Archbishop's Little Parish of Compton*, ed. Mark Hennessey (Oxford: J. Parker and Co., 1869), p. 81.

drawn on hurdles to the place of execution, half hanged and cut down whilst alive, castrated and then disembowelled before they were quartered and decapitated. The spectacle was designed to produce fear and horror and to illustrate the justice of the punishment. Just as with Charles, the ways in which the condemned men reacted to their fate on the scaffold influenced how those in attendance remembered them. Matthew Jenkinson has shown that the trials and executions of the regicides gained not insignificant sympathy for those 'martyrs' still committed to the good old cause.²⁵⁰ Like Charles, the regicides were able to use their scaffold performance to gain sympathy and become martyrs for their cause.

For Knoppers, power founded on theatrical display such as executions was radically unstable.²⁵¹ This is because those condemned could signal the error of the judgement against them. The Scaffold performances helped to create a counter discourse around the regicides.²⁵² *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the Late Kings judges*, published in late 1660, is a rare example of a non-loyalist view of the executions.²⁵³ This pamphlet presented both the speeches of and letters from the regicides which highlighted their sufferings in the trope of martyrdom. John Cook on the scaffold asked that 'if it may please the Kings Majesty, that no more blood may be shed after miae.'²⁵⁴ He also with resolve confirmed that 'I am not convinced of any thing I have done amisse, as to that I have been charged with.'²⁵⁵ The condemned faced their fate with brave resolution. Carew said 'O my friends, if you did know and feel what joy I have, and what a glorious crown I shall receive from the hand of Christ's ... you would not Mourn but Rejoice, that I am counted worthy to be a witness to this cause.'²⁵⁶ There was a clear similarity here to Charles' performance where on the scaffold he changed from 'this corruptible crowne of misery, to an

²⁵⁰ Matthew Jenkinson, *Culture and Politics at the court of Charles II, 1660-1685* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010), p. 19.

²⁵¹ Laura Lunger Knoppers, 'This So Horrid Spectacle': Samson Agonistes and the Execution of the Regicides', *English Literary Renaissance*. 20:3 (1990), pp. 488

²⁵² This would be a fascinating exploration as there are many stories concerning the regicides after their escape or death.

²⁵³ *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the Late King's Judges: Viz. Major General Harrison, 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, 1660. The Times of Their Death. Together with Severall Occasionall Speeches and Passages in Their Imprisonment Till They Came to the Place of Execution* (London, 1660).

²⁵⁴ Ibid, p. 32.

²⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 33.

²⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 12.

incorruptible crowne of glory'.²⁵⁷ Lucy Hutchinson noted that Scrope 'had the honour to die a noble martyr.'²⁵⁸ These men had performed, as Charles did, in the trope of martyr. The tension of remembering and forgetting is apparent in these executions. The dying regicides through their performance and speeches were able to evoke and remember what had led to their crime, the regicide. Recent research by Melinda Zook on the trials and executions argued that they were not necessarily to be seen as acts of revenge and that the impact of the executions in keeping alive the 'good old cause' was not anticipated by the royalists.²⁵⁹ Roger L'Estrange complained in 1663 that 'Scarce any one regicide or traitor has been brought to public justice since your Majesty's blessed return whom either the pulpit hath not canonised for a saint or the press recommended to be a patriot and a martyr.'²⁶⁰

The executions in 1660 were an important moment for the regime to illustrate that justice would be done. Their main concern was to ensure that the regicides did not become martyrs for the cause. Thomas Scot, who had been the intelligence officer during the Commonwealth just before the return of monarchy, spoke in parliament and took the opportunity to affirm the justice of the king's execution, saying that he desired no better epitaph than 'Here lies one who had a hand and a heart in the execution of Charles Stuart.'²⁶¹ This unrepentant regicide faced his death and declared that 'I bless His name that He engaged me in a cause not be repented of.'²⁶² In *Speeches and Prayers*, Scot highlighted the nature of the spectacle: 'O Blessed Lord, thou hast called him forth as a publick spectacle to some, in a condition of Shame and Reproach; to others, of Comfort.'²⁶³ Scot clearly understood his role and how his performance on the scaffold held meaning for those

²⁵⁷ *His Majesties speech on the scaffold at White-Hall on Tuesday last Jan. 30 before the time of his coming to the block of execution and a declaration of the deportment of the said Charles Stuart before he was executed to the great admiration of the people : and a proclamation of the Commons of England assembled in Parliament to be published throughout the Kingdoms prohibiting the proclaiming of any person to be King of England, Ireland or the dominions thereof : also A letter from the north to a member of the Army containing the declaration and resolutions of the Northern Army touching the late King of England and the lofty cedars of the city of London*, (London, 1649), p. 5.

²⁵⁸ Lucy Hutchinson, *The Memoirs of the life of Colonel Hutchinson, written by his widow Lucy*, ed. Harold Child (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co, 1904), p. 284.

²⁵⁹ Melinda Zook, "'Blood will have Blood': The Regicide Trials and the Popular Press" in *The State Trials and the Politics of Justice in Later Stuart England*, eds Brian Cowan and Scott Sowerby (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2021), pp. 112-134.

²⁶⁰ Roger L'Estrange, *Considerations and Proposals in order to the Regulation of the Press together with diverse instances of Treasonous, and Seditious Pamphlets, proving the necessity thereof* (London, 1663), p. 5.

²⁶¹ Patrick Morrah, *1660: The Year of Restoration* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1960), p. 185.

²⁶² *Speeches*, p. 70.

²⁶³ *Speeches*, p. 70.

who watched or heard later. Thomas Harrison, who made a stout defence at his trial, argued that he acted within the authority of parliament.²⁶⁴ He said to the judges, 'I do not come to be denying anything ... It was not a thing done in a corner.'²⁶⁵ Harrison gave a brave and defiant scaffold performance. On the scaffold his hands and knees were seen to tremble, but Harrison explained that 'It is by reason of much blood I have lost in the wars, and many wounds I have received in my body'.²⁶⁶ Much like with Charles I, who wore two shirts not to appear to shiver, Harrison did not want to appear to be scared at this important moment. He was met with hostility as he was drawn toward his execution. An onlooker called out to him, 'where is your good cause now'; he replied with a dramatic gesture, hand over his heart and a cheerful smile 'Here it is, and I am going to seal it with my blood.'²⁶⁷ Harrison followed the pattern of martyrdom, he was like Christ and Charles I willing to go to his death. 'If I had ten thousands lives, I could free and cheerfully lay them down.'²⁶⁸ His performance and courage astonished and impressed those who had watched him die. This enabled Harrison to become a martyr for the fifth monarchists and Thomas Venner led around fifty armed followers in London, who aimed to retrieve Harrison's head. They led a guerrilla campaign in London but were ultimately defeated by Monck and the army.²⁶⁹ The support he had garnered led to his head and quarters being delivered to his friends and interred in St Giles, Newcastle-under-Lyme, where a gravestone was commissioned.²⁷⁰

As the executions continued the reaction that followed moved from joyous applause to one of apathy and the desire to move on from more bloodshed. Pepys, who watched Harrison's execution, noted his cheerful countenance and that when he was cut down there was great shouts of joy.²⁷¹ Peter Mundy, who witnessed the executions of Clement, Scot, Scroope and Jones, saw the full horror of the spectacle. He noted that 'Never the like was seene before at any tyme in the Citty of

²⁶⁴ Morrah, 1660, p. 184.

²⁶⁵ Charles H. Firth, 'Memoir of Major-General Thomas Harrison', *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 52:3 (1944), pp. 390-464.

²⁶⁶ *Speeches*, p. 8.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid*, pp. 6-7.

²⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p. 8.

²⁶⁹ Jordon and Walsh, *Manhunt*, p. 248.

²⁷⁰ Firth, *Memoir*, p. 443. The Gravestone has been removed maybe when the church as rebuilt in the nineteenth century.

²⁷¹ Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 1, p. 265.

London'.²⁷² Pepys, who had seen limbs hung at Aldersgate, said it was 'a sad sight to see' and lamented, 'a bloody week this and last have been.'²⁷³ These executions mingled with the everyday. Pepys, who wrote his diary in chronological order, did not mention the regicides until the final sentences of the day. The rest of the day's entry focused on neighbour issues that included a blocked window and sewage coming into his house. This not unsurprising troubled him. While the sad sight of the regicides' limbs may not have been as important as sewage coming into his house, he continued to make reference to the deaths of the regicides in his diary.²⁷⁴ The people of Charing Cross complained about the smell of burnt bowels and petitioned the king to have future executions held elsewhere.²⁷⁵ The later executions of Hacker and Axtell happened at Tyburn instead. It was not until 1662 that Corbet, Okey and Barkstead were caught in Holland and brought back to England to face justice and publicly executed. Even though the authorities looked to clamp down on further pamphlets being produced, they failed. When, in 1662, a pamphlet did emerge, authorities were quick to take the printer prisoner, though he confessed nothing.²⁷⁶ *The Speeches, Discourses, and Prayers, of Col. John Barkstead, Col. John Okey, and Mr. Miles Corbet* covered their flight from England, their positive reception in Holland, their entrapment and their scaffold speeches.²⁷⁷ Corbet was presented as an elderly man in his sixties who was proud of his thirty years in public office.²⁷⁸ He understood the role of the scaffold performance: the night before the execution noted that the bloodier the execution the better for him. His speech did not look to apologise for his actions but instead asked for God to forgive anyone who had wronged him.²⁷⁹ The reaction from the crowd at the death of these three men was

²⁷² Peter Munday, *The Travels of Peter Mundy in Europe and Asia, 1608-1667* (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society, 1907), p. 329.

²⁷³ Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 1, p. 269.

²⁷⁴ For example, on 15 October 1660 (after his father's wedding), 'This morning Mr Carew was hanged and quartered', Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 1, p. 266; 18 October 1660, he noted that Colonel Hacker and Axtell should die, Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 1, p. 266; 19 October 1660, Hacker and Axtell were hanged and quartered, Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 1, p. 269.

²⁷⁵ *CSPD*, 1661-1662, p. 220.

²⁷⁶ *CSPD*, 1661-1662, p. 237.

²⁷⁷ *The Speeches, Discourses, and Prayers, of Col. John Barkstead, Col. John Okey, and Mr. Miles Corbet, upon the 19th of April being the day of their Suffering at Tyburn: Together with an account of the occasion and manner of their taking in Holland: As also of their several occasional speeches, discourses, and letters, both before, and in the time of their late imprisonment: Faithfully and impartially collected for a general satisfaction* (1662, London).

²⁷⁸ *Speeches 1662*, p. 48.

²⁷⁹ *Speeches 1662*, pp. 72-81.

relatively more muted; there were no triumphant cries as there were with the earlier executions.²⁸⁰

Pepys observed how all three men 'looked very cheerful, but I hear they all died defending what they did to the king.'²⁸¹ Okey, who had commanded the dragoons, faced his execution with pose and calmness. When Corbet had reached the scaffold after Okey, he helped him up and said, 'Come brother Corbet, how do you?' and then clasped his hand upon his breast.²⁸² Even the sheriff's officers noted that he was a 'lusty, brave man as ever fought in England.'²⁸³ His speech focused on his work in the cause of God, for the good of the people of the nation and the need for loyalty to Charles II.²⁸⁴ On 21 April Charles II allowed Okey's body to be committed to a Christian burial at his family's chapel in Stepney.²⁸⁵ However, two days later Okey's relations had abused this clemency as they intended for a great concourse of people to attend his funeral. There was great concern, and the Sheriff of London was dispatched to stop the ceremony. When he arrived some twenty thousand people were reported in attendance and were dispersed.²⁸⁶ To avoid another demonstration of solidarity with a regicide, Okey was instead buried in the grounds of the Tower of London.²⁸⁷ Whatever had been written in the partisan periodicals, the regicides had loyal supporters.

There were consequences of the regicide executions. The public executions heightened the fear of dissent and the Restoration regime continued to feel threatened by those linked to the regicide. In 1662 the Earl of Inchiquin wrote to Clarendon as he was concerned that Sir Edward Nicholas was not the man to be chief spy master. He noted that 'the practices of ill spirits throughout the Kingdoms did require [much] more labour and activity'.²⁸⁸ Alan Marshall has argued that the general fear of dissenters after the Venner rising meant that the regime was flooded with rumours and paranoia of further plots, which even the monarchical display of power

²⁸⁰ Jordan and Walsh, *Manhunt*, p. 247.

²⁸¹ Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 3, pp. 66-7.

²⁸² *Speeches 1662*, p. 74.

²⁸³ Ibid, p 50; Anna Milford, *Eye and Ear Witnesses: 350th anniversary of the English Civil War* (Leigh on Sea: Partizan Press, 1992), p. 174.

²⁸⁴ Ibid, pp. 34-77.

²⁸⁵ *CSPD, 1661-1662*, p. 344.

²⁸⁶ Ibid, p. 347.

²⁸⁷ Ibid, p. 346.

²⁸⁸ Historical Manuscript Commission, *Heathcot MSS (1669-1663)*, pp. 54-5.

that the executions could not overcome.²⁸⁹ As Pepys noted – with echoes of Earl of Manchester’s prophecy concerning Charles I if the king was ‘beaten ninety and nine times yet he is king still’ – for the regicides ‘Their work will be carried on, though they do die.’²⁹⁰

ii – Retribution, Leniency and Memorialisation

We shall ... pursue and bring to their due punishment those
bloody traitors who were either actors or contrivers of that
unparalleled and inhuman murder.²⁹¹

Charles II made this vow just after the regicide and what happened to the regicides after the Restoration has been characterised as a vicious manhunt by the new king.²⁹² As discovered in chapter two, Charles publicly condemned the regicide through a series of pamphlets. Algernon Sidney described Charles’ ‘lust and rage’ against the regicides.²⁹³ The death of any parent is a personal moment and Charles II was faced with the need to react to the murder of his father whilst adapting to the political climate. He was prepared to overlook almost anything to preserve the crown but his taste for forgiveness did not extend to those responsible for his father’s death.²⁹⁴ The men who signed the death warrant were singled out and villainised.

At the time of the Restoration, thirty-nine regicides were still alive and within the grasp of the new regime. Ten signatories of the death warrant successfully escaped abroad. Charles II needed to decide how to deal with them. The Houses of Commons and Lords spent months arguing over who should be included and Charles intervened to get the Act of Oblivion passed.²⁹⁵ The formal proclamation of Charles’

²⁸⁹ Alan Marshall, *Intelligence and Espionage in the reign of Charles II, 1660-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 9.

²⁹⁰ Pepys, *Diary*, Vol 2, p. 11.

²⁹¹ Charles Stuart, *His Majesties Declaration to all his Loving Subjects in his Kingdome of England and Dominion of Wales. Published with the advice of his Privie Councill. Dated in Castle-Elizabeth in the Isle of Jersey, the 31. Day of October 1649*, The Hague, Printed by Samuel Broun English bookeseller, dwelling in the Achter-Om at the signe of the English Printing house (London, 1649).

²⁹² Jordan and Walsh, *Manhunt*.

²⁹³ Algernon Sidney, ‘Court Maxims’, p. 203 cited in Blair Worden, ‘Milton, Samson Agonistes, and the Restoration’, in *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration; Literature, Drama, History*, ed. Gerald Maclean (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 124.

²⁹⁴ Howard Nenner, ‘The trial of the regicides: retribution and treason in 1660’, in *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain: Essays presented to Lois Green*, ed. Howard Nenner (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1997), p. 22.

²⁹⁵ *CJ*, Vol 8, pp. 131-133.

response to the justice of the regicide came in the Indemnity and Oblivion Act which passed on 29 August 1660.²⁹⁶ Ten were executed and two died in custody before their death sentences were carried out. In all other cases, the death sentences were commuted to life imprisonment. There was a clear step change in Charles' reaction to these men: initially he wanted to show his monarchical power and strength through executions, but after twelve months his blood lust diminished, and he became reactive to events.

Charles' reaction remained indifferent; the men who signed the death warrant were singled out by him in the various declarations he made from 1649 but by end of 1662 he had washed his hands of these men. Charles II distanced himself from the decisions made and it was reported that the 'King went away from London to avoid petitions' being presented on behalf of the condemned.²⁹⁷ As argued by Nenner and Fraser, Charles called a halt to the executions as he was so sickened by what he had witnessed.²⁹⁸ This could be part of his motivation, but it was more likely that he had seen the emotional regime fail around the regicide and that these men had died too well. Gilbert Burnet noted that they had shown 'such firmness and piety' and 'that the odiousness of the crime grew at last to be so much flattened'd ... the king was advised not to proceed father.'²⁹⁹ As argued by Knoppers this illustrated how unstable the theatre of execution could be. Nenner suggested that no one else was executed because they had given themselves up voluntarily and had been persuasive in their confessions.³⁰⁰ Whatever the reason, Charles was reluctant to continue with the bloodshed. He noted to Clarendon in a Privy Council meeting in 1661, when the regicides were raised again, that 'I must confess that I am weary of hanging except on new offences; let it sleep.'³⁰¹ Fraser argued that Charles II was not vengeful and that he preferred positive monuments to his father.³⁰² But as we have already seen, Charles II never followed through with building monuments to his father. His reaction

²⁹⁶ John Raithby (ed.), *Statutes of the Realm: Vol 5, 1628-80* (London: S.L., 1819), pp. 226-234.

²⁹⁷ Razzell, *Contemporary Account*, Vol 5, p. 265.

²⁹⁸ Nenner, 'Retribution and treason', p. 38; Fraser, *Charles II*, p. 185.

²⁹⁹ Bishop Gilbert Burnet, *History of His Own Time: From the Restoration of K. Charles II to the Conclusion of the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne. To which is Prefixed, a Summary Recapitulation of Affairs in Church and State, from King James I. to the Restoration in the Year 1660, Together with the Author's Life and Some Explanatory Notes*, Vol I (London: R. H. Evans, 1809), p. 290.

³⁰⁰ Nenner, 'Retribution and treason', p. 38.

³⁰¹ Maurice Ashley, *Charles II: The Man and the Statesman* (London: History Book Club, 1971), p. 112.

³⁰² Antonia Fraser, *King Charles II* (London: Book Club Associates, 1979), p. 185.

to the regicides followed this behaviour: the first year of his reign saw a concerted effort by him to execute judgment on his father's behalf but this energy dissipated quickly.

This is evident when on 10 December 1660 when parliament passed that on the anniversary of the regicide, the bodies of Cromwell, Ireton, Bradshaw and Pride would be dug up, drawn to Tyburn and then hung.³⁰³ This was not the first time that the Stuart monarchy ordered such a desecration. The bodies would then be buried under the gallows, this act was steeped in symbolism.³⁰⁴ Firstly, the bodies were being removed from the burial place of monarchy, Westminster Abbey. Secondly, they were hung, drawn and quartered; the ultimate punishment for traitors. Finally, their actions deserved no place of memorial, so they were buried in a pit. This removed any sanctity that Cromwell and the main architects of the regicide had gained through their actions over the last twenty years. In essence it was the ultimate public revenge to dehumanise and humiliate them. Peter Marshall, who has researched extensively on the role of the body in early modern Britain, noted that when the body was buried the minister would commend their soul to God and cast the body to the ground in certain hope for resurrection to eternal life.³⁰⁵ The body and what happened to it held power, for the body to remain unmolested meant that they could have a good Christian burial. For their bodies to be exhumed, mutilated and thrown into a pit meant these men faced the ultimate desecration.

John Evelyn referred to this event as 'the stupendous and inscrutable judgements of God!'³⁰⁶ The Venetian ambassador noted that it was carried out 'before a great crowd amid the universal approval of the city and of all the people.'³⁰⁷ The most puzzling decision made concerned Thomas Pride, the man who had so publicly purged members of parliament which enabled the Rump to put Charles on trial. He had been included in the Act of parliament but there is no actual evidence that his body had been part of the public spectacle. Pride had died at Nonsuch Place in 1658 but he does not appear in first-hand accounts of his body

³⁰³ *CSPD*, 1660-1661, p. 408.

³⁰⁴ *CJ*, Vol 8, p. 202.

³⁰⁵ Peter Marshall, *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 109.

³⁰⁶ Evelyn, *Diary*, Vol 2, p. 390.

³⁰⁷ Razzell, *Contemporary Account*, Vol 5, p. 279.

being exhumed and hung at Tyburn.³⁰⁸ Nonsuch was in Surrey, fifteen miles from London, and the parliamentary decree was explicit that it included those ‘whether buried in Westminster Abbey, or elsewhere’.³⁰⁹ This act of exhuming their bodies was the public show from the regime of their anger at the most prominent regicides. Charles II wanted to show himself as a strong leader who would ensure that justice would be served. The lack of evidence of any attempt to find and exhume Pride’s body as part of the spectacle of public humiliation suggests a half-hearted approach.

Charles’ execution of judgment remained mixed. Maurice Ashley even claims that Charles was ‘relatively lenient’ with the regicides.³¹⁰ He allowed the bodies of regicides who died in prison to be returned to their families. In contrast to the treatment of Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw, this allowed families to bury their regicides in consecrated ground.³¹¹ John Bouchier, an unrepentant regicide who declared ‘I tell you, it was a just act’, is one example.³¹² He had surrendered himself to authorities and died on 8 August 1660 before he could be convicted. He was then buried in St Mary Magdalen’s in London.³¹³ Like his body, his lands remained intact, because his son Barrington Bouchier had sided with Charles II in the Restoration.³¹⁴ Owen Rowe, was found guilty of the regicide in October 1660 and sentenced to life imprisonment, he died in the Tower and was buried in Hackney Parish.³¹⁵ Simon Mayne died in the Tower from gout, fever and fits on 13 April 1661; his body was returned to his widow ‘for internment in the country without ostentation’.³¹⁶ Isaac Pennington also died in the Tower and his body was returned to his family for burial.³¹⁷ Colonel Hacker was considered a regicide because he had possession of the

³⁰⁸ Ian. J. Gentles, Pride, Thomas, appointed Lord Pride under the protectorate (d. 1658), parliamentary army officer and regicide. ODNB < <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/22781> > [accessed 17 August 2022].

³⁰⁹ *CJ*, Vol 8, p. 202.

³¹⁰ Ashley, *Charles II*, p. 113.

³¹¹ Marshall, *Beliefs*, p. 110.

³¹² Edward Ludlow, *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Lieutenant-General of the Horse in the Army of the Commonwealth of England, 1625-1672*, ed. C.H. Firth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894), p. 293.

³¹³ A.W. Hughes Clarke (ed.), *The Registers of St Mary Magdalen, Milk Street, 1558-1666 and St Michael, London, 1538-1625*, (London: Harleian society, 1942), p. 72.

³¹⁴ *HOP, 1660-1690*, Vol 1, p. 693.

³¹⁵ H. Finch, *An Exact and most Impartial Accompt of the Indictment, Arraignment, Trial, and Judgment (according to law) of Twenty Nine Regicides, the Murderers of His Late Sacred Majesty of Most Glorious Memory begun at Hicks-Hall on Tuesday, the 9th of October, 1660, and continued (at the Sessions-House in the Old-Bayley) until Friday, the nineteenth of the same moneth: Together with a summary of the dark and horrid decrees of the caballists, preperatory to that hellish fact exposed to view for the reader's satisfaction, and information of posterity* (London, 1679), pp. 293-4

³¹⁶ *CSPD, 1660-1661*, p. 566.

³¹⁷ *CSPD, 1661-1662*, p. 184; Keith Lindley, ‘Penington, Isaac (c. 1584–1661), local politician and regicide.’ ODNB, < <http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/21840> > [accessed 28 Sep 2021].

death warrant. Rugg stated in his journal that Hacker was 'brought to Friday Street ... to be buried as his frinds pleased and to be geathred to his fathers'.³¹⁸ As Rugg noted Hacker's brother was a King's Colonel, and this could be why he received this honour.³¹⁹ All these men had committed the ultimate crime but had been given respect by enabling the families to have their bodies unharmed and buried in local churches.

The leniency that was shown by Charles II and his government continued. On 27 January 1662 Robert Wallop, Henry Mildmay and William Monson were dragged on a hurdle under the gallows at Tyburn and then dragged back through the town to the Tower. Schellinks witnessed this and noted that this spectacle would happen each year.³²⁰ However, no further reference to this spectacle taking place survives in diaries or newsbooks after 1662. For the men who were imprisoned it would appear that the sting for revenge abated and many were dealt with in a lenient fashion. Henry Marten raised and equipped a regiment of horses in Berkshire for parliament and signed the death warrant of Charles I.³²¹ He was one of the regicides to surrender under Charles II's pardon clause. He was tried on 16 October 1660 but escaped the death penalty. It has been argued that he had friends of influence such as Lord Lovelace who petitioned the king to enable him to escape the horror of a traitor's death.³²² He was originally taken to Berwick and then to Windsor, but Charles II wanted those 'glum faced prisoners removed from his sight'.³²³ Marten was finally imprisoned at Chepstow where he remained for twenty years until his death on 9 September 1680. Chepstow had been a royalist stronghold and was the last garrison to hold out for Charles I when the castle was surrendered in 1648.³²⁴ Not only did Marten's wife live with him but he was often seen out in the town. He visited local gentry, had a suite of rooms and even a carriage to travel in.³²⁵ Marten

³¹⁸ Rugg, *Journal*, p. 116.

³¹⁹ Rugg, *Journal*, p. 116.

³²⁰ *The Journal of William Schellinks' travels in England, 1661-1663*, eds. Maurice Exwood and H.L. Lehmann (London: University College London, 1993), p. 321.

³²¹ Clement Walker, *Anarchia anglicana: The history of independency, The Second Part* (London, 1694), p. 208.

³²² J. Cole, 'Some notes on Henry Marten, the Regicide, and his family', *Berkshire Archaeological Society*, 13 (1939) p. 25.

³²³ Cole, 'Some notes', p. 26.

³²⁴ D. Lewis (ed.), *Transactions of the Cymmrodorion, Or Metropolitan Cambrian Institution*, Vol 2 (London: W. Marchant, 1828), p. 300.

³²⁵ *Cymmrodorion*, p. 312.

died after a stroke while he was dining.³²⁶ During his imprisonment Marten was dealt with leniently, which was in stark contrast to Paul Hobson's treatment. He was imprisoned there in 1664 and was said to live in 'miserable conditions'. He petitioned to move to another prison.³²⁷

John Lambert did not sign the death warrant but was included in the Act of Oblivion for his actions during the years of turmoil. He was also a popular figure in the army and was imprisoned to contain any potential threats.³²⁸ He was imprisoned in two main locations, Castle Cornet in Guernsey and then from 1670 St Nicholas Island, Plymouth, until his death in 1684. In Guernsey, Lambert was originally in close confinement but on 17 February 1662 a licence was issued for his wife and children to live with him.³²⁹ Lambert's congenial conditions were dependent on whether there were news of plots: he was kept in close quarters especially when in November 1664 a plot was discovered to free him.³³⁰ However, his family remained on the island. In 1667 Lord Belasyse (who was married to a daughter of a regicide) petitioned on behalf of Lambert and he was allowed to take a house with his wife.³³¹ The relaxed nature of Lambert's imprisonment could be attributed to a family connection. Lambert's daughter Mary had married the Governor of Jersey Lord Hatton's son Charles. Lord Hatton wrote to the king in 1669 and confirmed that 'I did not know of the match until a year after and then I turned my son out of doors.'³³² This could be why in 1670 Lambert was transferred to Plymouth.

As part of the Act of Oblivion all regicide lands were to be forfeited. On 3 September 1662 Belasyse was granted all of Lambert's estates and lands in trust for his wife and children.³³³ Interventions such as this were not uncommon regarding regicides' properties. For instance, Robert Wallop had married Anne, the sister of Earl of Southampton and Southampton was granted all the manors in Wallop's name

³²⁶ C. Heath, *Monmouthshire: Historical and descriptive accounts of the ancient and present state of Chepstow Castle; including Persfield, notices of Caerwent, Moyne's Court, Matherine, and St. Pierre. Biographical anecdotes relating to Henry Marten, one of the judges of King Charles I* (Sagwan Press: 2018), p. 388.

³²⁷ CSPD, 1664-1665, p. 22.

³²⁸ David Farr, *John Lambert, Parliamentary Soldier and Cromwellian Major-general, 1619-1684* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003).

³²⁹ CSPD, 1661-1662, p. 276.

³³⁰ Farr, *Lambert*, p. 45.

³³¹ CSPD, 1667, p. 59.

³³² CSPD, 1668-1669, p. 324.

³³³ CSPD, 1661-1662, p. 478.

in trust for his wife and children.³³⁴ Whilst a prisoner, on 12 February 1663 Wallop married Mary the daughter of John Lambert.³³⁵ That he was allowed to get married seemed a lenient move but even more so when allowed to marry a daughter of a fellow prisoner and regicide. Wallop died in 1667 and his body was returned to his family and buried in his local church at Farley Wallop.³³⁶ Similarly Robert Tichborne, an active supporter of the regicide, surrendered in June 1660 and was sentenced to life imprisonment. In January 1663 Tichborne fell ill on Holy Island and his friends petitioned the king for a servant to help assist him.³³⁷ The illness clearly worsened because in October 1663 his wife Anne wrote to Secretary Bennett to petition to remove him from Holy Island because he has 'had a dangerous illness, and the place would endanger his life.'³³⁸ The petitions paid off as in March 1664 he was moved to Dover Castle. As in Lambert's case, Tichborne's family petitioned to live with the prisoner which was accepted and they remained there for ten years until he was returned to London.³³⁹ There are clear themes here: all these men were supported by their family or friends and petitioned on their behalf. They were all imprisoned under lenient conditions. Family members for all were allowed to live with them and even allowed to marry. What it does highlight is that the regicides and their children remained a close-knit community and this will be explored later.

Westminster Abbey became a contested space of national history during the Civil War, Commonwealth and Restoration. James Young argues that 'memorials provide the sites where groups of people gather to create a common past for themselves'.³⁴⁰ They therefore enable the creation of shared narratives. Westminster Abbey and the narratives created within its walls illustrate how the Civil Wars were not forgotten. Rather, they were contested in monuments and space, time after time. With Charles I holding court in Oxford during the Civil Wars, Westminster Abbey was under the command of parliament, and they used the Abbey as a space to justify and sanctify their supporters and members. Notable leaders such

³³⁴ *ibid*, p. 92.

³³⁵ Vernon James Watney, *The Wallop Family and Their Ancestry*, Vol 3, (Oxford: John Johnson, 1929) p. liii.

³³⁶ Vernon, *Wallop*, Vol 3, p. Liv.

³³⁷ *CSPD*, 1663-4, p. 21.

³³⁸ *ibid*, p. 289.

³³⁹ *ibid*, p. 592.

³⁴⁰ James E. Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 3.

as the Earl of Essex had elaborate funerals and were buried in the Abbey at the cost of the state. Essex died in 1646 and 'in acknowledgment of the good and faithfull service to the Publique ... It pleased the Parliament to allot a large summe of money ... towards the honourable Buriall of the said Earle, and voted that the whole House should attend at his Funerall Rites'.³⁴¹ It has been estimated that over £5,000 was spent on the funeral ritual, which included a hearse and effigy that rivalled royal funerals.³⁴² John Pym, an MP with a modest background, probably never expected to be buried in Westminster. Pym, who was the leader of the opposition in the Commons, died in 1643. Like Essex he received full honours, with a magnificent funeral which was voted in parliament that 'the speaker and the whole house, do accompany his body to interment'.³⁴³ He was buried under the gravestone of Sir John Wyndesore in the north ambulatory of Westminster Abbey on 15 December 1643.

This change in the parameters within the Abbey, from Kings, Queens, nobility and churchmen to those who served the Commonwealth, illustrates the importance of funeral rites and burials in the seventeenth century, especially in the nation's great churches. Julia Merritt, who has analysed the role of Westminster from 1641-1660, argued that the Commonwealth regime 'made very active use of the Abbey, turning it for the first time in its history into a state church'.³⁴⁴ Henry Ireton's memorial would attest to this. He was Oliver Cromwell's son-in-law and died in Ireland serving as deputy lieutenant. Like Pym and Essex, he had an elaborate funeral but also had a memorial built by sculptor William Wright.³⁴⁵ This memorial included a long-written inscription which highlighted his virtue as a lawyer and a soldier. It also more significantly linked Ireton as son-in-law to Cromwell: 'Cromwell sensed his divine character when he received him as his son in law; it is doubtful whether father

³⁴¹ Anon, *A Perfect Relation of the Memorable Funerall of the Right Honourable Robert Earle of Essex, wherein divers things are explained, which were not understood by many of the spectators. Also, the manner of the imbalming and the inscription written upon his breast, and buried with his body; and the finding of a crosier staffe in digging of the vault* (London, 1646).

³⁴² Peter Sherlock, 'Militant Masculinity and the Monuments of Westminster Abbey', in *Governing Masculinities in the Early Modern Period: Regulating Selves and Others*, eds. Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline Van Gent (Farnham: Routledge, 2011), pp. 131-153.

³⁴³ *CJ*, Vol 3, pp. 336-338.

³⁴⁴ J.F. Merritt, 'Reinventing Westminster Abbey, 1642-1660: A House of Kings from Revolution to Restoration', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 67 (2016), pp. 122-38.

³⁴⁵ Robert. W. Ramsey, *Henry Ireton* (London: Longmans, 1949), p. 201; Ian J. Gentles, 'Ireton, Henry (bap. 1611, d. 1651), parliamentarian army officer and regicide.' ODNB, < <http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14452> > [accessed 3 Dec 2019].

were more blessed in such a son in law, or son in law such a father'.³⁴⁶ Ireton's memorial constructed an image of a leader in battle but just as importantly a parliamentarian who ruled justly. Not only did the memorial construct the alternative royal family in Westminster Abbey but also a new kind of leader, different to Essex: Ireton was a law maker who had gained from 'Apollo the palm for learning, and from Mars the palm for bravery.'³⁴⁷ As Sean Kelsey has shown the regime used a range of traditional methods to legitimise the new regime. This included the role of spectacle through presentation of prestige and authority through parades, art, and the treatment of visiting European diplomats. The new regime was concerned with fostering identity through the use of icons, including flags, arms, maces, maps and seals. Just as important were the spectacle of thanksgiving days and elaborate funerals; all were used to establish and legitimise the Commonwealth.³⁴⁸ Parliament sought to establish their legacy in stone by imitating royalty and nobility, offering legitimisation through using well-known, traditional, iconic methods.

This argument is amplified when considering the actions of the Restoration government. The Restoration regime reconsecrated the Abbey with a renewed narrative of men loyal to the monarchy. From 1660 royalist burials replaced those loyal to the Houses of Parliament. James Butler, First Duke of Ormond and his family were buried in the vault previously occupied by the Cromwell family. Butler was the leading protestant landowner in Ireland and remained loyal to the Stuart cause throughout the Civil War and Commonwealth.³⁴⁹ He not only held an important and influential role in Ireland but had remained with Charles II in exile. Charles, after his return, created Butler the 1st Duke of Ormond, as a very public reward for his loyalty. By replacing the bodies of Cromwell and his family with the Butlers the narrative of Westminster Abbey was reshaped to the royalist ideals of honour and service to the king. The Abbey was a physical monument to the governance of the kingdom. Therefore, the memory of men who held prominent roles during the Civil War held

³⁴⁶ Westminster Abbey (2020) Westminster Abbey Commemorations. Available at: <https://www.westminster-abbey.org/abbey-commemorations/henry-ireton#i14681>. Accessed: 19 June 2019.

³⁴⁷ Westminster Abbey, *Ireton*.

³⁴⁸ Sean Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic: The Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649-1653* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).

³⁴⁹ Toby Barnard, 'Butler, James, first duke of Ormond (1610–1688), lord lieutenant of Ireland', ODNB, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/4191>> [accessed 11 Mar 2019].

meaning. Their funerals and memorials were public means to create a new legacy for the Commonwealth and then the Restoration regimes.

Imogen Peck, in her recent work on how the Civil Wars were remembered in the Interregnum period, highlighted the importance role funeral memorials had in the creation of narratives of the Civil War and that only a scant few memorials have survived that highlighted prominent parliamentary offices.³⁵⁰ It is perhaps unsurprising, therefore, that there are scant memorials to the regicides, but that there are any at all speaks volumes. Elaborate monuments were preserved for the wealthy and space within a church would more likely given to members of local standing, churches linked to a particular family and local commissioners such as mayors.³⁵¹ Marten, who had died in Chepstow, was allowed to write his own epitaph and therefore crafted what he deemed his lasting legacy. It named him as a 'true Englishman' and that he loved his country's freedom above his own.³⁵² Marten clearly wanted to position himself as someone whose actions were for the good of the nation. Stefanie Knoll articulated how a memorial would be constructed and that it would only be commissioned through a complex network of negotiations between family, craftsmen and the church authorities. The memorial needed to be commissioned by the individual or family member and agreed by the church authorities.³⁵³ That Marten was able to commission his own memorial, write it and gain the church's approval goes some way to substantiate the authority he held within the local community. A similar memorial is that of Sir Arthur Haselrig, who distinguished himself at the battles of Lansdown, Somerset, and Roundway Down and became Governor of Newcastle. He was not involved in Charles I's trial but on 13 August 1660 the Lords included him in the Act of Oblivion.³⁵⁴ He died in January 1661 before he could be brought to trial. His funeral memorial stated that most of his life he had been involved in the country's greatest troubles and that, just like Marten, he was a 'lover of liberty ... to his country.'³⁵⁵ These are powerful ideas that were put

³⁵⁰ Imogen Peck, *Recollection in the Republics: Memories of the British Civil Wars in England, 1649-1659* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), p. 232.

³⁵¹ Peter Sherlock, 'The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the Manipulation of Memory', *Journal of British Studies*, 2 (2007), pp. 263-289.

³⁵² Heath, *Monmouthshire*, p. 389.

³⁵³ Stefani Knoll, *Creating Academic Communities: Funeral Monuments to Professors at Oxford*, Leiden and Tubingen, 1580-1700 (Haren: Equilibris Publishing, 2003), pp. 227-246.

³⁵⁴ *CJ*, Vol 8, pp. 117-119.

³⁵⁵ Heath, *Monmouthshire*, p. 389.

into a local parish church. Both Marten and Haselrig were found guilty of treason, had funeral memorials made in their honour and were able to craft and write their own narratives and the role they had played in the Civil War and regicide – all while Charles II sat on the throne.

The ultimate function of the memorial was to create the lasting impression of the individual. Peter Sherlock has examined how James I used the funeral monument of Mary Queen of Scots at Westminster Abbey to construct a new narrative concerning her tarnished reputation.³⁵⁶ The monument depicts Mary as an innocent victim by using black for the sarcophagus and white for the effigy. The monument to the regicide John Hutchinson also looked to establish a narrative. His wife Lucy Hutchinson wrote the famous memoir which positioned him as a righteous man, surrounded by those more corrupt.³⁵⁷ She used his funeral memorial as James I did for his mother, to rehabilitate his reputation. John Hutchinson had signed the death warrant in 1649 yet stood up in parliament in 1660 to offer himself as a sacrifice due to the guilt he felt for the regicide.³⁵⁸ He repudiated his actions and the Lords accepted his plea, and his name was struck off the list of regicides. He was implicated in a Yorkshire plot in 1663 and was arrested and imprisoned in Sandown Castle where he died in 1664. His memorial in his ancestral church in Owthorpe and confirmed that he had died at Sandown Castle under 'harsh imprisonment without any crime or accusation made and in hope of a glorious resurrection.'³⁵⁹ The monument was commissioned by his wife Lucy and was built in a safe location of their ancestral church and therefore she was able to make the pointed statement of her husband's treatment. He was a man who had committed the ultimate crime of king-killing and Lucy looked to repair his reputation through the written word and in visual iconology through his funeral monument.

Parish churches held an important role as the primary setting for the display of monumental bodies. Most parish churches had links to landed families and they became living monuments to them. This provided some of the regicides a level of

³⁵⁶ Sherlock, 'Mary Stuart', pp. 263-289.

³⁵⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*.

³⁵⁸ P.R. Seddon, 'Hutchinson, John (bap. 1615, d. 1664), parliamentarian army officer and regicide.' *ODNB*, <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14283>> [accessed 2 Sep 2021].

³⁵⁹ Thank you to St Margaret's Church, Owthorpe who provided photographs for the transcription.

protection in their ancestral churches. Hutchinson's memorial was protected by his family connections to their ancestral church and William Cawley benefitted by this same protection. He had fled overseas after the Restoration but in Chichester there is a memorial to him. The Cawley family had close ties to this area. His father John had been a wealthy brewer and was Mayor of Chichester on three separate occasions.³⁶⁰ During the Civil War, William Cawley called the city in the name of parliament; however, the mayor was a royalist and raised the Sussex militia in the king's name. The siege of Chichester, which took place throughout December 1642, was won by the parliamentary forces. From then on 'Cawley's influence ... was paramount and it was exerted steadily first for the parliament and then for the Protector.'³⁶¹ The memorial to Cawley in his local family church of St Andrews was actually for his father who had died in 1621. It noted that he had been 'mayoral thrice and that his son in 1647 had become an MP'. It confirmed that William had signed the death warrant for the 'unfortunate monarch' and (incorrectly) that he had died in Burges at an advanced age.³⁶² Unfortunately there are no exact details on who commissioned the memorial, but it is extraordinary that it was so explicit in his role in the regicide. Cawley had another memorial in Vevay Switzerland where he had actually died in 1667, which confirmed his service to Chichester and to God.³⁶³

James Young understood that memorials did not need to reflect reality; instead, a representation might change public memory and create new realities.³⁶⁴ Monuments were a powerful form for achieving this, communicating information diversely through their position, size, inscriptions, heraldry, effigies, and materials. Monuments were placed in local churches across the country and were able to communicate important ideas and events which were seen in the memorials of Marten and Haselrig. Monuments were intended to reshape the remembered image of the dead, both sought and made by the bereaved. Therefore, those who were responsible for remembering the dead had a very important role as these were the

³⁶⁰ Rev. F.H. Arnold, 'Cawley the Regicide', *Sussex Archaeological Collections: Relating to the history and antiquities of the county*, 34 (1884), pp. 21-38.

³⁶¹ *ibid*, p. 24.

³⁶² *ibid*, p. 25.

³⁶³ Rev R.R. Lisgard Guthrie, 'Notice of the Inscriptions over the Graves of the Regicides at Vevay, in Switzerland', *Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 17 (1883), pp. 286-9.

³⁶⁴ Young, *Memory*, p. 3.

ultimate and lasting way to commemorate their loved ones and to transmit messages through the ages.

iii - Regicide Generation

It was a revolution in the consciousness of those who lived through it, and it was transmitted to their children and their children's children.³⁶⁵

Edward Legon has recently described a 'Restoration Generation' who, though they played no active part in the Civil War, grew up with inherited memories and fears of the revolution.³⁶⁶ This view is echoed by Erin Peters who noted that, 'This second generation would inherit the identity-crisis of their parents and were involved in constructing the collective narrative of the past that would influence the nature of the new Restoration culture.'³⁶⁷ There has been no examination of the regicide generation, the children and grandchildren of those who signed the death warrant. These children, most of whom were born after the regicide, formed their ideas without direct experience of the wars. Through examination of the familial and political networks they formed illustrate how the transmission of ideas passed between generations.

Marshall has argued that there was a palpable fear of 'fantaicks' returning, which shaped how the new regime acted towards potential dissident.³⁶⁸ After the Restoration people were still being identified by their allegiance in the Civil Wars. Robert Humberstone was called an 'old cavilere, beggarly rogue'.³⁶⁹ Others were known by their family's involvement in the wars: 'Captain Henry Slingsby, who is son to Sir Henry Slingsby who was beheaded.'³⁷⁰ Actions of families were ingrained in the consciousness. Even in 1685 James II issued a letter of dispensation which confirmed pardons for those who had suffered in the late rebellion for their loyalty to the Stuarts or those 'whose parents or nearest relations had been sufferers for the

³⁶⁵ John Morrill, *Nature of the English Revolution* (London: Routledge, 2013), p. 284.

³⁶⁶ Legon, *Revolution*, pp. 179-180.

³⁶⁷ Peters, *Commemoration*, p. 112.

³⁶⁸ Marshall, *Espionage*, p. 8.

³⁶⁹ W.J. Hardy, *Hertford County Records, Notes and Extracts from the Session Rolls, 1581-1698* (Hertford: Simon & Son Ltd, 1905), p. 327.

³⁷⁰ Roger Morrice, *The Entering Book of Roger Morrice, 1677-1691*. Vol 2, ed. Mark Golding (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), p. 364.

cause.³⁷¹ By virtue of familial ties the regicide generation had to act and react to the actions from the Stuart regimes. For Fraser, Charles II's disinclination for vengeance did not mean that he would forget and in the early years of his reign and there were animated surveys of the careers of those with regicide connections.³⁷² In 1666 Charles II issued a declaration for fourteen perceived anti-monarchical men to return to England. These men included William Scot (son of regicide Thomas Scot), Colonel John Desborough, Algernon Sidney, Oliver St John and Richard Cromwell.³⁷³ On 9 April 1666 both Scot and Desborough were accused of having remained beyond seas contrary to former proclamations and having treasonably served in the wars against their native country and are forfeited for high treason.³⁷⁴ Scot remained in Holland and later in 1666 Aphra Behn was sent to spy on her ex-lover. Scot had supplied some information about the network in Holland and the threat posed but it was likely that he played a double game as none of the information he gave resulted in any arrests.³⁷⁵

Those linked to a regicide could also not escape identification. Alicia Lisle, the widow of John Lisle who had been assassinated in exile, felt the vengeful act of Judge John Jefferies.³⁷⁶ She was condemned for harbouring fugitives after the Monmouth's rebellion. Jefferies referred to her at her trial as the wife of a regicide. Her marriage and involvement in another rebellion against the Crown provided her a history of treasonable behaviour.³⁷⁷ The officer who led the search of her house was John Penruddock whose father was killed in 1655 for rebelling against the protectorate. The man who judged his case was John Lisle.³⁷⁸ Alicia was beheaded on 2 September 1685 at Winchester.³⁷⁹ For some like Jefferies the regicide could not be forgiven. Her son in law John Lloyd was brought before the Privy Council in 1683 in the wake of the Rye House Plot and was described as 'Lisle a linen draper of Cornhill.'³⁸⁰

³⁷¹ Morrice, *Entering*, Vol 3, p. 467.

³⁷² Fraser, *Charles II*, p. 186.

³⁷³ CSPD, 1665-1666, p. 318.

³⁷⁴ CSPD, 1665-1666, p. 342.

³⁷⁵ Janet Todd, *The Secret Life of Aphra Behn* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1996), p. 312.

³⁷⁶ Antony Whitaker, *The Regicide's Widow: Lady Alice Lisle and The Bloody Assize* (Stroud: Sutton, 2006), p. 132.

³⁷⁷ Whitaker, *Regicide's Widow*, p. 133.

³⁷⁸ Jordan and Walsh, *Manhunt*, p. 321.

³⁷⁹ Whitaker, *Regicide's Widow*, p. 133.

³⁸⁰ CSPD, July-September 1683, p. 498.

Oliver Cromwell's family has merited some research, the most notable being Mark Noble's *Memoirs of the protectorate-house of Cromwell* which provided an overview of the children and grandchildren of Cromwell.³⁸¹ Much like his *Lives of the Regicides*, it is critical of this family and their actions but illustrated that the Cromwell family remained a curiosity. Noble's account provided an insight into what happened next for the Cromwell family. Cromwell's daughter Mary married Thomas Belasyse, first Earl Fauconberg in 1657 with a lavish celebration at Hampton Court.³⁸² Fauconberg was a surprise match because his father was a royalist and fought at Marston Moor.³⁸³ Fauconberg became ambassador to France and as the political situation began to change in England in 1659, he sent money to the future Charles II. This action secured his future in the new Restoration government, and he later became lord lieutenant of Durham and North Riding of Yorkshire.³⁸⁴ He remained loyal during Charles II's reign, but this changed when James II became king. In 1687 Belasyse met the Dutch agent Dykvelde and supported Mary Stuart's claim to her father's throne. In 1689 he was rewarded with the Earldom for his support. He died in 1700 and was buried in his family's church at Newbury Priory. His marble tomb, very probably by Grinling Gibbons, shows Thomas holding his Earl's coronet as if offering it to his father Henry who stands beside him. His inscription confirmed he was 'an example of old time nobility' and that his strengths ensured he was right for public office. It highlighted his ambassadorial roles for Charles II and William III. The wording that referred to his second wife Mary, is clumsy: 'offspring of the Cromwell's, begotten by Oliver her father.'³⁸⁵ The Belasyse's family history, written by Geoffrey Ridsdale Smith, confirmed that Mary wanted the memorial to say, 'the daughter of his Highness the then Lord protector of England'.³⁸⁶ Mary was keen to highlight her lineage and the role that her father had played but the Belasyses and their royalist heritage meant this acknowledgement would have been a step too far. So, Mary's lineage was included but with the compromised wording. Mary had

³⁸¹ Mark Noble, *Memoirs of the Protectorate-house of Cromwell: deduced from an early period, and continued down to the present time: collected chiefly from original papers and records, with proofs and illustrations* (Birmingham: Pearson and Rollason, 1784).

³⁸² Geoffrey Ridsdale Smith, *In well Beware: The Story of Newbury Priory and the Belasyse Family 1145- 1977* (Kineton: The Roundwood Press, 1978), p. 39.

³⁸³ Victor, Stater, 'Belasyse, Thomas, first Earl Fauconberg (1627/8–1700), nobleman.' ODNB <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/801981>> [accessed 5 October 2019].

³⁸⁴ Slater, 'Belasyse', ODNB.

³⁸⁵ Smith, *In Well Beware*, p. 94; Full memorial inscription provided by Newbury Priory

³⁸⁶ Smith, *In Well Beware*, p. 94.

remained very close to her sister Frances and is buried alongside her in Coxwold church but there is no visible monument to her.

Frances Cromwell, like her sister, also married into the nobility to Robert Rich (grandson of Earl of Warwick) but this was a short-lived marriage with Robert dying within months. In 1663 she married John Russell, who was brother-in-law to Henry Cromwell. Frances and John had five children before his death in 1670. Frances's daughter Elizabeth married Mary's nephew Thomas Frankland in 1683.³⁸⁷ Frankland would represent Thirsk as a Whig MP and he continued the link between those who fought for the right of parliament in the 1640s into the next century.³⁸⁸ The Russell Baronetcy passed to the oldest son William who played an active part in the Glorious Revolution. In a letter from Frances to the Earl of Devonshire, who was one of the immortal seven and a leading Whig, she confirmed that 'both her sons are in the king's service' and that her eldest had 'lost all his money in supporting the revolution.'³⁸⁹ There is no evidence that William was rewarded for his role but the Russell line have kept and cultivated numerous Cromwell related artefacts which can be viewed at their ancestral home of Chequers.

There are some family lines that are related to two different regicides and the most prominent is the Cromwell/Ireton line. Henry Ireton, who played a prominent role in the Civil Wars and later became Deputy Lieutenant of Ireland, married Bridget Cromwell in 1646. Ireton died in Ireland in 1651 but they had four children: Henry, Elizabeth, Jane and Bridget. This meant these children were directly related to both Oliver Cromwell and Henry Ireton.³⁹⁰ Henry Ireton the younger died in 1711 and his funeral memorial confirmed that he was 'Lt Colonel of ye Dragoons Guards, First equerry & Gentlemen of the horse to K W 3rd.'³⁹¹ Ireton appeared as an established man with ties to the regime of William III. However, as we will see with others from the regicide generation, he was implicated or involved in plots against the Stuart monarchy. Legon argues that the parliamentary heritage was important to the authorities who were prone to focus on their fanatic principles of disloyalty that they

³⁸⁷ George Edward Cockayne (ed.), *Complete Baronetage*, Vol 3 (1649-1664) (Exeter: William Pollard and Co, 1903), p. 163.

³⁸⁸ *HOP*, 1715-1754, pp. 50-51.

³⁸⁹ Smith, *In Well Beware*, p. 90.

³⁹⁰ Gentles, 'Ireton, Henry', *ODNB*.

³⁹¹ Samuel Rudder, *A New History of Gloucestershire* (Circenester: Samuel Rudder, 1779), p. 618.

had inherited.³⁹² Little is known about Ireton's life until his commission with William III. The only evidence that survives is from Governmental records that show Ireton was on the radar of the Restoration regime. In 1671 there was a warrant for his arrest for high treason in corresponding with traitors.³⁹³ Despite this, on 13 January 1680, along with Gilbert Gerard and 'a sonn of another traytor' they petitioned Charles II for the second Exclusion Parliament to be allowed to meet, but the king refused.³⁹⁴ Gerard was rumoured to have the black box which contained the marriage licence of Charles II and the Duke of Monmouth's mother.³⁹⁵ Gerard was arrested in August 1685 and this could be due to his implied role in the Monmouth rebellion, where Lord Grey in his confession confirmed his involvement.³⁹⁶

Ireton was involved in a network which had and would rebel against the Stuart monarchy. In 1683 he was implicated, for instance, in the Rye House Plot that planned to kill both Charles II and James, Duke of York. Morrice noted that on he was seized alongside Lord Grey and Mr Overton but that they were bailed later the same day.³⁹⁷ Lord Grey, who also took a prominent role in the Monmouth rebellion and was taken prisoner, wrote an account of what happened in hope for a pardon. He noted that his cousin, Henry Ireton, came over from Holland but this was unfortunate timing as he knew nothing about the plot.³⁹⁸ On 6 July a letter from Grey was intercepted along with a large sum of money intended for Ireton.³⁹⁹ Evidence of the close regicide generation remained evident when in the aftermath of the plot many people were questioned. In his examination Robert West told how the son of Richard Cromwell and Henry Ireton intended to assist in the assassination of the king and duke.⁴⁰⁰ This same son could be the man who, with Mr Oliver St John (son of Oliver St John who we encountered in chapter 2) failed to commemorate the regicide on 30 January 1681.⁴⁰¹ Their failure to commemorate could be another indication

³⁹² Legon, *Revolution*, p. 320.

³⁹³ CSPD, 1671, p. 321.

³⁹⁴ Edward Maunde Thompson (ed.), *Correspondence of the Family of Hatton: Being chiefly letters addressed to Christopher, first Viscount Hatton, 1601-1704* (London: Camden society, 1878), p. 215.

³⁹⁵ HOP, 1690-1715, pp. 468-70.

³⁹⁶ Forde Grey, Earl of Tankerville, *The Secret History of the Rye-House Plot: and of Monmouth's Rebellion* (London, 1685), p. 65.

³⁹⁷ Morrice, *Entering*, Vol 3, p. 369.

³⁹⁸ Grey, *Rye-House Plot*, p. 106.

³⁹⁹ CSPD, July-September 1683, p. 94.

⁴⁰⁰ Thomas Sprat, *A True Account and Declaration of the Horrid Conspiracy against the Late King, His present Majesty, and the Government: as it was order'd to be published by His late Majesty* (London, 1684), pp. 62-63.

⁴⁰¹ TNA 29/415/96 96/1.

that the families advocated their ancestors' role in the event. It also provides evidence of the dissident community that formed: Ireton had been connected to Monmouth, Lord Grey and his cousin Richard Cromwell.

Ireton remained on the radar of the Restoration regime. On 19 January 1684 a warrant for his arrest was drawn up. He had escaped back to Holland but returned by April 1685 when the Mayor of Harwich confirmed that he had been secured in custody.⁴⁰² He was examined before the king on 26 September 1685 and recommitted to Newgate on a charge of high treason for corresponding with traitors.⁴⁰³ Later the same year, he became ill and the king consented for him to be bailed. On 19 April 1686 he was pardoned for 'all treasons before 1 April.'⁴⁰⁴ In Wigfield's comprehensive research, which listed everyone involved in the Monmouth rebellion, he states that Ireton had 'supplied arms to Ford, Lord Grey.'⁴⁰⁵ After Ireton's elevation to Equerry to William III he became an MP for Cirencester in 1698 and remained there until 1710. The Hanoverian government classed him as a Whig.⁴⁰⁶ He married Katherine Powle, whose father also supported William III. He had been an MP during the early Restoration period and spoke out about the right of parliament when under the threat of prorogation.⁴⁰⁷ In 1688 Henry Powle spent time with William of Orange to discuss how to summon parliaments. On 16 December 1689 he presented the Bill of Rights to William and Mary and was speaker of the House until 1690.⁴⁰⁸ Ireton's memorial, commissioned by his wife, highlighted his lineage as son of Henry Ireton and his role as a member for several parliaments.⁴⁰⁹ There was clear pride in his regicide ancestry.

The Ireton siblings appeared to remain close. Whilst imprisoned in the Tower, Henry was visited by his sister Bridget. In 1670 Bridget married Thomas Bendish, a leading member of the independent church in Great Yarmouth. What is notable about this is that Bridget's father-in-law had close connections to another regicide, Miles Corbet. All references to Bridget noted how she resembled her grandfather in

⁴⁰² *CSPD*, 1685, p. 134.

⁴⁰³ *Ibid*, pp. 134; 136

⁴⁰⁴ *ibid*, 1686, p. 337.

⁴⁰⁵ W. MacDonald Wigfield, *The Monmouth Rebels 1685* (Gloucester: Sutton, 1985), p. 93.

⁴⁰⁶ *HOP*, 1690-1715, Vol 2, pp. 468-70.

⁴⁰⁷ *HOP*, 1660-1690, Vol 2, p. 270.

⁴⁰⁸ *HOP*, 1660-1690, Vol 2, p. 270.

⁴⁰⁹ Rudder, *Gloucestershire*, p. 618.

looks and personality.⁴¹⁰ Therefore Bridget was always linked back to her regicide ancestors, and she wore this as a badge of honour. This pride was evident when a fellow passenger spoke harshly of Oliver Cromwell during a coach journey; when they alighted she grabbed a sword and challenged the passenger.⁴¹¹ This incident, recorded by a family member fifty years later, signified her enduring loyalty.⁴¹² Bridget like her brother was said to take an interest in politics and had 'been in the secret of the Revolution'.⁴¹³ In 1688 she distributed papers recommending William and in 1694 she was introduced to Queen Mary and promised a pension. The pension never materialised because Mary died in the same year.⁴¹⁴ She was known in her local community as a non-conformist and was buried at the local independent church at St Marys. She died in 1702 and buried alongside her husband. Unfortunately, the church was bombed and badly damaged during the Second World War and many of the funeral memorials were destroyed. However, the transcript of her husband's memorial remains which confirmed his lineage and that he married Bridget who was the daughter of Henry Ireton, sometime lord lieutenant of Ireland.⁴¹⁵ The arms of Ireton were also intertwined with the Bendish arms, signalling his wife's lineage, yet another lasting memorial to the Ireton line and the regicide.

Both Noble and Rowse argued that families were embarrassed to be related to a regicide. Rowse illustrated this through the family of Carew, who were so horrified that they ensured all traces of his history, including his marriage, were destroyed.⁴¹⁶ Even so, it is apparent that many families supported their ancestor's involvement and the regicide generation remained close, plotted together and even intermarried. At the height of the disgust for the regicides in 1660s, petitions were made by the families. George Fleetwood asked that his innocent children not to be ruined by his

⁴¹⁰ Charles Palmer, *The History of Great Yarmouth, Designed as a Continuation of Manship's History of that Town* (Great Yarmouth: Meall, 1856), p. 171 footnote; Henry Manship, *The History of Great Yarmouth*, ed. Charles John Palmer (Great Yarmouth: Meall, 1854), p. 392; John Glyde, William Haldimand and Thomas Barret Lennard, *The New Suffolk Garland: A Miscellany of Anecdotes, Romantic Ballads, Descriptive Poems* (Ipswich: 1866), p. 33; *Gentlemen's magazine* – GM, 1st ser., 35 (1765), pp. 357-8; Rev James Anderson, *Memorable Women of the Puritan times* (London: Blackie and Son, 1862), pp. 383-402.

⁴¹¹ Glyde, *The New Suffolk Garland*, p. 33.

⁴¹² Samuel Say, *The Character of Mrs Bridget Bendish grand-daughter of Oliver Cromwell written in the year 1719, on occasion of the closing words of Lord Clarendon's character of her grandfather* (Annual Register, 1774), p. 79.

⁴¹³ Anderson, *Memorable Women*, p. 390.

⁴¹⁴ Palmer, *Great Yarmouth*, p. 172.

⁴¹⁵ Dawson Turner, *Sepulchral Reminiscences of a Market Town: as afforded by a list of the interments within the walls of the parish church of St. Nicholas, Great Yarmouth* (Yarmouth: Charles Barber, 1848), p. 170.

⁴¹⁶ Rowse, *Regicides*, p. 169.

inexcusable offence.⁴¹⁷ Haselrig's children asked for liberty to visit his father from time to time.⁴¹⁸ Thomas Scott's wife asked to enjoy the company of her husband and later asked for the king's assurance that her husband would not be executed as he had surrendered himself.⁴¹⁹ The regicide community appeared to be close knit and it was noted in 1663 that 'Mrs Cawley ... is intimate with the wives of Ludlow, Goffee and Whalley.'⁴²⁰ Within Great Yarmouth leading independent families were intermarried: Carter's son Nathaniel married Mary Ireton; Thomas Bendish married Bridget Ireton; William Burton married a daughter of General Desborough.⁴²¹ In 1660, the Burton family had been accused of aiding Miles Corbet to escape to Holland before his trial.⁴²² In 1686, Hannah Hewling married Richard Cromwell, the son of Henry Cromwell. Hannah's brothers had both been executed for their role in the Monmouth rebellion. It has been viewed as the last bastion of the 'Good old cause' and formed on the nostalgia of the 1640s and 1650s.⁴²³ Hannah interceded on her brother's behalf to both Judge Jeffrey and Charles II but failed. However, she was able to retrieve their bodies which were followed through the streets by a large crowd with echoes of Okey's burial.⁴²⁴ Instead of the regicide generation hiding away the community of dissidents and the regicide generation continued to grow.

The Mayne brothers were also viewed as dissidents. Their father Simon Mayne attended several of the painted chamber sessions and was the fortieth signature on the death warrant.⁴²⁵ He was tried and found guilty of the regicide but died in 1661 before his appeal could be heard. He had two sons, Simon and Samuel, who were both questioned as part of the Rye House plot. Simon the younger, a linen draper, was questioned on 11 July 1683. He confirmed he knew nothing of the plot but that he did know one of the suspected plotters Aaron Smith.⁴²⁶ Three days later his brother was seized and brought back to London.⁴²⁷ In August both Mayne brothers

⁴¹⁷ CSPD, 1660-1661, p. 172.

⁴¹⁸ Ibid, p.172.

⁴¹⁹ Ibid, p.172.

⁴²⁰ Arnold, 'Cawley the Regicide', p. 34.

⁴²¹ Manship, *Great Yarmouth*, p. 392.

⁴²² CJ, Vol 8, pp. 50-52.

⁴²³ Anderson, *Memorable Women*, pp. 372-381.

⁴²⁴ John Tutchin, *The Western Martyrology* (London: James Blackwood, 1873), pp. 128-144; Anderson, *Memorable Women*, p. 377.

⁴²⁵ George Lipscomb, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Buckingham* (London: J. & W. Robins, 1847), p. 138.

⁴²⁶ CSPD, July-September 1683, p. 303.

⁴²⁷ Ibid, p. 374.

were implicated by a Samuel Starkey. According to Starkey, both had entered Aaron Smith's house and had brought several pages with them. Starkey was able to listen through the keyhole where he heard very conveniently that they could not involve Starkey as he would ruin them. The three discussed the king and duke's death and that it needed to be affected quickly. When Smith was asked how many were involved he confirmed not above 20 and that 'they are all or most old sufferers for their liberties and rights.'⁴²⁸ There is no evidence that the brothers were arrested but much like with Ireton they continued to rebel against the Stuart monarchy and were involved with other leading dissidents such as Smith who was arrested as part of the Rye House Plot.

The Mayne brothers came from Buckinghamshire, which had a history rebelling against the Stuarts dating back to John Hampden's refusal in 1637 to pay ship money. His grandson was arrested in the Rye House plot and Monmouth Rebellion.⁴²⁹ Twelve of those who had signed the death warrant of Charles I came from Buckinghamshire.⁴³⁰ In the later Stuart period rebellious behaviour continued in Buckinghamshire. Concerns were heightened in the reign of Charles II of Catholics securing prominent roles and potential influence. In 1673 the Test Act was passed which enforced anyone taking 'any office, civil, military or religious, the obligation of taking the oaths of supremacy and allegiance ... [and] a declaration against transubstantiation and also of receiving the sacrament within three months after admittance to office.'⁴³¹ In essence to ensure that Catholics could not secure prominent positions. When in 1687 James II looked to dispense with the previous Test Act, many rebelled.⁴³² Alongside the names of those rebelled is a handwritten remark which stated that 'most of them supposed to be dissenters', alongside the name of Simon Mayne are those of Richard Beke and Richard Ingoldsby.⁴³³ Beke had supported Richard Cromwell and married Levina Whitstone, a niece of Oliver Cromwell. Ingoldsby was the son of the regicide who had been pardoned in the

⁴²⁸ Ibid, p. 381.

⁴²⁹ Richard L. Greaves, 'Hampden, John (bap. 1653, d. 1696), politician and conspirator.' *ONDB* <<http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/96141>> [Accessed 22 Sep. 2021].

⁴³⁰ Robert Gibbs, *The Regicides of Buckinghamshire*, Records of Buckinghamshire (Aylesbury News, 1879), p. 1.

⁴³¹ *Statutes*, Vol 5, pp. 782–85.

⁴³² John Miller, *James II* (London: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 237.

⁴³³ Sir George Floyd Duckett, *Penal Laws and Test Act: Questions Touching Their Repeal Propounded in 1687 by James II* (London: Forgotten Books, 2019), p. 152.

Restoration.⁴³⁴ After the Glorious Revolution, Mayne was appointed a victualling commissioner in November 1689.⁴³⁵ After a failed attempt to get into parliament in 1688 he became an MP for Aylesbury in 1691 and is noted in Luttrell's diary as a Whig.⁴³⁶ He remained an MP until 1710 and died in 1725 and buried near his regicide father at Dinton.⁴³⁷ Many families with regicide connections were under the radar of the authorities but for the majority of the time remained out of their grasp. What they do signify is that there had been transmission of ideas from their regicide fathers' with their role in potential plots and that they continued to support and uphold the role of parliament.

The last great plot of the Stuart period was the Glorious Revolution that overthrew of James II and established the joint monarchy of his protestant daughter Mary and her Dutch husband, William of Orange. Even here we can find the fingerprints of the regicide generation. Thomas Grey, son of the regicide, was born in 1654 and had been implicated in the Rye House plot. As with the Mayne brothers, evidence was given against him: Richard Goodenough confessed that he had seen Grey with Monmouth and promised to raise men.⁴³⁸ In July 1685 he was imprisoned, and a trial date was set. Due to prorogation the trial never happened and on 3 April 1686 he was pardoned.⁴³⁹ He was regarded as 'one of the leading opponents of James II because of his spirit and talents'.⁴⁴⁰ Grey raised troops for William and met the prospective king at Hungerford. In November 1688 he was at Nottingham with Earl of Devonshire, Manchester and Rutland with 4,000 troops.⁴⁴¹ He was rewarded with the high stewardship of the honour of Leicester and in 1694 became a member of the Privy Council.⁴⁴²

⁴³⁴ Duckett, *Penal Laws*, p. 153.

⁴³⁵ *HOP*, 1690-1715, Vol 2, p.780; Narcissus Luttrell, *The Parliamentary Diary of Narcissus Luttrell, 1691-1693* ed. Henry Horwitz (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), p. 500.

⁴³⁶ Luttrell, *Diary*, p. 500.

⁴³⁷ George Lipscomb, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Buckingham* (London: J. & W. Robins, 1847), p. 153.

⁴³⁸ Sprat, *Horrid Conspiracy*, pp. 50-51.

⁴³⁹ Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs, from September 1678 to April 1714*, Vol 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1857) p. 374.

⁴⁴⁰ Steven Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2009), p. 205.

⁴⁴¹ Luttrell, *Brief*, Vol 1, p. 479.

⁴⁴² Richard L. Greaves, 'Grey, Thomas, second earl of Stamford (1653/4–1720), conspirator and politician'. ODNB < <http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/97018> > [Accessed 23 Sep. 2021].

Alex Walsham, in her work on the generations throughout the Reformation, noted that as the first generation gave way to the second and the third Protestantism cemented its hold on English society.⁴⁴³ As the regicide generation moved forward, we can see that the same sentiments were being cemented around the role of parliament and defence of liberties. In St Bartholomew's Church in Otford, Kent there stands funeral memorials to a local prominent family, the Polhills. The Polhills had only been in this part of Kent since the sixteenth century and the family played no prominent role during the Civil Wars. In 1666, Thomas Polhill married Elizabeth Ireton, daughter of Henry and granddaughter of Oliver Cromwell. Their son David became active in politics in the at the turn of the century. In 1701 he was a leader in the Kent petition against parliament who had voted against William III's request for resources to oppose Louis XIV accepting the Spanish throne. He was imprisoned but gained national acclaim and was soon released.⁴⁴⁴ In total David stood for parliament eleven times and won seats on four occasions. His action suggested that he was a key supporter of the role of Parliament. At his death in 1754 he was still MP for Rochester and still attending parliament.⁴⁴⁵

The funeral monument to David Pohill is found on the south wall of the Nave. It was commissioned by his third wife, Elizabeth Borrett, and his surviving children. The monument confirmed his lineage 'son of Thomas Polhill ... by Elizabeth daughter of Henry Ireton by Bridgett daughter of Oliver Cromwell.'⁴⁴⁶ It confirmed he was active in promoting the interest of his sovereign and defending liberties both civil and religious. His monument implied that his lineage of Ireton and Cromwell led to his principles which were highlighted in the memorial. It signals the continuation of the regicide generation. Henry Ireton the younger's will noted two pictures, one of his grandfather and one of his father and both were bequeathed to his nephew David Polhill.⁴⁴⁷ The portrait of Oliver Cromwell is now in the Cromwell Museum.⁴⁴⁸ How the regicide generation acted throughout the latter seventeenth century is

⁴⁴³ Alexandra Walsham, *The Reformation of the Generations: Age, Ancestry, and Memory in England c. 1500-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 105.

⁴⁴⁴ *HOP*, 1715-1754, Vol II, p. 359.

⁴⁴⁵ *Ibid*, p. 359.

⁴⁴⁶ Edward Hasted (ed.), *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*, Vol 3 (Canterbury, 1797), pp. 105-126 and thank you to St. Bartholomew's Church for providing photographs of the memorial.

⁴⁴⁷ TNA, PROB 11/525/11.

⁴⁴⁸ Thank you to Stuart Orme, curator of the Cromwell Museum for this information.

enlightening. Some remained under the radar and may have been embarrassed by the actions of their father. Yet, there were many that continued to fight for the principles their fathers had fought for, whether shown through their actions or in their lasting funeral memorials. It is clear that the fixed view established by Noble needs to be re-evaluated and that the regicide generation was a dissident community that needs further exploration.

iv - Conclusion

The research by Noble and Rowse too easily fits into a narrative that the regicides were part of the revolution that all sides wanted to forget. However, the research in this chapter has shown that there was an appetite for their stories, from their scaffold speeches to their memorialisation and shared politics and associations of their next generations. Charles I asked for people to remember what happened to him and there has been much research on how his martyr cult was formed. The men who sent him to the scaffold have not received this same level of attention, but it is clear that they were also remembered. A dominant royalist narrative was created during the Restoration, but this chapter has illustrated that a counter-narrative about the men who signed the death warrant did exist. The remembrance was found through monuments, their actions and transmission of their ideas. Through the action of their families, through their petitioning from the initial arrests, through to their deaths twenty years later, they continued to support their regicide family members. Some were able to petition for the return of the bodies of regicides so they could give them a Christian burial. The 20,000 spectators at Okey's burial indicated that these men continued to have a popular following. Even printers were prepared to go to prison to publish pamphlets on the trials and executions of the regicides, to ensure that their last speeches and scaffold performance were transmitted. As Charles I's scaffold performance held power, so did those of the regicides.

How the government dealt with the regicides was contradictory, or at least inconsistent. Revenge was sought, as numerous historians have argued, with this need to show power and revenge exemplified by the exhumation of the bodies of Cromwell, Bradshaw and Ireton. But Charles II and his reaction remained inconsistent, he demanded action and revenge against these men but wanted it done

quickly. The main action against the regicides happened in the first twelve months of his reign. If Okey, Barkstead and Corbet had not been caught and brought to England then there would not have been any further regicide executions. He had to react to these men being presented to him. This suggests that the need for revenge waned. It is telling that after these initial deaths, the rest of the regicides remained unharmed. Charles II did the minimum with only ten men facing the ultimate punishment. He could have gone much further, but he did not. This mirrors his actions when remembering his father, a concerted effort which quickly turned to apathy.

We also explored the regicide generation as a new avenue of research, which has enabled us to gain further insight into how the regicides were remembered. The regicide generation illustrates how ideas transmitted through familial ties. Through each of the three large scale plots against the Stuart monarchy, members of the regicide generation had a part to play. The network of regicides' dissidents continued, with many families continuing to intermarry and remain as a close-knit network. It is clear from the research here that their familial and political networks provided the regicide generation with touchpoints between the events of the Civil Wars and regicide. The ideals that the regicides fought for continued in the message conveyed in their funeral memorials for future generations to interpret in their local communities. The men who signed the death warrant might have been neglected by historians but not by many of their families.

Conclusion

The primary aim of this thesis has been to examine reactions to and memories of the regicide across sixty years. Through the use of a case study approach, it aimed to illustrate how public memory and its emotional resonances differ when examined in the short and long term. Part one examined the politics at the time of the regicide and then at the time of the Restoration to argue that both the Commonwealth and Restoration regimes looked to harness 'emotional governance' around the narrative of the regicide. Both regimes used emotional manipulation of the events to serve and undermine the immediate interests of their opponents. Part two examined how Charles and men who condemned him were remembered and mis-remembered throughout the rest of the Stuart period. It argued that efforts to commemorate Charles I trailed off and that the image of him as martyr was firmly etched in *Eikon*. For the regicides subversive memories persisted and their families often celebrated their legacy and continued to defend parliamentary politics.

Over the past twenty years early modern history has experienced a 'memory turn' exploring the contested nature of the remembrance of the Civil Wars. These studies have focused on the period after the Restoration and have looked at how people reacted to the regicide as a by-product. There has been no concerted research into how reactions to the regicide itself evolved over these sixty years. I have argued that these reactions changed and developed over time. The Restoration was the perfect opportunity to remember and revere the sainted Charles. His son tried to utilise his father's memory, but these efforts proved unsustainable and eventually Charles I became largely irrelevant in public discourse. Finally, the regicide was not just about Charles I but the men who signed his death warrant. These men transmitted some of their ideas to their children and grandchildren who illustrated this in their actions and remembrance in stone. This thesis demonstrates that remembering the regicide involved a complex mixture of emotion and political action.

The thesis has explored how emotions have the power to generate meaning through the histories and contexts that they invoke. Ahmed noted that 'emotions

tells us a lot about time; emotions are the very flesh of time.’¹ Emotions accumulate over time, as a form of affective value. For example, individuals remember something, this memory will likely trigger a feeling, an emotion. This is how the past can persist: memories evoke the emotions and the initial reaction associated with that event or person. This thesis has explored how the death of Charles I was a deeply emotional event, with genuine concern about what the future would hold. Kings had died before but there had been a natural successor in the wings from Henry IV to even Richard III. As we saw in chapter one, after the initial outpouring of emotions life returned to normality, shops opened, and the world did not end. Up to the regicide Charles I had a problematic public reputation. He had, as Cressy has argued, ‘eroded the respect, affections and trust on which successful English kingship depended.’² This erosion of trust, respect and affection could be the very reason why this raw emotion subsided. Even in his own lifetime he was not consistently revered.

The thesis has centred on the word reaction as this encapsulates the transition between the raw state of the initial response to an event to the emotion that can be relived through remembrance. Samuel Johnson in his dictionary noted that a reaction is ‘the reciprocation of any impulse or force impressed, made by the body on which such impression is made: action and reaction are equal’.³ A reaction is an action to something, it can be an emotion as emotions are relational. A reaction can be something that you continue to do across a time period: you have an immediate response to something but then across time you can continue to react to the feeling you had at that moment. This process is natural as human beings we have an initial reaction to an event; even not having a reaction, is a reaction. This reaction is then processed: why did we react in that way? As the emotion is processed it begins to move from raw emotion into memory. This process is visible on the first anniversary of the regicide where the emotion some felt resurfaced, and a series of printed works were published to cast guilt on prominent men who had died on and near the anniversary. What is curious about this event is that after a flurry of pamphlets, much like with any emotion, they receded – this is the moment that that raw emotion turns into memory.

¹ Ahmed, *Cultural*, p. 211.

² David Cressy, *Charles I and the People of England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 313.

³ Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of The English Language*, Vol 2 (London: Plummer & Brewer, 1825), p. 460.

Charles II looked to harness this raw emotion on his return but as we saw could not sustain emotional governance around his father. The first year of his return, much like the first year after the regicide, saw consistent devotion to the remembrance to Charles I but the need to remember Charles I quickly subsided. From 1662 attendance to the sermons remained largely the habit of those loyal to the Stuart cause. Throughout the Restoration era emotions moved into history and the memory of those who had lived through the Civil Wars. This, according to Ahmed, is 'how histories stay alive, even when they are not consciously remembered'.⁴ The memory of those who had lived through the wars was transmitted to the next generation through 'communicative memory'. These memories are shown in a range of sources which have been explored, from memorials, ballads, sermons, memoirs, diaries and letters. They convey knowledge about the past and that the initial reaction of the regicide moved into memory which then circulated in kin networks, local parishes and even political network.

Perhaps the most significant theme that has emerged from this research is how Charles I was not effectively remembered in the seventeenth century and that his cult hinged on the *Eikon* and the printed word. Lacey suggested that other research would confirm what he found in the printed word, which was 'so central to the cult experience', and that it was not until the late seventeenth century that divergence from the image of martyr emerged.⁵ But, this thesis has shown through examination of other mediums that Charles I was a problematic martyr across the late-seventeenth century. The main focus and foundation of this cult had been the *Eikon*. But if we expand the field of study to include a far wider range of sources, from the literary to the non-textual, we find that the martyr cult was remarkably one-dimensional. Charles I was the only 'saint' of the protestant religion and six churches were dedicated to his cult in the seventeenth century. These were not commissioned or led by the Restoration government and there is no evidence that Charles II was involved in any of their dedications. The churches demonstrate, as Wood showed in his work on the agrarian communities, how the local region acted

⁴ Ahmed, *Cultural*, p. 8.

⁵ Lacey, *Cult*, pp. 3, 7.

as the centre of popular memory.⁶ The churches located at Shelland and the Peak District were financed privately and demonstrated personal devotion of a few wealthy landowners to the late King. Cropley was buried in the church he built and dedicated to Charles I. His devotion and loyalty are in the very fabric of the Shelland chapel and preserved there in perpetuity. The church located at Plymouth, in the depth of the royalist West, should attest to the love of Charles but when Seth Ward wanted to consecrate it in the martyr's name there was an outcry. Newton's church was built to symbolise royalist credentials against those of their parliamentary neighbours in Wem. The pinnacle of the Charles churches, at Tunbridge Wells, had not originally been dedicated to Charles as shown in the title deed. Falmouth is the only church where there is any evidence of support by the Stuart monarchy with the Duke of York contributing towards the cost of the new building. These churches are symbolic of the thin veneer of the Charles I cult throughout the seventeenth century.

Fraser argued that 'Charles II was never a vindictive man ... he preferred positive memorials to his father.'⁷ Yet, this thesis has shown that there was no concerted effort to create these positive memorials and cultivate his father's cult beyond the printed word. In 1677 Charles II commissioned Wren to create the funeral urn for the princes in the tower but the following year despite the backing from parliament his father's funeral memorial never happened. The equestrian statue of Charles I at Charing Cross was and remains a powerful symbol overlooking the Banqueting House where he had lost his life. Yet, the statue had not been commissioned by his newly installed son but instead had been purchased via a friend. It fell into disrepair within just seventy years, reflecting a public display of indifference to the martyred king and his memory. There was no mass building of monuments to Charles I or even a formal memorial to him. Charles II had the opportunity to revere his father in monument, but it is curious that he failed in this. The Popish Plot has been a convenient argument as to why this did not happen, because Charles II and his parliament were distracted by the discussion around the succession, but this thesis has been able to undermine this established view. After the Restoration Charles I became a useful political tool and became useful during

⁶ Andy Wood, *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 12.

⁷ Antonia Fraser, *King Charles II* (London: Book Club Associates, 1979), p. 185.

moments of political discourse, yet he had limited use as a figure for public memorial because, despite attempts to cast him as a martyr King, he presided over twenty five years of turmoil, much of it caused by himself.

Charles II had set 30 January as a day to remember his father and the sins of the nation. And each year sermons were preached across the country in the name of the martyr. However, as Helen Randal has shown, 'between 1670 and 1688, the preachers translated the sermon into an instrument of political education.'⁸ This thesis has confirmed Randal's arguments, that these sermons often spoke to current political crises. Chapter three also uncovered how, after the first year of the Restoration, sermons were not well-attended; Josselin and Newcome both tell how they had few people come to hear or engage with their regicide sermons. Even men like Pepys, who held powerful positions in the new regime, did not attend and there is no evidence that they were encouraged to do so either. Evelyn and his consistent devotion to Charles the martyr is an exception to the diaries examined in this thesis, not the rule. Lady Warwick is a clear example of how devotion to the martyr waned, and she began to use her prayers on 30 January as a redemptive motion against the perceived sinful court of Charles II. Shops remained open and Whitelocke and Pepys continued to work on this most scared of days. Legon has noted that many have assumed that the royalist interpretation of British history, and obedience in commemorating the regicide, dominated the Restoration era. He used the term 'mis-commemoration' to illustrate failure to live up to the expectation of commemorative behaviour.⁹ This thesis has taken this view one step further to argue that Charles I's problematic legacy led to 'non-commemoration'. Many people did not attend these 30 January services, nor did many want to remember and revere the man who brought the country to war.

Using Richards' emotional governance framework, we have seen how Charles II positioned himself and the regicide in the public sources. For Richards, emotional governance is deliberate attention to emotional dynamics in the public sphere. In chapter two we examined how Charles II looked to harness emotional governance at

⁸ Helen Randal, 'The rise and fall of a Martyrology: Sermons on Charles I', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 10:2 (1947), p. 147.

⁹ Legon, *Revolutions*, p. 142.

the time of the Restoration and used the memory of his father to shape the contours of public opinion. There was a concerted effort to introduce Charles II to his new regime through the memory of Charles I. The series of pamphlets that were printed around the time of the Restoration focused on the character of Charles II and demonstrated how he was England's natural leader based on how he coped with his father's death and embodied his piety and honour. Yet while at the beginning of his reign Charles II looked to invest in the memory of his father, that effort failed and that he would eventually quietly distance himself from his father. Charles II's attempts to create emotional governance around his father's memory proved unsustainable and ineffective. Despite frequent references and a triumphal arch in his honour, Charles I proved too problematic to celebrate. Josselin's 'troubled' reaction to the arch and its inscription 'to the divine James, to the divine Charles, I give endless power' epitomised how Charles II's acts of dynasty building could touch on the very issues that helped spark the war.¹⁰ This indicated that people wanted to move on from the Civil War. In chapters three and four we uncovered how Charles II's long-term reaction to the regicide was one of indifference.

Two essential findings of the thesis have been the apathy as shown by Charles II towards the regicides after the first executions and how the regicides were remembered through the counter-narrative created by their children and grandchildren. These two findings are clearly articulated in the curious case of Robert Danvers. Robert Villiers had married the daughter of regicide Sir John Danvers. When Charles II ascended the throne the Duke of Monmouth and the Speaker of the House alleged that Villiers had made many seditious speeches. The most revealing was that he 'hated him [Charles I] and his cause, that because those of Villiers did side with him and assist him, therefore I hated that name also and changed it for Danvers.'¹¹ In 1661 he was implicated in Venner's rising and accused of uttering the words 'the Anabaptists would prevail.'¹² Therefore it seemed incredible that on 25 March 1662 he was granted licence to take the surname and arms of Danvers.¹³ The way in which both Danvers and Charles reacted is telling. Danvers is a classic example of how

¹⁰ Josselin, *Diary*, p. 112.

¹¹ *JHL*, Vol 11, pp. 64-6.

¹² *CSPD*, 1660-1661, p. 477.

¹³ *CSPD*, 1661-1662, p. 320.

Charles dealt with the stain of regicide: instead of lust for revenge he appeared indifferent. This is consistent behaviour for Charles II. After the initial twelve months his father became less relevant to political discourse and retribution towards those who signed the death warrant waned. It also illustrated how the regicide generation continued to rebel and export the ideas of their regicide forebears.

The recent 'memory turn' has focused upon how the Restoration regime looked to control the narrative of the Civil Wars and regicide. Matthew Neufeld's ground-breaking study of public memory of the wars during the Restoration argued that the public learned from the 'writings offered' by the Restoration regime. This is echoed by Erin Peters who noted that 'the majority is usually content to remember in the manner prescribed by the dominant frame of reference'.¹⁴ Charles II's attempts to incorporate his father's memory into public narratives about himself and his regime ultimately failed. The reactions would therefore support Andy Woods' view that early modern people were able to resist these dominant narratives and create their own counter narratives.¹⁵ This is clearly articulated when it came to the regicides. On 17 October 1660, the day that three regicides were executed at Charing Cross, five naked men 'bright and glorious' were seen over the skies in Shenley. When quarters of the regicides' bodies were placed at Tyburn a bright star was seen over Aldgate.¹⁶ Stories of the regicides emerged after their deaths, from the miracles seen here to sightings overseas, as people reclaimed their deaths from the official narratives. There was no official commemoration to the regicides and no statues on horseback but there were other ways in which they were remembered. After the Restoration the regicides that were executed were able to use their scaffold performance as political weapons. They became martyrs for their cause, where miracles were said to have happened after their deaths. Their scaffold performances could also prompt action, such as we saw with Venner's rising. These performances

¹⁴ Neufeld, *Public Remembering*, p. 25; Peters, *Commemoration*, p. 2; Andy Wood, *The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 209-214.

¹⁵ Wood, 1549, pp. 209-214.

¹⁶ *Eniaytos Terastios Mirabilis Annus, or, The Year of Prodigies and Wonders being a faithful and impartial collection of severall signs that have been seen in the Heavens, in the Earth, and in the Waters; together with many remarkable Accidents, and Judgements befalling divers persons, according as they have been testified by very credible hands: all which have happened within the space of one year last past, and are now made publick for a seasonable warning to the people of these three Kingdoms speedily to repent and turn to the Lord, whose hand is lifted up amongst us* (London, 1661).

were highly influential and reached a wider audience as also disseminated in printed form.

In 2001 Jason Peacey argued that research into the men who were considered regicides had been hampered by the 'weight of the opprobrium heaped upon the events and actors of January 1649'.¹⁷ The caricatures of these men were not challenged in the dominant royalist narrative, which was solidified by Mark Noble, and even in the 1990s Rowse still portrayed these men as vile.¹⁸ Looking beyond the written biographies and the printed word has illustrated that these men were remembered and revered. The thesis has illustrated the ways that people talked about the regicide but not in the mainstream media. Places of memory such as funeral monuments are an important but still under researched medium. I have looked at the messages that have been transmitted through funeral monuments in relation to the part played in the Civil Wars.¹⁹ Imogen Peck has researched the funeral memorials left behind by parliamentarians in the 1650s. However, there remains a large absence in the funeral memorials left behind by the men who had been considered a regicide. That there are any at all speaks volumes of the local protection and reverence that regicides held. These memorials which are located in local churches across the country are viewed by visitors today and continue passing on their messages. Both Hutchinson and Marten were able to leave a physical monument and transmit powerful ideas for generations to read. Hutchinson's memorial positioned him as a man who only followed his conscience and he died in terrible conditions even though he was innocent of any crime. Marten followed ideas of his republican contemporary Haselrigg that he was a true Englishman who only sought their freedom. These are such powerful ideas for a man who, in Nobles account, became 'monuments of their own ruin, and public objects of scorn, contempt and abhorrence.'²⁰ But yet this thesis has shown that they were not all seen in this light and were able to commission a funeral monument, which involved a complex network of negotiations between family, craftsmen and the church

¹⁷ Jason Peacey, 'Introduction' in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), p. 2.

¹⁸ A.L. Rowse, *The Regicides and the Puritan Revolution* (London: Duckworth, 1994); Mark Noble, *The Lives of the English Regicides, and other Commissioners of the Pretended High Court of Justice, appointed to sit in judgement upon their Sovereign, King Charles the First* (London: J. Stockdale, 1798).

¹⁹ Cheryl Kerry, 'Honour, Memory and Lineage: Remembering the English Civil War through Funeral Memorials', *History* (2021), pp. 1-21.

²⁰ Noble, *Regicides*, p. 59.

authorities. Even the next generation shared these ideals in their memorials. Henry Ireton and David Polhill were both keen to highlight their love of freedom, echoing the words used by Marten.

How the reactions to the regicide moved from emotion, though the 'flesh of time', into memory can be viewed with the research on the regicide generation, the children and grandchildren of the regicides. On 9 August 1664 Mary Roe was arrested for uttering the words 'Mrs Palmer's was the king's whore' and threatening to burn her neighbour's house.²¹ Mary was the daughter of John Alured, one of the regicides, and she was identified in this vein. Although these seditious words did not focus on the act of the regicide, it symbolised the core of regicide children who illustrated their support for their ancestors through rebellious actions against the monarchy or through sharing seditious memories. Mary, like many of the regicide children, continued to be identified by her ancestry and sustained these associations through rebellious acts. Legon's research on seditious memories identifies the Restoration generation as those who did not have lived memories of the wars but still reacted to those events. For Legon 'the affinities of the Restoration generation ... [were] a set of opinions that were inherited from individuals who had been active participants' in the Civil Wars.'²² Similarly, family remained an important mode of transmission for memories of the Civil Wars. If regicide children such as Henry Ireton and Bridget Bendish were not often the ringleaders of rebellion, they nonetheless lived under suspicion and became implicated in plots. These children and grandchildren were placed in a difficult position: they could publicly abhor their ancestor, try to forget them or continue to uphold and preserve a counter narrative to the official story of the regicide.

The initial reaction to the regicide has been symbolised over the centuries by the groan heard by Philip Henry. Even in 2015, Cressy noted 'a deep groan and a shocked silence followed the fall of the axe.'²³ However, as we have seen even initial reactions to the regicide were much more complex. Henry wrote his account some forty years after the event and the groan could be implanted with hindsight. Pepys

²¹ *CSPD*, 1663-1664, pp. 257-288; *TNA*, SP 29/101 f. 31.

²² Legon, *Revolution*, p. 159.

²³ Cressy, *Charles I*, p. 305.

was also there and never mentioned this infamous groan and we have seen conflicting emotions from grief to disbelief. Several diaries that made no reference to the regicide at all. Perhaps for these people the regicide was not sufficiently noteworthy, though one suspects some, such as Shaftsbury, may not have felt safe giving their honest reaction. Through the lens of emotional communities, we can see how people who had no connection to each other reacted in similar ways. This is an important breakthrough as the regicide was an event where many people across the political spectrum momentarily shared an emotional reaction and became an emotional community. The application of this through the burgeoning new avenue of the history of emotions has enabled this thesis to go beyond the 'groan'.

The interaction between the personal and public material is crucial to understanding how such a public event, which many did not see first-hand, fed into the private thoughts. People could only react to what they heard or read and therefore the arc of emotions described in chapter one is illustrative of this interaction. The writer who updated Gell of events became increasingly fervent as the potential for Charles to be tried and found guilty became more likely. His concern became painfully clear in his reports to Gell and other sources from November 1648 to January 1649 reveal a similar growth in panic and disbelief. Many such as Lady Verney and the Venetian ambassador were convinced that there would be negotiations and a deal struck, and it was not until the last throws of 1648 that fear and concern emerged.

This thesis has not attempted a three kingdoms approach to this topic. How Charles I was remembered in each of his kingdoms would no doubt provide rich character to how he was revered. It is interesting to note that there were no churches dedicated to Charles in Scotland or Wales. If scope had allowed and more words available, it would be useful to examine the longevity of Charles across the kingdoms. As an example, not until the Stuarts vacated the throne and the rise of Jacobinism did Charles I become a popular figure in Scotland. Some eighty years after they sold him to parliament, Charles became a man worth fighting for, at least for some Scots. There are sources still ripe for further investigation. This thesis has only scratched the surface of how the regicides were remembered. There are many

stories around these men from Bradshaw being in Jamaica to the Dinton hermit. Perhaps as well a longer view of the regicide generation merits consideration, for the Civil Wars and regicide remained a dominant reference point in British history up to this day.

For those who lived through the turmoil of the Civil Wars, a world without a king seemed a perilous conclusion to a world turned upside down. Those who have lived since have been reluctant to forget. It seems fitting to turn to physical monuments to end this thesis. As a bust of Charles I outside the east end of St Margaret's Westminster stares across to the statue of Oliver Cromwell outside parliament, we are reminded that the Civil Wars are preserved today and that both parties, whether royalist and parliamentarian, are still in battle. At the heart of the legacy of the revolution remains that most revolutionary of events: the regicide of Charles I.

Bibliography

i - Primary Material: Manuscript

Derbyshire Record Office, Matlock

D3287/44/4/6 Gell Papers, journal about events in the English Civil War

Guildhall Library, London

MS 184/4 Accounts of Disbursements by the Chamberlain of London, 1667-76

The National Archives, Kew

Works	Office of Works Accounts: 1660 to 1703
PROB 11	Prerogative Court of Canterbury: Wills
HMC	Historical Manuscript Commission: 5 th Report, 12 th Report and Heathcote MSS
SP 28	State Papers Domestic: Civil War and Interregnum
SP 29	State Papers Domestic: Charles II
SP 99	State Papers Foreign: Venetian

Plymouth and West Devon Record Office, Plymouth

1/14 Warrant regarding removal of current, and appointment of new Magistrates and Common Councilmen

Staffordshire Record Office, Stafford

D868/8/53b Letter books of the Leveson and Leveson-Gower family

ii – Primary Material: Printed pamphlets (Pre-1715)

A.B., *An Epitah* (London, 1649).

Anderson, Henry, *A Loyal Tear Dropt on the Vault of the High and Mighty Prince Charles II* (London, 1660).

Anon, *A Perfect Relation of the Memorable Funerall of the Right Honourable Robert Earle of Essex, wherein divers things are explained, which were not understood by many of the spectators. Also, the manner of the imbalming and the inscription written upon his breast, and buried with his body; and the finding of a crosier staffe in digging of the vault* (London, 1646).

Anon, *Collections of Notes Taken at the Kings Tryall, at VVestminster Hall, On Munday last, January 22 1648* (London: Robert Ibbitson, 1649)

Anon, *The Life and Death of King Charles the Martyr, parallel'd with our Saviour in all his sufferings. Who was murdered (before His own palace at Whitehall) the 30th of*

Jan 1648. With some observations upon his cruel and bloody persecutors (London, 1649).

Anon, A Declaration of the Parliament of England, expressing the grounds of their Late Proceedings, and of settling the Present Government in a way of a Free State (London, 1649).

Anon, A crowne, a crime or, the monarch-martyr (London, 1649).

Anon, An Elegie on the meekest of Men, the Most Glorious of Princes, the Most Constant of Martyrs (London, 1649).

Anon, Charles the I, the Most Glorious of Princes (London, 1649).

Anon, His Majesties speech on the scaffold at White-Hall on Tuesday last Jan. 30 before the time of his coming to the block of execution and a declaration of the deportment of the said Charles Stuart before he was executed to the great admiration of the people: And a proclamation of the Commons of England assembled in Parliament to be published throughout the Kingdoms prohibiting the proclaiming of any person to be King of England, Ireland or the dominions thereof. Also A letter from the north to a member of the Army containing the declaration and resolutions of the Northern Army touching the late King of England and the lofty cedars of the city of London, (London, 1649).

Anon, The Monument of Charles the First, King of England (London, 1649).

Anon, The Most Constant of Martyrs, Charles the I (1649).

Anon, Thanksgiving for the Recovery of Philip, Earl of Pembroke (1649).

Anon, The Faithfull souldier, or, The Speech of a common souldier concerning his arrears and putting the King to death (London, 1649).

Anon, A True Narration of the Title, Government, and cause of the Death of the Late Charls Stuart King of England. VVritten for the satisfaction of all those that are not wilfully obstinate for a regal government, and neglecters or contemners of their own just liberties (London, 1649).

Anon, A Thanksgiving for the Recovery of Philip, Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery. Who being lately admitted into the supreame authority of the nation a Knight for Berkshire; was unfortunately jeared into a pestilent-feaver, which after turn'd to the fowl disease, but by the skill of a state-emperick and Mrs. May his nurse is happily recovered: and desires a thanksgiving for the same, from the supreame authority, and all other well-affected to the nation. Taken verbatim from his own mouth, by Michael Oldsworth (London, 1649).

Anon, The last VVill and Testament of Philip Herbert, Burgesse for Bark-shire, vulgarly called Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, who dyed of foole-age, Jan. 23, 1650 with his life and death, and severall legacies to the Parliament and Councel of State: also his elegy, taken verbatim in time of his sicknesse, and published to prevent false copies by Michael Oldisworth (1650).

Anon, *The Rebels Warning-piece; being certaine rules and instructions left by Alderman Hoyle (a member of Parliament) being a Burgesse for York-shire, who hanged himself January 30 within half an hour after that day twelve-moneth he and his sectarian brethren had murdered their King. This seasonable caveat being written by his owne hand, was found lying by him in the chamber where he hanged himselfe. Also the sudden madnesse of Sheriff Wilson, a perjur'd relapsed, and apostate Alderman of the City of London, who was carried mad from Guild-hall, so soon as he had taken the new ingagement, and now desperately seeketh to end his life. With a new epitaph on Alderman Hoyle, and a new ballad on the loathed life and sudden death of Sir Philip E. of Pembroke* (London, 1650).

Anon, *The Life and Death of Philip Herbert, the late infamous knight of Barkshire, once Earle of Pembrock, Mounghomerie. Who departed from this life to another January 23 1649. Having, by a degenerate basenesse, betrayed his nobilitie; and entred himselfe a commoner, amongst the vere scum of the kingdom. Likewise a discourse with Charon in his voyage to Hell. With his araignement, tryall and condemnation, before the three judges, Æacus, Minos and Raddamanthus. Also the entertainment and welcome made by his brethren, Pym, Dorislaus, Raynsborough, with an ample testimonie of their rejoycing at his Lordships arivall* (London, 1650).

Anon, *The Troubled-Spirited Mans Departing: or, a wonderful relation of the wilfull murder committed by Thomas Mince, late of Collonel Whaley's regiment, upon his own person, in the parish of Saint Giles Cripplegate, London, on Thursday the 17 of March. With the true copy of a letter written by his own hand, left with his wife immediatly before he committed the fact, directed, to all the saints of the most high God. Wherein he makes known unto them some reasons of his discontent & laboureth to justifie the fact, with his strange opinions, the act of killing himself, and other things very observable, as they were proved upon oath before the coroners inquest on Friday the 18 of March* (London: Printed by John Clowes, 1653).

Anon, *A Further narrative of the passages of these times in the Common-wealth of England* (London, 1658).

Anon, *The History of the Life and Death of his most serene Highness, Oliver, late Lord Protector* (1659).

Anon, *Avvake O England or, The Peoples Invitation to King Charles being a recital of the ruines over-running the people and their trades, with an opportune advice to return to obedience of their kings, under whom they ever flourished* (London, 1660).

Anon, *The Royal Martyrs or, a list of the Lords, Knights, Commanders, and Gentlemen, that were slain in the Late Wars, in defence of their King and country. As also of those Executed by the High Courts of Justice or Law-martial* (London, 1660).

Anon, *The King Advancing, or Great Brittain's Royal Standard, with His Majesties Gracious Speech to His Loyal Subjects; and the Investing Him in His Royal Throne, Crown and Dignities* (London, 1660).

Anon, *The State Martyrologie. Or, innocent blood speaking its mournfull tragedy, in the history of the late anarchy since 1648 to this present time* (1660).

Anon, *A Free and Full Parliament. Or General Monks Restoring of England Antient Liberties* (London, 1660).

Anon, *His Majesties Gracious Letter and Declaration, sent to the House of Peers, by Sir John Greenville, Knight, from Breda: and Read in the House the First of May, 1660. Ordered by the Lords in Parliament assembled, that his Majesties Gracious Letter and Declaration be forthwith Printed and Published* (London, 1660).

Anon, *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the Late King's Judges: Viz. Major General Harrison, 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, 1660. The Times of Their Death. Together with Severall Occasionall Speeches and Passages in Their Imprisonment Till They Came to the Place of Execution* (London, 1660).

Anon, *Dagon Demolished: or, Twenty admirable examples of Gods severe justice and displeasure against the subscribers of the late engagement, against our lawfull sovereign King Charls the second; and the whole House of Peeres, in these words. I do declare and promise, that I will be true and faithfull to the common-wealth of England, as it is now established without a King or House of Lords. Also against some of the judges of the late King in the high court of injustice. Published, to reclaim such fanaticque persons, who have been too forward to promote this wicked, destructive engagement; and still designe it, which hath wounded the consciences of so many Godly Christians in this kingdome. By that late worthy patriot of his country, Mr. John Vicars* (London, 1660).

Anon, *Englands Redemption: or, A path Way to Peace: Plainly Demonstrating, that we shall never have any settled state, until Charles II (Whose Right It Is) enjoy the crown* (London: printed for Charles King, 1660).

Anon, *A Character of King Charles II Written by an Impartial Hand and Exposed to Publick view for Information of the People* (London, 1660).

Anon, *Argyles Arraignment; or, Treachery Displayed. In verse* (London, 1660).

Anon, *Eniaytos Terastios Mirabilis annus, or, The year of prodigies and wonders being a faithful and impartial collection of severall signs that have been seen in the heavens, in the earth, and in the waters; together with many remarkable accidents, and judgements befalling divers persons, according as they have been testified by very credible hands: all which have happened within the space of one year last past, and are now made publick for a seasonable warning to the people of these three kingdoms speedily to repent and turn to the Lord, whose hand is lifted up amongst us* (London, 1661).

Anon, *A New Meeting of Ghosts at Tyburn being a discourse of Oliver Cromwell, John Bradshaw, Henry Ileton, Thomas Pride, Thomas Scot, secretary to the rump. Major gen. Harrison & Hugh Peters the divells chaplain* (1661, London).

Anon, *The Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, and John Bradshaw* (London, 1661).

Anon, *A New Meeting of Ghosts at Tyburn* (London, 1661).

Anon, *The Speeches, Discourses, and Prayers, of Col. John Barkstead, Col. John Okey, and Mr. Miles Corbet, upon the 19th of April being the day of their suffering at Tyburn: Together with an account of the occasion and manner of their taking in Holland. As also of their several occasional speeches, discourses, and letters, both before, and in the time of their late imprisonment: Faithfully and impartially collected for a general satisfaction* (London, 1662).

Anon, *Great News from the Tower, or, A True and perfect relation of the dreadful end of the Earl of Essex lately committed prisoner to the Tower, an account of the horrid phanatical plot against His Sacred Majesty, His Royal Highness and all lovers of monarchy, giving an account how he was found murdered in the tower about ten of the clock this instant Friday the thirteenth of July, 1683* (London, 1683).

Anon, *A True Narrative of the Bloody Murther of the Earl of Essex upon himself being now Prisoner in the Tower* (London, 1683).

Bagshaw, Edward, *The Rights of the Crowne of England, as it is established by law. Written in the time of the late King, by Edward Bagshaw Esquire, an apprentice of the common-law* (London, 1660)

Bennet, Colonell Robert, *King Charles Triall Justified: or, Eight objections against the same fully answered and cleared, by Scripture, Law, History and Reason. Being the sum of a charge given at the last sessions held at Trewroe in the county of Cornwall, Aprill 4 1649* (London, 1649).

B., J.G., *Royall Poems Presented to King Charles II* (London, 1660).

Brome, Alexander (ed.), *Rump, or, An exact collection of the choicest poems and songs relating to the late times by the most eminent wits from anno 1639 to anno 1661* (London: 1662).

Burton, Robert, *The Anatomy of Melancholy: What it is, with all the kinds causes, symptomes, prognostickes, & severall cures of it. In three partitions, with their severall sections, members & subsections. Philosophically, medicinally, historically, opened & cut up* (Oxford, 1611).

Campbell, Archibald, Earl of Argyll, *The Speech of the Late Marquiss of Argyll upon the scaffold, May 27, 1661 being a true and perfect copy* (Edinburgh, 1660).

Campbell, Archibald, Earl of Argyll, *Instructions to a Son by Archibald, Late Marquis of Argyle: written in the time of his confinement* (London: Printed for J. Latham, 1661).

Carrington, S., *The History of the Life and Death of His Most Serene Highness, Oliver, Late Lord Protector. Wherein, from his cradle to his tomb, are impartially transmitted to posterity, the most weighty transactions, forreign or domestique, that have*

happened in his time, either in matters of law, proceedings in Parliaments, or other affairs in church or state (1659).

Chandler, Henry, *A Sermon Preached for the funeral of that humble and faithful servant of Jesus Christ, Mr. Nathanael Smith late of Malmesbury, in the county of Wilts. : with a brief account of his life, in an epistle to Dr. Annesley* (London, 1691).

Cooper, Anthony Ashley, Earl of Shaftesbury, *Some Observations concerning the regulating of Elections for Parliament: found among the Earl of Shafsbury's papers after his death*, ed. Tony Randal (London, 1689).

Dalton, M., *The Country Justice: Containing the Practice, Duty and Power of the Justices of the Peace, as well in as out of Their Sessions* (London, 1626).

D., J. Esq, *The Last Counsel of a Martyred King to his Son. Wherein is contained, 1. The last precepts of the most Christian King of Charles the First, written by his own hand to his son Charles the Second King of Great Brittain France and Ireland, &c. 6. A divine elogie upon the great sufferings and death of his sacred Majesty* (London: printed for J. Jones, 1660).

Edward, Terry, *A Character of King Charles II* (London, 1660).

Ferguson, Robert, *An Enquiry into and Detection of the Barbarous Murther of the Late Earl of Essex, or, A vindication of that noble person from the guilt and infamy of having destroy'd himself* (London, 1683).

Finch, T., *An Exact and most Impartial Accompt of the Indictment, Arraignment, Trial, and Judgment (according to law) of Twenty Nine Regicides, the Murtherers of His Late Sacred Majesty of Most Glorious Memory begun at Hicks-Hall on Tuesday, the 9th of October, 1660, and continued (at the Sessions-House in the Old-Bayley) until Friday, the nineteenth of the same moneth: Together with a summary of the dark and horrid decrees of the caballists, preperatory to that hellish fact exposed to view for the reader's satisfaction, and information of posterity* (London, 1679).

Fleckno, Richard, *The Idea of His Highness Oliver, Late Lord Protector, &c. with certain brief reflexions on his life* (London, 1659).

Grey, Forde, Earl of Tankerville, *The Secret History of the Rye-House Plot: and of Monmouth's Rebellion* (London, 1685).

Holles, Denzil Baron, *Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles, baron of Ifield in Sussex, from the year 1641 to 1648* (London: T. Goodwin, 1699).

L'Estrange, Hamon. *The Reign of King Charles* (London, 1656).

L'Estrange, Roger, *Considerations and Proposals in order to the Revolution of the Press* (London, 1663).

Lambert, Thomas, *Sad Memorials of the Royal Martyr, or, A parallel betwixt the Jewes murder of Christ and the English murder of King Charls the First being a sermon preached on the solemnity of His Majestie's martyrdom in the Cathedral-Church of Sarum, An. Dom. 1669* (London, 1670).

Lilly, William, *Monarchy or No Monarchy in England* (London, 1651).

Mabbot, Gilbert, *King Charls his Tryal: or A perfect narrative of the whole proceedings of the High Court of Iustice in the tryal of the King in Westminster Hall. Begun Saturday January 20. and ended on Saturday Jan. 27. 1648. With the several speeches of the King, Lord President, and Solicitor General. Together with that eloquent and learned speech of the Lord President before he gave sentence, not before published. Corrected & enlarged by a more perfect copy. With a perfect copy of the Kings speech upon the scaffold immediately before he was beheaded, Tuesday, Jan. 30. To these proceedings of the tryall of the King, I say, imprimatur, Gilbert Mabbot* (London: Peter Cole, 1649).

Mercurius Melancholicus, *Craftie Cromwell: or, Oliver ordering our new State. A Tragi-Comedie. Wherein is discovered the Trayterous undertakings and proceedings of the said No I, and his Levelling Crew* (London, 1648).

Mercurius Pragmaticus, *The Second Part of Crafty Crvmwell, or, Oliver in his glory as King a Trage Commedie wherein is presented, the late treasonable undertakings, and proceedings, of the rebels, their murthuring of Capt. Burley, with their underhand workings to betray their King* (London, 1649).

Nelson, John, *A True Copy of the Journal of the High Court of Justice for the Tryal of K. Charles I as it was read in the House of Commons and attested under the hand of Phelps, clerk to that infamous court / taken by J. Nelson Jan. 4, 1683: With a large introduction* (London: Printed by H.C. for Thomas Dring, 1684).

Payne, William, *Sermon upon the Thirtieth of January, 1683: being the day of the martyrdom of King Charles I.; Sermon upon the thanksgiving for the deliverance of the King and kingdom from the late treasonable conspiracy* (London, 1683).

Payne, William, *The Unlawfulness of stretching forth the hand to resist or Murder Princes with the principal cases about resistance, considered, in two sermons: the first preacht upon the last thirtieth of January, the other, upon the day of thanksgiving, for the deliverance of the King and kingdom from the late treasonable conspiracy* (London, 1683).

Peyton, Edward, *The Divine Catatropshe of the Kingly of the Hose of stuarts, or Short History of the rise, Reign and Ruine therefore* (London, 1652).

Pope, Walter, *The Life of the Right Reverend Father in God, Seth, Lord Bishop of Salisbury and chancellor of the most noble Order of the Garter with a brief account of Bishop Wilkins, Mr. Lawrence Rooke, Dr. Isaac Barrow, Dr. Turberville, and others* (London: William Keblewhite, 1697).

Prynne, William, *Conscientious, serious theological and legal quaeres, propounded to the twice-dissipated, self-created anti-Parliamentary Westminster juncto, and its members* (London, 1660).

Rolles, Samuel, *Loyalty and Peace, or, Two seasonable discourses from I Sam. 24, 5 viz., David's heart smote him because he cut off Saul's skirt: the first of conscience*

and its smittings, the second of the prodigious impiety of murdering King Charles I, intended to promote sincere devotion and humiliation upon each anniversary fast for the Late King's death (London, 1678).

Sacheverell, Henry, *The Perils of False Brethren, Both in Church, and State: Set Forth in a Sermon Preach'd Before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London, at the Cathedral-Church of St. Paul, on the 5th of November, 1709* (London, 1709).

Sanderson, William, Sir, *Compleat History of the Life and Raigne of King Charles from his cradle to his grave* (London, 1658).

Sprat, Thomas, *A True Account and Declaration of the Horrid Conspiracy against the Late King, His present Majesty, and the Government: as it was order'd to be published by His late Majesty* (London: 1684).

St John, Oliver, *The Case of Oliver St John, Esq. Concerning his actions during the late troubles* (London, 1660).

Stanhope, Thomas, *Four Sermons Preached upon Solemne Occasions* (London, 1670).

Stuart, Charles, *To the Inhabitants of the County of Cornwall a letter of thanks from King Charles I of ever blessed memory, dated Sept. 10, 1643 from Sudly Castle* (1643).

Stuart, Charles, *A Fountain of Loyal Tears Poured Forth by a Sorrowful Son, for the untimely Death of his Royal Father being a form of Prayer to be used by all those that yet Retain a Spark of Religion to God, or Loyalty to their Prince: recommended by King Charles the II, to be used by all his Faithful Subjects throughout his Dominions, in these times of War, Sickness, Famine, Trouble, and Adversity* (Paris, 1649).

Stuart, Charles, *The Declaration and Resolution of His Highnesse the Prince of Wales, upon the Death of his Royall Father* (1649).

Stuart, Charles, *His Majesties Declaration to all his Loving Subjects in his Kingdome of England and Dominion of Wales. Published with the advice of his Privie Councill. Dated in Castle-Elizabeth in the Isle of Jersey, the 31 day of October 1649* (London, 1649).

Stuart, Charles, *King Charles his Speech to the Six Eminent Persons vwho lately arrived at Brussels, to treat vvith his Majesty touching his restoration to the royal throne and dignity of his father* (Antwerp, 1660).

Stuart, Charles, *The Kings Declaration to all his Loving Subjects* (London, 1660).

Stuart, Charles, *King Charles II his Declaration to all his Loving Subjects of the Kingdom of England. Dated from his Court at Breda in Holland, the 4/14 of April 1660* (London, 1660).

Stuart, Charles, *Charles II, 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).

Stuart, James, *Basilikon Dōron, or, King James's instructions to his dearest sonne, Henry the Prince* (London, 1603).

Stuart, James, *The Trve Law of Free Monarchy, or, The reciprocall and mutuall duty betvixt a free king and his naturall subjects by a well affected subject of the kindome of Scotland*, London (1642).

Walker, Clement, *Anarchia Anglicana: Or The History of Independency. With Observations Historicall and Politique Upon this Present Parliament, Begun Anno 16. Caroli Primi., Anno Domini 1640. Together with the Rise, Growth, and Practises of that Powerfull and Restlesse Faction*, Volume 1 (London, 1648).

Walker, Clement, *History of Independency* (London, 1649).

Walker, Clement, *Anarchia Anglicana: The history of independency, The Second Part* (London, 1694).

Warner, John, *The Devilish Conspiracy, Hellish Treason, Heathenish Condemnation, and Damnable Murder, Committed, and Executed by the Lewes, against the anointed of the Lord, Christ their King And the just judgment of God severely executed upon those Traytors and Murderers. As it was delivered in a sermon on the 4 Feb. 1648. being the quinquages. Sunday, out of some part of the Gospel appointed by the Church of England to be read on that day* (London, 1648).

Well-willer to peace and truth, *A shrill Crye in the ears of Cavaliers, apostates, and presbyters, for the resolve of XIII queries touching the primitive state of this nation, since the Conquest: the late proceedings of the Army, the Covenant, and other weighty matters, tending to the publique peace of the nation* (London, 1649).

Wel-wisher to the Safety and Freedom, *The Execution of the Late King Justified and the Parliament and Army therein Vindicated: published for satisfaction to the kingdome* (London, 1649).

Whitelocke, Bulstrode, *Memorials of the English Affairs: Or, an Historical Account of What Passed from the Beginning of the Reign of King Charles I, to King Charles II. His Happy Restauration* (London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1682).

III – Primary Material: Newsbooks (Pre-1715)

(Numbers in brackets refer to Nelson, C. and Seccombe, M. *British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1641-1700* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1986).

Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer (1643-49, 214).

Man in the Moon (1649-50, 248).

Mercurius Aulius (1648, 274).

Mercurius Aulius for King Charles II (1660, 275).

Mercurius Britanicus (1643-46, 286).

Mercurius Brittanicus (1649, 285).

Mercurius Elencticus (1647-49, 312).

Mercurius Melancholicus (1647-48, 344).

Mercurius Politicus (1650-1660, 361).

Mercurius Pragmaticus (1647-49, 369).

Mercurius Pragmaticus (For King Charles II) (1649-50, 370).

Mercurius Publicus (1660-63, 378).

Moderate impartially communicating martial affaires to the kingdome of England (1645-49, 419).

Newes (1663-64, 450).

Perfect Diurnall of some passages in Parliament, and from other parts of this kingdome (1643-49, 504).

Perfect Occurances of Parliament (1644-49, 465).

The Publick Intelligencer. Communicating the chief occurrences and proceedings within the dominions of England, Scotland, and Ireland (1655-1660, 575).

IV - Primary Material: Printed (Post 1715)

Andrews, Frances (ed.), *Depositions from the Castle of York, relating to 12 offences committed in the Northern Counties in the seventeenth century* (Durham: Frances Andrews, 1861).

Angier, John, *Life of John Angier of Denton: Together with Angier's diary, and extracts from his 'An helpe to better hearts'. Also Samuel Angier's diary*, ed. Oliver Heywood (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1968).

Anon, *Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of his Majesty King Charles 1st* (London: D. Stewart, 1879).

Anon, *The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England from the earliest times to the Restoration of Charles II*, Vol 17, (London: J. and R. Tonson, 1762-3).

Baillie, Robert, *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1637-1662*. ed. David Laing (Edinburgh, 1841).

Beaven, Alfred, *The Aldermen of the City of London Temp. Henry III-1908: With Notes on the Parliamentary Representation of the City, the Aldermen and the Livery Companies, the Aldermanic Veto, Aldermanic Baronets and Knights* (London: E. Fisher Ltd, 1913).

Brodie, Alexander, *The Diary of Alexander Brodie of Brodie, and of his son, James Brodie of Brodie, consisting of extracts from the existing manuscripts* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1863).

Bryant, Arthur, *The Letters Speeches and Declarations of King Charles II* (London: Cassell, 1935).

Bulter, James, Earl of Ormond, *A Collection of original letters and papers, concerning the affairs of England, from the year 1641 to 1660: Found among the Duke of Ormonde's papers*, ed. Thomas Carte (London: M.A, 1789).

Burnet, Gilbert, *History of His Own Time: From the Restoration of K.Charles II to the Conclusion of the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne. To which is Prefixed, a Summary Recapitulation of Affairs in Church and State, from King James I to the Restoration in the Year 1660, Together with the Author's Life and Some Explanatory Notes*, Vol I (London: R. H. Evans, 1809).

Chappell, Edwin, *The Tangier Papers of Samuel Pepys* (London: Navy Records Society, 1935).

Clarke, William, Sir, *Clarke Papers: Selections from the papers of William Clarke: Secretary to the Council of the Army, 1647-49, and to General Monck and the Commanders of the Army in Scotland, 1651-60*, ed. Sir Charles Harding Firth (London: Royal Historical Society, 1992).

Clifford, Lady Anne, *The Diaries of Lady Anne Clifford*, ed. D. J. H. Clifford (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1990).

Cobbett. W., *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials*, Vol 5 (London: T.C. Hansard, 1810).

Culpeper, Cheney, Sir, *The Letters of Sir Cheney Culpeper, 1641-1657*, eds M.J. Braddick and Mark Greengrass (London: Camden miscellany, 1996).

Dugdale, William, *The Life, Diary, and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale*, ed. William Hamper (London: Harding, Lepard and Co, 1827).

Evelyn, John, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. Nigel Smith, Vols 1-4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).

Eyre Adam, Shawe John, Fretwell James, Hobson John, Dering Heneage, Priesteley Jonathan, Priestley Nathaniel, *Yorkshire Diaries and Autobiographies in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Edinburgh: Surtees Society, 1877).

Fox, George, *The Journal of George Fox*, ed. Nigel Smith (London: Penguin, 1998).

Floyd Duckett, Sir George, *Penal Laws and Test Act: Questions Touching Their Repeal Propounded in 1687 by James II* (London, Forgotten Books, 2019).

Gardiner, Samuel, *A History of The Commonwealth to the Protectorate 1649-1656*, Vol 1, (Adlestrop: Windrush Press, 1903).

Gardiner, S.R. (ed.), *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906).

Gater, G.H. and Wheeler, E.P. (eds.), *Survey of London: Volume 16, St Martin-in-The-Fields I: Charing Cross* (London: London County Council, 1935).

Graham, James, *Memoirs of the Marquis of Montrose*, ed. Mark Napier (London: Hamilton, Adams, 1856).

Grey, Anchitell (ed.), *Debates of the House of commons, from the year 1667 to the year 1694. Collected by the honble Anchitell Grey, Esq; who was thirty years member for the town of Derby; chairman of several committees; and decyphered Coleman's letters for the use of the House*, Vol 5 (London: T. Becket and P. A. De Hondt, 1769).

Hardy, W.J. (ed.), *Hertford County Records, Notes and Extracts from the Session Rolls, 1581-1698* (Hertford: Simon & Son Ltd, 1905).

Heath, C., *Monmouthshire: Historical and descriptive accounts of the ancient and present state of Chepstow Castle; including Persfield, notices of Caerwent, Moyne's Court, Matherine, and St. Pierre. Biographical anecdotes relating to Henry Marten, one of the judges of King Charles I* (Sagwan Press: 2018).

Henry, Cary (ed.), *Memorials of the great Civil War in England, from 1646 to 1652*, Vol 2 (London: Colburn, 1842).

Henry, Philip, *Diaries and letters of Philip Henry, M.A. of Broad Oak, Flintshire, 1631-1697*, ed. Matthew Henry Lee (London: Kegan Paul, 1882).

Herbert, Thomas, *Memoirs of the Two Last Years of the Reign of King Charles I* (London: Wright, 1839).

Heywood, Oliver, *The Life of John Angier* (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1968).

Heywood, Oliver, *Oliver Heywood, 1603-1702: His Autobiography, Diaries, Anecdote and Event Books: Illustrating the general and family history of Yorkshire and Lancashire*, ed. Horsfall Turner (Brighouse: The Editor, 1980).

Hinds, Allen (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice*, Vols 32 and 33 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1931).

Hooke, Robert, *The Diary of Robert Hooke, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., 1672-1680*, eds. H.W. Robinson and Walter Adams (London: Taylor & Francis, 1935).

Hughes Clarke, A.W. (ed.), *The Registers of St Mary Magdalen, Milk Street, 1558-1666 and St Michael, London, 1538-1625*, (London: Harleian society, 1942).

Hutchinson, Lucy, *The Memoirs of the life of Colonel Hutchinson, written by his widow Lucy*, ed. Harold Child (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co, 1904).

Hyde, Edward, *History of the Rebellion and Civil War in England begun in 1641*, Vol 1-3 (Oxford: Theatre, 1807).

Hyde, Henry, *Correspondence Of Henry Hyde, Earl Of Clarendon, And His Brother Laurence Hyde, Earl Of Rochester; With The Diary Of Lord Clarendon From 1687 To 1690, Containing Minute Particulars Of The Events Attending The Revolution And The Diary Of Lord Rochester During His Embassy To Poland In 1676*. Vol II (Henry Colburn: London, 1828).

- Jaffray, Alexander, *Diary of Alexander Jaffray*, ed. John Barclay (London: Darton & Harvey, 1834).
- Johnson, Samuel, *A Dictionary of The English Language*, Vol 2 (London: Plummer & Brewer, 1825).
- Journals of the House of Commons*, Vols 6-12 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1802).
- Josselin, Ralph, *Diary of Ralph Josselin*, ed. E. Hockliffe (London: Royal Historical Society, 1908).
- Juxon, William, *Memoirs of Archbishop Juxon and his Times: With a Sketch of the Archbishop's Little Parish of Compton*, ed. Mark Hennessey (Oxford: J. Parker and Co, 1869).
- Larkham, Thomas, *The Diary of Thomas Larkham, 1647-1669*, ed. Susan Hardman Moore (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011).
- Lewis, D. (ed.), *Transactions of the Cymmrodorion, Or Metropolitan Cambrian Institution*, Vol 2 (London: W. Marchant, 1828).
- Ludlow, Edmund, *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Lieutenant-General of the Horse in the Army of the Commonwealth of England, 1625-1672*, ed. C. H. Firth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894).
- Luttrell, Narcissus, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs, from September 1678 to April 1714*, Vol 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1857).
- Luttrell, Narcissus, *The Parliamentary Diary of Narcissus Luttrell, 1691-1693*, ed. Henry Horwitz (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).
- Mackenzie, Sir George, *Memoirs of the affairs of Scotland from the Restoration of King Charles II* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1830).
- Manship, Henry, *The History of Great Yarmouth*, ed. Charles John Palmer (Great Yarmouth: Meall, 1854).
- McIlwain, C.H. (ed.), *The Political Works of James I* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918).
- Moore, Giles, *The Journal of Giles Moore*, ed. Ruth Bird. (Lewes: Sussex Record Society, 1971).
- Morrice, Roger, *The Entering Book of Roger Morrice, 1677-1691*. Vols 2-4, ed. Mark Golding (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007).
- Munday, Peter, *The Travels of Peter Mundy in Europe and Asia, 1608-1667*, eds Richard. C. Temple and Lavinia Mary Anstey (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society, 1936).
- Newcome, Henry, *Autobiography of Henry Newcome* Vol 1, ed. Richard Parkinson (Manchester: Cheltenham Society, 1852).

Nicoll, John, *A Diary of Public Transactions and Other Occurrences, chiefly in Scotland, from January, 1650, to June, 1667*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: T. Constable, 1836).

Noble, Mark, *Memoirs of the Protectorate-House of Cromwell: Deduced from an early period, and continued down to the present time: collected chiefly from original papers and records, with proofs and illustrations* (Birmingham: Pearson and Rollason, 1784).

Noble, Mark, *The Lives of the English regicides, and other Commissioners of the Pretended High Court of Justice, appointed to sit in judgement upon their sovereign, King Charles the First* (London: J. Stockdale, 1798).

Paige, John, *The Letters of John Paige, London Merchant, 1648-1658*, ed. George F. Steckley (London: London Record Society, 1984).

Pepys, Samuel, *The diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds. Robert Latham and William Matthews. Vols 1-4 (London, G. Bell and Sons Ltd, 1970).

Phippen, James, *Colbran's New Guide For Tunbridge Wells, Being A Full And Accurate Description Of The Wells And Its Neighbourhood, Within A Circuit Of Nearly Twenty Miles; Illustrated With Plates, Wood Engravings, Etc. Of Most Of The Principal Places* (London: John Lane, 1833).

Pickering, Danby, *The Statutes at Large from the Thirty-Ninth Year of Queen Elizabeth, to the Twelve Year of King Charles II Inclusive*, Vol 8 (Cambridge: 1763).

Pomfret, Thomas, *The Life of the Right Honourable and Religious Lady Christian, Late Countess Dowager of Devonshire* (London: William Rawlins, 1685).

Portland, William John Arthur Charles James Cavendish-Bentinck, Duke of, *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, Preserved at Welbeck Abbey* (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1894).

Raithby, John (ed.), *The Statutes of the Realm*, Vol 5 (London: S.L, 1819).

Razzell, Edward and Razzell, Peter (eds.), *The English Civil War: A Contemporary Account*, Vols 1-5 (London: Caliban Books, 1996).

Reresby, John, *The Memoirs of the Honorable Sir John Reresby : Baronet, and last Governor of York. Containing several private and remarkable transactions, from the Restoration to the Revolution inclusively* (London: Samuel Harding, 1734).

Rich, Mary, *Memoir of Lady Warwick: Also Her Diary, from A.D. 1666 to 1672, Now First Published: To Which Are Added, Extracts from Her Other Writings Paperback*, ed. Anthony Walker (London: Religious Tract Society, 1847).

Rugg, Thomas, *The Diurnal of Thomas Rugg, 1659-1661*, ed. William S. Sachse (London: Butler & Tanner, 1961).

Rushworth, Thomas, *Historical collections of private passages of state: weighty matters in law, remarkable proceedings. Beginning the sixteenth year of King James, anno 1618 and ending with the death of King Charles the First, 1648* (London: printed for D. Browne, 1721).

Sancroft, William, *The Life of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. George D'Oyly, Vol 1 (London: John Murray, 1821).

Say, Samuel, *The Character of Mrs Bridget Bendish grand-daughter of Oliver Cromwell written in the year 1719, on occasion of the closing words of Lord Clarendon's character of her grandfather* (Annual Register, 1774).

Schellinks, William, *The Journal of William Schellinks' Travels in England, 1661-1663*, ed. Maurice Exwood and H.L. Lehmann (London: Royal Historical Society, 1993).

Shaw, William. A. (ed.), *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1672-1675*, Vol 4 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1909).

Smyth, Richard, *The Obituary of Richard Smyth, Secondary of the Poultry Compter, London*, ed. Richard Ellis (London: Printed for the Camden Society, 1849).

Sydney, Robert, Earl of Leicester, *Sydney Papers: Consisting of a Journal of the Earl of Leicester, and Original Letters of Algernon Sydney*, ed. R.W. Blencowe (London: John Murray, 1825).

Thompson, Edward Maunde (ed.), *Correspondence of the Family of Hatton: Being chiefly letters addressed to Christopher, first Viscount Hatton, 1601-1704* (London: Camden society, 1878).

Thornton, Alice, *The Autobiography of Mrs. Alice Thornton of East Newton, Co. York*, ed. Charles Jackson (Edinburgh: Surtees Society, 1875).

Twysden, Isabella, *The Diary of Isabella, Wife of Sir Roger Twysden, Baronet, of Royden Hall, East Peckham, 1645-1651*, ed. Rev. F.W. Bennett (Kent Archaeological Society, 1940).

Wallington, Nehemiah, *The Notebooks of Nehemiah Wallington, 1618-1654*, ed. David Booy (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

Walpole, Henry, *Anecdotes of painting in England: With some account of the principal artists, and incidental notes on other arts. Also, a catalogue of engravers who have been born or resided in England* (London: H. G. Bohn, 1849).

Walpole, Horace, *Horace Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting in England*, Vol 2, ed. R. N. Wornum (London, 1888).

Ward, John, *Diary of the Rev. John Ward, A.M: Vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon, extending from 1648 to 1679. From the original MSS preserved in the library of the Medical society of London*, ed. Charles Severn (London: Colburn, 1839).

Watney, Vernon James, *The Wallop Family and Their Ancestry*, Vol 3, (Oxford: John Johnson, 1929).

Whitelocke, Bulstrode, *The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke*, ed. Ruth Spalding (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).

Wishart, George, *Memoirs of the Most Renowned James Graham, Marquis of Montrose* (Edinburgh, 1819).

Worth, R.N., *Calendar of the Plymouth Municipal Records* (Plymouth: Willian Brendon & Son, 1893).

Worth, R.N., *The History of Plymouth from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (W Brendon & Sons: Plymouth, 1987).

Worthington, Dr John, *The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington*, ed. James Crossley (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1968).

Wren, Stephen, *Parentalia Or Memoirs of the Family of the Wrens Viz. of Mathew Bishop of Ely, Christopher Dean of Windsor. But Chiefly of Christopher Wren Surveyor-general of the Royal Buildings* (Creative Media Partners: LLC, 2017).

Verney, Frances, *Memoirs of the Verney Family During the Civil War: Compiled from the Letters and Illustrated by the Portraits at Claydon House*, Vol 2 (London: Longmans, Green, 1892).

V - Secondary Material – Books

Ackroyd, Peter, *Civil War: The History of England*, Vol 3 (London: Pan, 2015).

Ahmed, Sara, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004).

Amussen, Susan Dwyer and Kishlansky, Mark A., *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: essays presented to David Underdown* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995).

Anderson, James, *Memorable women of the Puritan times* (London: Blackie and Son, 1862).

Andriette, Eugene, *Devon and Exeter in the Civil War* (London: David & Charles, 1971).

Ariès, Phillipe, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*, translated by Robert Baldick (New York: Random House, 1962).

Arnold-Forster, Frances, *Studies in Church Dedications; or, England's Patron Saints* (London: Skeffington & Son, 1899).

Ashley, Maurice, *Charles II: The Man and the Statesman* (London: History Book Club, 1971).

Aylmer, G.E., *The Crown's Servants: Government and Civil Service under Charles II, 1660-1685* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Barber, Sarah, *Regicide and Republicanism: Politics and Ethics in the English revolution, 1646-1659* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998).

- Barber, Sarah, *A Revolutionary Rogue: Henry Marten and the English Republic* (Stroud: Sutton, 2000).
- Barrell, John, *Imagining the King's Death: Figurative treason, fantasies of regicide, 1793-1796*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Bennett, Martyn, *The Civil War Experienced: Britain and Ireland, 1638-1661* (London: Routledge, 2000).
- Bettley, James and Pevsner, Nikolas, *Suffolk: West: The Buildings of England* (London, 2015).
- Blackford, Oscar, *Cornish Church Guide* (Truro: Blackford, 1925).
- Blanning, Tim, *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture: Old Régime Europe 1660-1789* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Brandon, David and Brooke, Alan, *London: The Executioner's City* (Stroud: Sutton, 2006).
- Broomhall, Susan, *Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction* (Florence: Taylor and Francis, 2016).
- Browning, Andrew, *Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds, 1632-1712* (Glasgow: Jackson, Son, 1951).
- Coate, Mary, *Cornwall in the Great Civil War and Interregnum, 1642–1660* (Truro: Bradford Barton, 1963).
- Cockayne, George Edward (ed.) *Complete Baronetage*, Vol 3 (Exeter: William Pollard and Co, 1903).
- Cogswell, Thomas, Cust, Richard and Lake, Peter (eds), *Politics, Religion, and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Corbin, Alain, *The Village of Cannibals: Rage and Murder in France, 1870* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992).
- Coulson, J, Carr, C.T., Hutchinson, Lucy and Eagle, Dorothy (eds), *The Oxford Illustrated Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975).
- Coward, Barry, *Oliver Cromwell* (London: Longman, 1991).
- Coward, Barry, *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).
- Coward, Barry, *The Stuart Age: 1603-1715* (Harlow: Longman, 2012).
- Cox, John Charles, *Notes on the Churches of Derbyshire: The Hundreds of the High Peak and Wirksworth* (London: Bemrose and Sons, 1877).
- Cressy, David, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989).

- Cressy, David, *Charles I and the people of England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
- Cubitt, Geoffrey, *History and Memory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).
- Daniel, William, *History of the Abbey and Palace of Holyrood* (Edinburgh: Duncan Anderson, 1852).
- Davies, Godfrey, *Restoration of Charles II, 1658-60* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1969).
- Daybell, James, *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-writing, 1512-1635* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
- DeGroot, Jerome, *Royalists Identities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
- Drew, Paul and Wootton, Anthony, *Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order* (Cambridge: Polity, 1988).
- Dunn, Susan, *The Deaths of Louis XVI: Regicide and the French Political Imagination* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).
- Durston, Christopher, *James I* (London: Routledge, 1993).
- Edkins, Jenny, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Edwards, Graham, *The Last Days of Charles I* (Stroud: Sutton, 1999).
- Esdaile, Katherine, *English Church Monuments, 1510-1840* (London: B.T. Batsford 1946).
- Evans, Michael, *The Death of Kings: Royal deaths in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon & London, 2003).
- Farr, David, *John Lambert, Parliamentary Soldier and Cromwellian Major-general, 1619-1684* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003).
- David Farr, *Henry Ireton and the English Revolution* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2006).
- Farrow, W.J., *The Great Civil War in Shropshire, 1621-49* (Shrewsbury: Wilding, 1926).
- Fell-Smith, Charlotte, *Mary Rich, Countess of Warwick (1625-1678): Her family and friends* (London: Longmans, 1901).
- Fox, Adam and Woolf, David, *The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain, 1500-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).
- Fraser, Antonia, *King Charles II* (London: Book Club Associates, 1979).
- Friedeburg, R., *Murder and Monarchy. Regicide in European history, 1300-1800* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2004).

- Friedman, J., *Miracles and the Pulp Press during the English Revolution: The battle of the frogs and Fairford's flies* (London: UCL Press, 1993).
- Friest, Dagmar, *Governed by Opinion: Politics, Religion, and the Dynamics of Communication in Stuart London, 1637-1645* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 1997).
- Fuller, John, *The Church of King Charles the Martyr, Tunbridge Wells* (Milton Keynes: City Print, 2000).
- Gardiner, S.R., *A History of The Commonwealth to the Protectorate 1649-1656*, Vols 1-4 (Adlestrop: Windrush Press, 1988).
- Gater, G.H and Wheeler, E.P (eds), *Survey of London: Volume 16, St Martin-in-The-Fields I: Charing Cross* (London: London County Council, 1935).
- Gibbs, Robert, *The Regicides of Buckinghamshire* (Aylesbury: Aylesbury News: 1879).
- Gitting, Clare, *Death, Burial and the Individual in Early Modern England* (London: Croom Helm, 1984).
- Glyde, John, Haldimand, William and Lennard, Thomas Barret, *The New Suffolk Garland: A Miscellany of Anecdotes, Romantic Ballads, Descriptive Poems* (Ipswich: 1866).
- Goffman, Erving, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (London: Penguin, 1990).
- Griffiths, Paul, Fox, Adam and Hindle, Steve (eds), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996).
- Gross, Daniel, *The Secret History of Emotion: From Aristotle's rhetoric to modern brain science* (London: University of Chicago Press, 2006).
- Guscott, S.J., *Humphrey Chetham, 1580-1653: Fortune, Politics, and Mercantile Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (Manchester: Smith Settle on behalf of the Chetham Society, 2003).
- Habermas, Jurgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, translated by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992).
- Halasz, Alexandra, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Hardacre, Paul, *The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1956).
- Harris, J and Higgott. G., *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings (Studies in Architecture)* (London: Zewwmer, 1999).
- Harris, Tim, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

- Harris, Tim, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715* (London: Longman, 1993).
- Harris, Tim, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms, 1660-1685* (London: Allen Lane, 2005).
- Hasted, Edward (ed.), *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent: Vol 3* (Canterbury, 1797).
- Havens, Earles, *Commonplace Books: A History of Manuscripts and Printed Books from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century* (New York: University Press of New England, 2001).
- Hill, Christopher, *A Nation of Change and Novelty: Radical Politics, Religion and Literature in Seventeenth-century England* (London: Routledge, 1990).
- Hill, Christopher, *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714* (London: Routledge Classics, 2002).
- Hirst, Derek, *Authority and Conflict: England, 1603-1658* (London: Edward Arnold, 1986).
- Hirst, Derek, *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Hirst, Derek, *England in Conflict, 1603-1660: Kingdom, Community, Commonwealth* (London: Arnold, 1999).
- Hobson, James, *Charles I's Executioners: Civil War, Regicide and the Republic* (London: Pen and Sword History, 2020).
- Holmes, Clive, *Why Charles I was Executed?* (London: Hambledon, 2006).
- Holmes, Clive and Heal, Felicity, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994).
- Holmes, Geoffrey, *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1973).
- Houlbrooke, Ralph, *Death, Ritual and Bereavement* (London: Routledge, 1989).
- Hunt, Tristram, *The English Civil War at First Hand* (London: Penguin, 2011).
- Hutton, Ronald, *The Restoration: A political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).
- Hutton, Ronald, *Charles the Second, King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989).
- Hutton, Ronald, *The British Republic 1649-1660* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).
- Jackson, Clare, *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003).

- Jenkinson, Matthew, *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II, 1660-1685* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010).
- Jones, J.R., *The First Whig: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-1683* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961).
- Jones, J.R., *Charles II: Royal Politician* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987).
- Jordan, Don and Walsh, Don, *The King's Revenge: Charles II and the Greatest Manhunt in British History* (London: Little Brown, 2012).
- Keay, Anna, *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* (London: Continuum, 2008).
- Keeler, Mary Frear, *The Long Parliament, 1640-1641: A biographical study of its members* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1954).
- Kelsey, Sean, *Inventing a Republic: The Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649-1653* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).
- Kenyon, Peter, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
- Kirkton, James, *The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland: From the Restoration to the year 1678* (Edinburgh: James Ballatyne & Co, 1817).
- Kishlansky, Mark, *Rise of the New Model Army* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- Kishlansky, Mark, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain, 1603-1714* (London: Penguin, 1997).
- Knights, Mark, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Knoll, Stefani, *Creating Academic Communities: Funeral Monuments to Professors at Oxford, Leiden and Tübingen, 1580-1700* (Haren: Equilibris Publishing, 2003).
- Lacey, Andrew, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003).
- Ladd, Brian, *The Ghosts of Berlin: Confronting German history in the Urban Landscape* (London: The University of Chicago Press, 2018).
- Lake, Peter, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: Orthodoxy, Heterodoxy and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009).
- Lake, Peter and Sharpe, Kevin (eds.), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994).
- Lake, Peter and Pincus, Steve (eds.), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

- Legon, Edward, *Revolution Remembered: Seditious Memories After the British Civil Wars* (Politics, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain) (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019).
- Leonard, Carol. S., *Reform and Regicide: The Reign of Peter III of Russia* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993).
- Lewis, Samuel (ed.), *A Topographical Dictionary of England* (London: S. Lewis, 1848).
- Lipscomb, George, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Buckingham* (London: J. & W. Robins, 1847).
- Little, Patrick and Smith, David, L., *Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Llewellyn, Nigel, *The Art of Death: Visual Culture in the English death ritual, c. 1500-c. 1800* (London: Reaktion Books in association with the Victoria & Albert Museum, 1991).
- Llewellyn, Nigel, *Funeral Monuments in post-Reformation England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Lockyer, Roger, *The Trial of Charles I: A Contemporary Account Taken From the Memoirs of Sir Thomas Herbert and John Rushworth* (London: Folio Society, 1959).
- Lunger Knoppers, Laura, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645-1661* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Lunger Knoppers, Laura (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, Baron, *History of England, Vol I* (London: Continuum, 2009).
- MacDonald. M. and Murphy T.R., *Sleepless Souls: Suicide in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- MacDonald Wigfield, W., *The Monmouth Rebels 1685* (Gloucester: Sutton, 1985).
- MacKinnon, Dolly, *Earls Colne's Early Modern Landscapes* (London: Routledge, 2016).
- Malden, H.E. (ed.), *A History of the County of Surrey: Vol 4* (London, 1912).
- Marshall, Alan, *Intelligence and Espionage in the Reign of Charles II, 1660-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Marshall, Peter and Gordon, Bruce, *The Place of the Dead: Death and Remembrance in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Marshall, Peter, *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

- McElligott, Jason, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007).
- McInnes, Allan, *The British Confederate: Archibald Campbell, Marquess of Argyll, c.1607-1661* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2011).
- Milford, Anna, *Ear and Eye Witnesses: 350th anniversary of the English Civil War* (Leigh on Sea: Partizan Press, 1992).
- Miller, John, *After the Civil Wars: Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Harlow: Longman, 2000).
- Miller, John, *James II* (London: Yale University Press, 2000).
- Morrah, Patrick, *1660: The Year of Restoration* (London, Chatto & Windus, 1960).
- Morrill, John, *Reactions to the English Civil War 1642-1649* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1982).
- Morrill, John (ed.), *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins & Brown, 1991).
- Morrill, John (ed.), *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s* (London: Collins & Brown, 1992).
- Morrill, John, *The Nature of the English Revolution: Essays by John Morrill* (London: Routledge, 1993).
- Muddiman, J.G., *The Trial of Charles I* (London, W. Hodge & Co, 1928).
- Naphy, William. G. and Roberts, Penny, *Fear in Early Modern Society* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).
- Nelson. C. and Seccombe M., *British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1641-1700* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1986).
- Neufeld, Matthew, *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Suffolk: Boydell, 2013).
- Nevitt, Marcus, *Women and the Pamphlet Culture of Revolutionary England, 1640-1660* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).
- Oatley, Keith, *Emotions: A Brief History* (London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2007).
- Ogg, David, *England in the Reign of Charles II* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956).
- Orme, Nicholas, *English Church Dedications: With a survey of Cornwall and Devon* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996).
- Palgrave, Mary, *Mary Rich, Countess of Warwick (1625-1678)* (J.M. Dent: London, 1901).

- Palmer, Charles, *The History of Great Yarmouth, designed as a continuation of Manship's History of that Town* (Great Yarmouth, L.A. Meall, 1856).
- Partridge, Robert B., *O Horrible Murder: The Trial, Execution and Burial of Charles I* (London: Rubicon Press, 1998).
- Patterson, Annabel, *The Long Parliament of Charles II* (Yale: Yale University Press 2008).
- Peacey, Jason (ed.), *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).
- Peacey, Jason, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).
- Peck, Imogen, *Recollection in the Republics: Memories of the British Civil Wars in England, 1649-1659* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).
- Peters, Erin, *Commemoration and Oblivion in Royalist Print Culture, 1658-1667* (London: Palgrave, 2017).
- Pevsner, Nikolas, *The Buildings of England: Gloucestershire: The Cotswolds* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1970).
- Phippen, James, *Colbran's New Guide to Tunbridge Wells* (London: John Lane, 1840).
- Pincus, Steven, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2009).
- Plamper, Jan, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
- Pollmann, Judith, *Memory in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).
- Potter, Lois, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Purkiss, Diane, *Literature, Gender and Politics during the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Rachman, Stanley, *Fear and Courage* (London: W.H. Freeman & Co Ltd, 1990).
- Ramsey, William, *Henry Ireton* (London: Longmans, Green, 1949).
- Raymond, Joad, *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England, 1641-1660* (Moreton-in-Marsh: Windrush Press, 1993).
- Raymond, Joad, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641-1649* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).
- Raymond, Joad, *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass, 1999).

- Raymond, Joad, *Pamphlet and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- Reddy, William, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Richards, Barry, *Emotional Governance: Politics, Media and Terror* (London: Palgrave, 2007).
- Ridsdell Smith, Geoffrey, *In well beware: The Story of Newbury Priory and the Belasyse Family 1145- 1977* (Kineton: The Roundwood Press, 1978).
- Rosenwein, Barbara, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006).
- Rosenwein, Barbara, *Generations of Feeling: A History of Emotions, 600-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- Rowse, A.L., *The Regicides and the Puritan Revolution* (London : Duckworth, 1994).
- Rudder, Samuel, *A New History of Gloucestershire* (Circenester: Samuel Rudder, 1779).
- Savidge, Alan, *Royal Tunbridge Wells: A History of a Spa Town* (London: Parapress, 1923).
- Savidge, Alan, *The Story of The Church of King Charles the Martyr, Royal Tunbridge Wells* (The British Publishing Company Ltd ,1926).
- Seaward, Paul, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Scott, Jonathan, *Algernon Sidney and the English Republic, 1623-1677* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Scott, Jonathan, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677-1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- Seel, Graham E., *Regicide and Republic England 1603-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Seel, Graham E and Smith, David L., *Crown and Parliaments, 1558-1689* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Sharpe, J.A., *Early modern England: A Social History, 1550-1760* (London: Arnold, 1997).
- Sharpe, Kevin, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2000).
- Sharpe, Kevin, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

- Sherlock, Peter, *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).
- Smith, A.G.R., *The Emergence of a Nation State: The Commonwealth of England 1529-1660* (London: Longman, 1997).
- Smith, David L., *A History of the Modern British Isles, 1603-1707: The Double Crown* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).
- Smith, Geoffrey, *Royalist Agents, Conspirators and Spies: Their role in the British Civil Wars, 1640-1660* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).
- Smuts, Malcolm, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999).
- Smuts, Malcolm, *Culture and Power in England 1585-1685* (Hampshire: Palgrave, 1999).
- Smyth, Adam, *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2004).
- Southcombe, George and Tapsell, Grant, *Restoration Politics, Religion, and Culture Britain and Ireland, 1660-1714* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
- Sprange, J., *The Tunbridge Wells Guide; Or, An Account of the Ancient and Present State of that Place* (Tunbridge Wells: J. Sprange, 1801).
- Spurr, John, *England in the 1670s: This Masquerading Age* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).
- Spurr, John, *The Post Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain 1603-1714* (London: University of Swansea, 2006).
- Stone, Brian, *Debryshire in the Civil War* (London: Scarthin Books, 1992).
- Stone, Lawrence, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (London: Penguin, 1979).
- Stoyle, Mark, *Loyalty and Locality: Popular allegiance in Devon during the English civil war* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1994).
- Stoyle, Mark, *West Britons: Cornish identities and the early modern British state* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002).
- Thomas, Richard, *History and Description of the Town and Harbour of Falmouth* (Pub. at the Museum, by J. Trathan, 1827).
- Thornbury, Walter, *Old and New London: A Narrative of its History, its People and its Places. Vol 1* (London: Cassell, Petter & Galpin, 1878).
- Todd, Janet, *The Secret Life of Aphra Behn* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1996).
- Trevelyan, G.M., *England Under the Stuarts* (Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2013).

- Tumblety, Joan, *Memory and History: Understanding memory as source and subject* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013).
- Turner, Dawson, *Sepulchral Reminiscences of a Market Town: as afforded by a list of the interments within the walls of the parish church of St. Nicholas, Great Yarmouth* (Great Yarmouth: Charles Barber, 1848).
- Turner J. H. (ed.), *Yorkshire Genealogist*, Vol 2 (Bingley: The Editor, 1890).
- Tutchin, John, *The Western Martyrology* (London: James Blackwood, 1873).
- Uglow, Jenny, *A Gambling Man: Charles II's Restoration game* (London: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009).
- Underdown, D.E., *Royalist conspiracy in England, 1649-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960).
- Underdown, D.E., *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
- Underdown, D.E., *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular politics and culture in England, 1603-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Van Dulmen, Richard, *Theatre of Horror: Crime and punishment in early modern Germany* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990).
- Walsham, Alexandra, *The Reformation of the Generations: Age, Ancestry, and Memory in England c. 1500-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Waters, Ivor, *Henry Marten and the Long Parliament* (Chepstow: Chepstow society, 1973).
- Wedgwood, C.V., *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford, 1593-1641: A Revaluation* (London: Cape, 1961).
- Wedgwood, C.V., *The Trial of Charles I* (London: Collins, 1964).
- Wedgwood, C.V., *A Coffin for King Charles: The Trial and Execution of Charles I* (London: Lifetime Book, 1981).
- Western, J.R., *Monarchy and Revolution: The English State in the 1680s* (London: Blandford, 1972).
- Whitaker, Antony, *The Regicide's Widow: Lady Alice Lisle and The Bloody Assize* (Stroud: Sutton, 2006).
- Wilcher, Robert, *The Writing of Royalism 1628-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- Willcock, John, *The Great Marquess; life and times of Archibald, 8th earl, and 1st (and only) Marquess of Argyll (1607-1661)* (London: O. Anderson & Ferrier, 1903).
- William, Daniel, *History of the Abbey and Palace of Holyrood* (Edinburgh: Duncan Anderson, 1852).

- Williams, Barry, *Elusive Settlement* (London: Nelson Thornes Ltd, 1984).
- Willis, Browne, *Parochiale Anglicanum or, the Names of All the Churches and Chapels Within the Dioceses of Canterbury, Rochester, London, Winchester, Chichester, Norwich, Salisbury, Wells, Exeter, St. Davids, Landaff, Bangor, and St. Asaph* (London: Gale, 1827).
- Wilson, John, *Fairfax: A life of Thomas, Lord Fairfax, Captain-General of all the Parliament's forces in the English Civil War, Creator & commander of the New Model Army* (London: Murray, 1985).
- Wood, Andy, *The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Wood, Andy, *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular senses of the past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- Woolrych, Austin, *England Without a King, 1649-1660* (London: Methuen, 1983).
- Woolrych, Austin, *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Worden, Blair, *The Rump Parliament, 1648-53* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).
- Worden, Blair, *Roundheads Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (London: Allen Lane, 2001).
- Worden, Blair, *The English Civil Wars: 1640-1660* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2009).
- Worden, Blair, *God's Instruments Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Worth, R.N., *The History of Plymouth from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (Plymouth: W. Brendon & Sons, 1987).
- Wurzbach, Natascha, *The Rise of the English Street Ballad 1550-1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- Young, James E., *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1994).

VI - Secondary Material – Chapters and articles

- Arnold, F.H., 'Cawley the Regicide', *Sussex Archaeological Collections; Relating to the History and Antiquities of the County*, 34 (1884), pp. 21-38.
- Assman, Jan, 'Collective memory and cultural identity', *New German Critique*, 65 (1995), pp. 125-133.

Barber, Sarah, 'Belshazzar's Feast: Regicide, Republicanism and the Metaphor of Balance', in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 94- 117.

Baker, Philip, 'The regicide', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 154-169.

Beddard, R.A., 'Wren's mausoleum for Charles and the cult of the Royal Martyr', *Architectural History*, 27 (1984), pp. 36-49.

Bonney, Richard, 'The European Reaction to the Trial and Execution of Charles I', in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 247-280.

Bowen, L., 'Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism, 1649-1660', in *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, eds. Jason McElligott and David L Smith (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), pp. 44-66.

Boyden, James, 'The worst death becomes a good death: the passion of Don Rodrigo Calderon' in *The Place of the Dead: Death and Remembrance in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, eds. Peter Marshall and Bruce Gordon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 240-266.

Braddick, Micheal, 'Mobilisation, Anxiety and Creativity in England during the 1640s' In *Liberty, Authority, Formality: Political Ideas and Culture, 1600-1900*, eds J. Morrow and J. Scott (Exeter, Exeter University Press, 2008) pp. 175-193.

Bryant, Richard A, 'Post-traumatic stress disorder: A state-of-the-art review of evidence and challenges', *World Psychiatry*, 18:3 (October 2019), pp. 259-269.

Claydon, Tony, 'The sermon the 'public sphere' and the political culture of late seventeenth-century England', in *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600-1750* eds Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 208-235.

Cole, J., 'Some notes on Henry Marten, the Regicide, and his family', *Berkshire Archaeological Society*, 13 (1939), pp. 23-41.

Crawford, P., 'Charles Stuart, "that man of blood"', *Journal of British Studies*, 16 (1977), pp. 41-61.

Cross, C., 'A man of conscience in seventeenth-century urban politics: Alderman Hoyle of York', *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England*, eds J. Morrill, P. Slack, and D. Woolf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 205-24.

Cust, Richard, 'News and politics in early seventeenth century England', *Past & Present*, 111 (1986), pp. 60-90.

Cust, Richard, 'Honour, rhetoric and political culture: the earl of Huntingdon and his enemies', in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays*

presented to David Underdown eds Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 84–112.

Deak, Istvan, 'Introduction', in *The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and Its Aftermath*, eds Istvan Deak, Jan T. Gross and Tony Just, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 3-18.

Deak, Istvan, 'Themes for a social history of war experience and collaboration', in *The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and Its Aftermath*, eds Istvan Deak, Jan T. Gross and Tony Just, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 39-73

Eisner, M., 'Killing kings: Patterns of regicide in Europe, AD 600-1800', *British Journal of Criminology*, Issue 51 (May 2011), pp. 556-577.

Esdaille, K.A., 'The Busts and Statues of Charles I', *The Burlington Magazine*, 91:550 (1949), pp. 9-15.

Lucien Febvre, 'Sensibility and History: How to reconstitute the emotional life of the past', *A New Kind of History* ed P. Burke, pp. 12-26.

Fox, Adam, 'Ballads, libels and popular ridicule in Jacobean England', *Past & Present*, 145 (1994), pp. 47-83.

Fox, Adam, 'Rumour, news and popular political opinion in Elizabethan and early Stuart England', *The Historical Journal*, 40:3 (1997), pp. 597-620.

Firth, Charles, 'Memoir of Major-General Thomas Harrison', *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 52:3 (1944), pp. 390-464.

Fitzgibbons, Jonathan, 'Recording, reporting and printing the Cromwellian 'Kingship debates' of 1657', *Historical Research*, 89:245 (2016), pp. 486-509.

Fitzgibbons, Jonathan, "'To settle a government without something of Monarchy in it': Bulstrode Whitelocke's Memoirs and the Reinvention of the Interregnum', *English Historical Review*, 137:586 (June 2022), pp. 651-699.

Furtado, Peter, 'The Cult of St Edward the Confessor', *History Today*, 11 (2005), pp. 21-27.

Greene, John, 'The Diary of John Greene (1635-57)', ed. E M Symonds. *The English Historical Review*, 43:171 (1929), pp. 385-394.

Holmes, Clive, 'The Trial and Execution of Charles I', *Historical Journal*, 53:2 (2010), pp. 289-316.

Hopper, Andrew J., 'The Reluctant Regicide? Thomas Wayte and the Civil Wars in Rutland', *Midland History*, (2014) 39:1, pp. 36-52.

Howell, R., 'Newcastle's Regicide: The Parliamentary Career of John Blakiston', *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 42 (1964), pp. 207-30.

Hughes, Ann, 'A "Lunatick Revolter from Loyalty": The Death of Rowland Wilson and the English Revolution', *History Workshop Journal*, 61 (2006), pp. 192-204.

- Hunter, Elizabeth K., 'Between the Bridge and the Brook', *Reformation and Renaissance Review*, 15:3 (2013), pp. 237-257.
- Hubbard, H.L., 'Colonel Francis Hacker, Parliamentarian and Regicide', *Transactions of the Thornton Society*, 45 (1941), pp. 5-17.
- Kelsey, Sean, 'The Death of Charles I', *The Historical Journal*, 45 (2002), pp. 727-754.
- Kelsey, Sean, 'The Ordinance for the Trial of Charles I', *Historical Research*, 76 (2003), pp. 310-331.
- Kelsey, Sean, 'Politics and Procedure in the Trial of Charles I', *Law and History Review*, 22 (2004), pp. 1-25.
- Kishlansky, Mark A., 'Mission Impossible: Charles I, Oliver Cromwell and the Regicide', *English Historical Review*, 125 (2010), pp. 844-74.
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger, 'This So Horrid Spectacle': Samson Agonistes and the Execution of the Regicides', *English Literary Renaissance*, 20:3 (1990), pp. 487-504.
- Kruger, Christa, 'Culture, trauma and dissociation: A broadening perspective for our field', *Journal of Trauma and Dissociation*, 21:1 (2020), pp. 1-12.
- Lacey, Andrew, 'Elegies and Commemorative Verse', in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 225-243.
- Lacey, Andrew, 'The Office for King Charles the Martyr in the 'Book of Common Prayer', 1662-1685', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 53 (2002), pp. 510-526.
- Lake, Edward, 'Diary of Dr. Edward Lake, Archdeacon and Prebendary of Exeter, Chaplain and Tutor to the Princesses Mary and Anne, daughters of the Duke of York, afterwards James the Second, in the years 1677-1678', *Camden Old Series*, 39 (1847), pp. 1-32.
- Lisgard Guthrie, Rev R.R., 'Notice of the Inscriptions over the Graves of the Regicides at Vevay, in Switzerland', *Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 17 (1883), pp. 286-9.
- Llewellyn, Nigel, 'The Royal Body: Monuments to the Dead, for the Living', in *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c.1540-1660*, eds Lucy Gent and Llewellyn Nigel (London: Reakiton, 1990), pp. 218-241.
- Mann, Emily, 'In Defence of the City: The Gates of London and Temple Bar in the Seventeenth Century', *Architectural History*, 49 (2006), pp. 75-99.
- Marchant, Alicia, 'Narratives of Death and Emotional Affect in Late Medieval Chronicles', *Parergon*, 31, (2014), pp. 81-98.
- Mason, Laura, 'Song: Mixing Media', in *Revolution in Print: the Press in France, 1775-1800*, eds Robert Darnton and Daniel Roche (London: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 170-191.
- McShane, Angela, 'Drink, Song, and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England', *Folk Music Journal*, 11:3 (2018), pp. 107-123.

Merritt, J.F., 'Reinventing Westminster Abbey, 1642–1660: A House of Kings from Revolution to Restoration', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 67 (2016) pp. 122-38.

Nenner, Howard 'The trial of the regicides: retribution and treason in 1660', in *Politics and the political imagination in later Stuart Britain: essays presented to Lois Green*, ed. Howard Nenner (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1997), pp. 21-39.

Nora, Pierre, 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire', *Representations*, 26 (1989), pp. 7-24.

Oberlin, Amy B., "'Share with Me in my Grief and Affliction'": Royal Sorrow and Public Mourning in Early Eighteenth-Century England Share with Me in my Grief', *Parergon*, 31:2 (2014), pp. 99-120.

Peacey, Jason, 'Reporting a Revolution: A Failed Propaganda Campaign', in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 161-181.

Peacey, Jason, 'The Struggle for Mercurius Britannicus: Factional Politics and the Parliamentary Press, 1643–1646', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005), pp. 517-543.

Peacey, Jason, 'Print Culture and Political Lobbying during the English Civil Wars', *Parliamentary History*, 26 (2007), pp. 30-48.

Peacey, Jason, 'A Knowing but a Discrete Man': Scribal News and Information Management in Restoration England', *Parliamentary History*, 41 (February 2022), pp. 19-36.

Pells, Ismini, 'Soliciting Sympathy: The Search for Psychological Trauma in Petitions from Seventeenth-Century Maimed Soldiers', in E. Peters and C. Richards, *Early Modern Trauma: Europe and the Atlantic World* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2021), pp. 129-150.

Plamper, Jan, 'The History of Emotions: An Interview with William Reddy, Barbara Rosenwein and Peter Stearns', *History and Theory*, 49:2 (2010), pp. 237-265.

Potter, Lois, 'The royal martyr in the Restoration' in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 240-263.

Randal, Helen. W., 'The rise and fall of a Martyrology: Sermons on Charles I', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 10:2 (1947), pp. 135-167.

Raymond, Joad, 'Marchamont Nedham', in *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 376-401.

Rosenwein, Barbara, 'Worrying about Emotions in History', *American Historical Review*, 107:3 (2002), pp. 821-45.

- Rosenwein, Barbara, 'Problems and methods in the History of Emotions', *Parergon*, 3 (2010), pp. 1-27.
- Sachse, William L., 'England's "Black's Tribunal": An Analysis of the Regicide Court', *Journal of British Studies*, 12:2 (1973), pp. 69-85.
- Sawday, Jonathan, 'Re-Writing a Revolution: History, Symbol, and text in the Restoration', *The Seventeenth Century*, 7:2 (1992), pp. 171-199.
- Scott, David, 'Motives for King-Killing', in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 138-161.
- Sharpe, Kevin, 'So Hard a Text'? Images of Charles I, 1612-1700, *The Historical Journal*, 43:2 (2000), pp. 383-405.
- Shepherd, Robert, 'The Political Commonplace Book of Sir Robert Sidney', *Sidney Journal*, 21:1 (2003), pp. 1-30.
- Sherlock, Peter, 'The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the Manipulation of Memory', *Journal of British Studies*, 2 (2007), pp. 263-289.
- Sherlock, Peter, 'Militant Masculinity and the Monuments of Westminster Abbey' in *Governing Masculinities in the Early Modern Period: Regulating Selves and Others*, eds. Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline Van Gent (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 131-153.
- Snow, J., 'The life of Master John Shaw' in *Yorkshire Diaries and Autobiographies in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, ed. C. Jackson (London: Spottiswoode & CO, 1877), pp. 119-163.
- Stewart, Bryon, 'The Cult of the Royal Martyr', *Church History*, 38:2 (1969), pp. 175-187.
- Thomas, James (with revisions by Elizabeth Barry), 'From people power to mass hysteria Media and popular reactions to the death of Princess Diana', *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 11:3 (2008), pp. 362-376.
- Tomlinson, Howard, 'Commemorating Charles I, King and martyr?', *History Today*, 45:2 (1995), pp. 11-19.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh, "'Eikon Basilike': The Problem of the King's Book", *History Today*, 1:9 (1951) pp. 211-220.
- Trubowitz, Rachel, 'Nursing Fathers and National Identity: James I, Charles I, Cromwell and Milton', in *Nation and Nurture in Seventeenth-Century English Literature*, ed. Rachel Trubowitz (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 94-146.
- Tullett, William, 'Political Engines: The Emotional Politics of Bells in Eighteenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies*, 59 (2020), pp. 555-581.
- Tubb, Amos, 'Printing the Regicide of Charles I', *History*, 89:296 (2004), pp. 500-524.

- Vallance, Edward, 'Remembering the regicide in an Age of Revolutions: The case of Mark Noble', in *Remembering Early Modern Revolutions: England, North America, France and Haiti*, ed. Edward Vallance (Milton: Routledge, 2018), pp. 45-61.
- Vallance, Edward, 'The Manuscript Journals of the Trial of Charles I: New Evidence on Their Provenance and Purpose', *Historical Research*, 94:264 (May 2021), pp. 303-323.
- Walsham, Alexandra, 'Reformed Folklore? Cautionary Tales and Oral Tradition in Early Modern England', in *The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain, 1500-1850* eds Adam Fox and David Woolf (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 173-196.
- Walzer, Michael, 'Regicide and Revolution', *Social Research*, 40 (1973), pp. 617-42.
- Wheeler, Elizabeth Skerpan, 'Eikon Basilike and the Rhetoric of Self-Representation', in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 122-40.
- Whitebrook, J.C., 'Sir Thomas Andrewes, Lord Mayor and Regicide, and his Relations', *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*, 13 (1939), pp. 151-65.
- Wilcher, Robert, 'Eikon Basilike: The Printing, Composition, Strategy, and Impact of 'The King's Book'', in *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 290-301.
- Wilcox, Helen, 'Civil War Letters and Diaries and the Rhetoric of Experience', in *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution* ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 215-227.
- Wood, Andy, 'Social Conflict and Change in the Mining Communities of North-West Derbyshire, c. 1600-1700', *International Review of Social History*, 38:1, pp. 31-58.
- Worden, Blair, 'Milton, Samson Agonistes, and the Restoration', in *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration; Literature, Drama, History*, ed. Gerald Maclean, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 111-135.
- Zook, Melinda, "'Blood will have Blood": The Regicide Trials and the Popular Press' in *The State Trials and the Politics of Justice in Later Stuart England*, eds. Brian Cowan and Scott Sowerby (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2021), pp. 112-134.

VII - Unpublished Research

- Greenwood, Fiona, *The Foundation of the Church of Charles the martyr, Tunbridge Wells* (MA Dissertation: Cambridge University, 1992).
- Wong, Meng Yan Matthias, *The Impact of the Regicide of Charles I on Contemporary English notions of Time and the Future* (PhD Thesis: University of Cambridge, 2019).

Worton, Jonathan, *The Royalist and Parliamentary War Effort in Shropshire During the First and Second English Civil Wars, 1642-1648* (PhD Thesis: University of Chester, 2015).