Chapter 1

Introduction:
'Remember the Good Old Cause'

The wars and revolutions in Britain between 1637 and 1660 continued to impact the lives of the people of the Restoration era. This was especially the case in the 1680s when the fault lines that had wrought war and revolution four decades earlier were cleft open once more by the issue of whether, as a Roman Catholic, James, Duke of York, ought to succeed to the throne of his brother Charles II. For members of the emerging Tory party, the efforts of their Whig counterparts to secure York's exclusion from the throne were dangerously reminiscent of the actions of those who, forty years earlier, overthrew the Stuarts and the Church of England.[1] One common manifestation of the Tories' fears was accusations that old Parliamentarians, as well as a new generation of troublemakers, brazenly retained sympathies for their so-called 'good old cause'. In her 1678 comedy *Sir Patient Fancy*, the playwright Aphra Behn depicted the title role – based on the London alderman and Puritan Sir Patience Ward – as yearning for those 'better dayes', or, more specifically, 'the good days of the late Lord Protector [i.e. Oliver Cromwell]'.[2] Three years later, and echoing Behn's drama in starker language, the author of one pamphlet charged the Whigs, or 'factious schismatics', with 'commending and slyly insinuating the good days of the late times [and] the plenty, power, riches, and reputation of *their* dear commonwealth'.[3] In a graphic representation of these accusations, the 1682 broadside *The Whig Rampant* incorporated the image of a dissenting 'tub-preacher' from an earlier work, ascribing to him the words 'remember the good old cause'.[4]

The sympathies for the 'old cause' to which Aphra Behn and others alluded have been largely absent from the recent surge of interest in how the civil wars and revolutions were remembered in Britain.[5] Instead, historians have tended to impute rather different attitudes to the men and women who lived in the three decades after 1660.[6] In these accounts, traumatic memories

of civil war and revolution 'imprisoned' Britons with fears of a return to 'rebellion' and 'usurpation'.[7] So ingrained were these fears that they are taken to have comprised an ideological 'middle ground' after the Restoration from which those who failed to conform to the narrow political and religious settlements of the 1660s were sniped at as the heirs of civil war 'fanatics'.[8] This account of the Restoration era's mnemonic landscape – a term that is used in this book to refer to the memories and ways of remembering that defined British society in this era – has dovetailed with analyses of the crisis at the end of Charles II's reign. In studies of the so-called 'Exclusion Crisis', the Tories' evocation of Parliamentarianism and republicanism, such as is evident in the writings of Aphra Behn and others, is held to have had greater potency than the Whigs' warnings about the dangers of 'popery' and 'arbitrary government', thus forestalling the efforts of the latter to prevent the Duke of York from succeeding to the throne and securing toleration for Dissenters.[9] If anyone was remembering the old cause, it was the Tories, while 'the[ir] opposition ... by and large, did not see themselves as the descendants of Cromwell or [John] Pym'.[10]

A willingness to explore the nature and depth of enduring sympathies for the old cause is largely confined to literary studies, especially those of the era's celebrated band of authors and poets; John Milton, Andrew Marvell, John Bunyan, and Richard Baxter were all active opponents of the Stuarts and the established church at various stages between 1640 and 1660. The best of these studies have situated such figures, and some others, within what they have termed a culture of 'defeat'.[11] And yet not everyone has been so willing to identify the continuation of the old cause after 1660, drawing attention instead to the transmutation of revolutionary impulses into 'quietism'.[12] Whatever their differences, the foci of these investigations often converge on the coterie of educated, and thus predominantly elite and male, figures whose testimonies have been bequeathed to us by print. Even then, owing to the hazard of adopting certain political and religious positions publicly after the return of Charles II, enduring sympathies for Parliament and the Republic tend to be synonymised by scholars with radical or republican intentions.[13] By extension, the incorporation of these sympathies into the historical mainstream is usually identified much later: after the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89 when the deposal of James II corresponded with an upswing in critical accounts of the Stuart dynasty.[14] Finally, and most crucially, the individual and social significance of the act of remembering is often subordinated to the contentious issue of how, and indeed whether, the political and religious trajectories of civil war and revolution endured after 1660.[15]

Influenced by theoretical developments in the field of 'memory studies', historians and literary scholars are now addressing some of these lacunae by devoting their attention to the mnemonic and psychological impacts of civil war and revolution across Restoration society.[16] Most notably, Matthew

Neufeld has underscored the tension between remembering and forgetting in England during the reigns of the later Stuarts, the latter having been exemplified by the Act of Free and General Pardon, Indemnity, and Oblivion in 1660, a precursor to modern programmes of reconciliation that forbade 'using any words tending to revive the Memory of the late Differences'.[17] For Neufeld, combatants and others who experienced the 1640s and 1650s wished to exorcise its spectral presence. Rather than 're-fighting the old struggle', Neufeld posits 'public remembering' after 1660 as having entailed 'commending and justifying, or contesting and attacking, the Restoration settlements that underlay the Anglican confessional state.'[18] Prominent in Neufeld's account is a hostile version of Parliamentarianism and republicanism that constructed 'a legal *cordon sanitaire* around the puritan impulse' and 'vindicated an exclusively Anglican confessional polity'.[19] Here, historically minded Whigs are viewed as circumspect when seeking to profit from the recent past, warning their readers of the pitfalls of returning to the 'popish' counsel of the 1630s, rather than identifying more positively with those who opposed, resisted, or overthrew the Stuarts and established church in the following decades.[20]

By highlighting the trauma of early modern warfare, and the government's role in sanctioning certain memories of the recent past, these studies are critical to how we understand the Restoration. However, it has not been within the scope of these works to challenge the prevailing idea that Royalist interpretations of the wars and revolutions were not only dominant, but also widely held. We may infer, then, that a hostile attitude towards the events of the 1640s and 1650s was the inevitable, or even natural, position for people to adopt after the Restoration, save, perhaps, for a radical or republican minority of elite authors.

The main objectives of this book are to build on the emerging interest in the mnemonic landscapes of Restoration Britain by illustrating that they were considerably more diverse than is evident in existing studies, that they were far from consensual, and that there was social depth to enduring sympathies for opposition to and resistance against the Stuarts and Church of England. It does so by acknowledging that the printed evidence in which many historians have located memories of the civil wars and revolution is, as historians have shown, an inaccurate barometer of the full range of opinions about politics and religion in the era that followed.[21] In Peter Lake's concise formulation, we must acknowledge that 'hegemony is not monopoly'.[22] Furthermore, I argue that the hostile version of the civil wars and revolution which characterised the output of the presses after the Restoration must be associated with those who were responsible for its regulation from the early 1660s. Prominent among these was the redoubtable Sir Roger L'Estrange, whose 'anti-fanaticism' and associated hostility to Parliament and the Republic are referred to regularly in the pages that follow.[23]

Given the illusory effect of print, a survey of the diversity of memories in Restoration Britain, one that includes the majority of individuals who were

excluded from the traditional 'political nation', must incorporate alternative forms of communication.[24] Inspirational in this, and other, respects is the work of Andy Wood, a historian of early modern politics and society who has looked beyond print, and especially to oral culture, as a way of engaging with plebeian custom and, by extension, the 'popular' memories of subaltern communities.[25] Following Wood's lead, this book engages carefully with sympathies for Parliament and the Republic in England and Wales between 1660 and 1688, the articulation of which in speech and writing by a broad social base was rendered seditious and treasonable, and thus, in many cases, made visible, by the Sedition Act of 1661 and pre-existing legislation.[26] This includes cases that came before assize and quarter sessions courts throughout England and Wales, including those that were communicated to secretaries of state at Whitehall. Given the reliance of this study on evidence of seditious and treasonable speech, its scope is confined to the three decades in which British governments were preoccupied by sympathies for Parliament and the Republic. That, as Paul Kléber Monod has shown, Jacobitism replaced these sympathies as the chief menace to William and Mary's government deems the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89 an appropriate limit for this study.[27]

The legal records and government papers in which alternative opinions about the civil wars and revolution reside have proven fecund for historians of the Restoration, especially those who are interested in the relationship between oral culture and 'popular' politics.[28] Yet the relationship between this evidence and contemporaries' *memories* has not received the attention it deserves. Chapter 2 begins by tapping such material to expose a reservoir of Parliamentarian and republican sympathies in the form of what are referred to collectively as 'seditious memories' of the civil wars and revolution in England and Wales. In doing so, it shows that there were opinions about those events that were targeted specifically by the Sedition Act, as well as others that were vulnerable to treatment as threats to the safety and security of the realms. Chapter 2 also presents a typology of seditious remembering that is employed throughout this book. This includes memories that are characterised by justification of, identification with, and nostalgia for forms of opposition and resistance during the 1640s and 1650s, as well as their 'prospection': that is, the prediction that those events would be re-realised at some stage in the future. In each of these cases, the memories of people after the Restoration are compared with those to which scholars of memory have referred in other chronological and geographical contexts. In doing this, I take several opportunities to reflect on how concepts that have been developed by scholars from a range of disciplines, but especially social psychology, may be transposed fruitfully to early modern Britain.

The second role of chapter 2 is to interrogate the issue of how representative seditious memories were of a more widespread understanding of the recent past. Like those of more famous Restoration authors, sympathies for Parliament and the Republic in evidence of sedition and treason are

usually synonymised with the enduring legacy of popular political and religious radicalism.[29] The most notable advocate of this approach was Richard L. Greaves, whose work highlighted dissenting voices during the reigns of Charles II and James II.[30] In doing so, Greaves attracted criticism from historians who have argued that radical and republican communities, insofar as they survived the return of monarchy and episcopacy, were small, sparse, and disunited.[31] Such criticisms are often informed by national war fatigue, the scale of popular support for the return of Charles II, and the abject failure of any subsequent efforts to depose him or his brother (such as in 1661, 1663, 1683, and 1685). Chapter 2 takes heed of these revisionist accounts of the Restoration by arguing that the threat of seditious memories must be understood in relation to the anxieties of those who, having remained loyal to Crown and established church before 1660, acquired the authority to police such opinions. This is borne out by the fact that the range of opinions about the 1640s and 1650s that were actionable as seditious and even treasonable after the Restoration do not always correspond with evidence of radical or republican intent.

In the absence of an explanation for seditious and treasonable sentiments in which they are equated with a popular radical tradition, a trend has emerged of treating these opinions as ineffectual and unrepresentative; what one historian has described as the 'alehouse chatter' of 'a disgruntled minority' and even the 'ordinary anti-authoritarian belligerence of drunk or disgruntled commoners.'[32] Elsewhere, the kinds of language to which Greaves and others referred has been described as reflecting 'a tavern culture where imagined realities could be played out in varying degrees of intoxication in deep, but essentially meaningless, plans.'[33] Tim Harris, whose portrayals of popular politics and religion in the late seventeenth century are otherwise exceedingly rich, has echoed this dismissiveness by labelling seditious and treasonable words as the sentiments of 'a 'radical fringe' and, elsewhere, 'little more than the product of the fertile imaginations of unscrupulous informers seeking to feed off government paranoia'.[34] Few, it is held, were interested in perpetuating the bloodshed and turmoil of the British civil wars beyond the Restoration.

I contend that such evidence deserves to be bestowed with far greater significance. The fact that a range of sympathies for Parliament and the Republic were *vulnerable* to being treated as sedition or treason is viewed here as a reason to suspect that the available evidence of such sentiment is representative of a wider, but necessarily concealed, body of opinion. In the words of Melinda Zook, 'sedition' was a label that was 'applied to numerous ... seventeenth-century folk' whose 'grievances' extended far beyond 'repudiat[ing] the existing order and legitimat[ing] a new one'.[35] This portrayal of seditious memories as intersecting a diverse range of political and religious opinions is borne out by the extent to which other individuals, including those who are often associated with a movement away from the

good old cause, secreted away their own sympathies for opposition and resistance before the Restoration in diaries and other 'personal' writings. In all these respects, the book follows the important claim of the sociologist Zsuzsa Gille that 'lamenting the losses that came with the collapse of [a regime] does not imply wishing it back', and that 'favorable, because selective, recollections of the old regime can come from the entire length of the traditional political spectrum'.[36]

This analysis leaves us with a question: given that radical and republican intent is unlikely to account for more than a small proportion of cases of seditious remembering, what is it that motivated individuals to articulate these memories and to risk themselves in the process? The remaining chapters of this book seek an answer, one that avoids dismissing seditious and treasonable words as anti-authoritarian or drunken grumbling. It does so by deducing what the intentions of the speakers and authors of seditious memories were. Necessarily, this involves navigating the assumption of the authorities, and some later historians, that the motivation of such language was *ipso facto* seditious or treasonable – that is, intending to undermine the authority of Crown and established church. Instead, I suggest that conclusions can be drawn about authorial intention from information about the immediate context of seditious remembering, as well as how memories were conveyed to the authorities: namely, that audiences were usually expected to react in a certain way to opinions about Parliament and the Republic. Moreover, the full significance of these expectations becomes apparent only when we acknowledge their inextricability from structures of political, religious, and socio-economic authority that were constituted by the attempts of those with authority – by and large civil war Royalists – to eradicate the 'fanatic' ideology that had motivated their erstwhile enemies.

In this respect, my approach draws inspiration from the work of Phil Withington, who has shown that records of plebeian speech are often expressive of 'a politics ... of social participation involving inclusions, exclusions and the construction of boundaries (both visible and invisible to the historical eye).'[37] It is also underpinned by a conceptualisation of remembering as inextricable from authority and identity (i.e. senses of self), factors that are, in turn, inextricable from each other.[38] Scholars of memory argue that sharing experiences of reality (as a form of what sociologists refer to as 'intersubjectivity')[39] plays a critical role in the formation and reproduction of social identities.[40] Where a society has undergone, or is undergoing, major disunity (along, for instance, political or religious lines), interpretations of experiences of reality (including memories) that are meaningful to a sizable proportion of that society's members are liable to diverge significantly. Moreover, if that society is one in which censorship is regarded as a legitimate tool of authority, it follows that the principal media of communication are vulnerable to appropriation by dominant interests as means of promoting their interpretations of experiences of reality at the expense of others.[41] In doing so, these interests

effectively control the means through which the identities of the dominated are publicly and socially reproduced. The upshot is that we arrive at what the historian Berthold Molden has recently described as 'mnemonic hegemony', a situation in which 'one particular narrative' is accepted 'as a quasi-natural universality and delegitimizes alternative forms of reasoning.'[42] But the story does not end here. Hegemony must be regarded as a process, something that is struggled for and, by extension, may act as a source of anxiety for dominant forces within a society.[43] Studies of remembering have shown us that any efforts to promote and demote certain memories are necessarily vulnerable to contestation and subversion.[44] Indeed, any discussion of 'mnemonic hegemony' must include also a discussion of what have been termed variously 'counter-memories', 'popular memories', and 'vernacular memories'.[45]

The remaining chapters of this book unpick the full significance of seditious memories by thinking of them as counter-memories amid attempts by some Royalists to secure mnemonic hegemony. This involves reconfiguring how the transition from forgetting (as embodied by the Act of Free and General Pardon, Indemnity, and Oblivion) to remembering in the early 1660s has been thought about. Whereas historians have seen this transition as a natural response to popular anxieties about political and religious 'fanatics', chapter 3 argues that the Restoration's politics of memory was characterised by the active efforts of 'hard-line' Royalists – those who prescribed a purge of political and religious dissenters to cure Britain of its ills – to achieve mnemonic hegemony. This entailed their seizure of the authority to speak for the past, culminating in the *censorship* of Parliamentarians and republicans (as is evident in the sedition legislation through which seditious remembering becomes visible) and the retrospective *censure* of their actions during the 1640s and 1650s.[46] Censorship and censure are regarded as having been driven by a specifically Royalist impulse to eradicate a 'fanatic' ideology, and with it certain political and religious identities, through the public and social delegitimisation of Parliamentarianism and republicanism. The remainder of chapter 3 shows that censorship and censure comprised a major component of what Christopher Hill and others have referred to as the 'experience of defeat' for those who fought for, and otherwise supported, the old cause.[47] This is reflected in the extent to which some of these figures utilised oblivion as a legitimate, although largely ineffective, foil to Royalist recrimination by re-placing the authority to speak for the past in the hands of Charles II.

Chapter 3 allows us to depict seditious memories as having been, by definition, illegitimate counter-thrusts to these Royalists' pursuit of mnemonic hegemony. Put differently, they are treated not only as alternative memories, but also as *counter*-memories that are inextricable from, and thus potentially counteractive within, a politics of memory in which they were censored and their authors were censured. In this respect, the book draws on Daniel Woolf's acknowledgment that men and women outside the political nation

'were able to hang on to a significant portion of their beliefs about the past'. Whereas Woolf's reference point is 'mounting antiquarian scepticism and the rising tide of printed historical material',[48] the focus of this book is the concerted efforts of some Royalists to secure mnemonic hegemony across various media.

Subsequent chapters analyse in detail the myriad ways in which counter-memories could be deployed by people within this politics of memory. They do so by investigating the immediate context in which such memories were expressed and the forms they took. Chapter 4 focuses on evidence of seditious remembering in which the speaker or author was conscious of the hostility of audiences to Parliamentarian and republican sympathies. This is taken to represent how seditious memories served to counteract the censure of Royalists by legitimising the decisions to oppose and resist Crown and established church *publicly*. In doing so, the chapter shows that, outside an early historiography of the civil wars that, as historians have recently shown, was largely Royalist, there was a vibrant debate about the meanings of opposition and resistance during the 1640s and 1650s.[49] Chapter 5 focuses on cases of seditious remembering in which consensus was the expectation of the speaker or author. Accordingly, the sharing of seditious memories is construed as a means by which attempts by Royalists to prevent the *social* circulation of favourable interpretations of opposition and resistance between former Parliamentarians and republicans was reversed and, consequently, identities that were anchored in the events of the civil wars and revolution were reproduced. In this way, the chapter shows that seditious memories mediated the creation of 'communities of memory' that, in turn, acted as sources of solidarity amid experiences of Royalist recrimination.[50]

As well seditious memories that were retrospective in orientation, chapters 4 and 5 consider those that were present oriented and 'prospective' (or 'restorative'): that is, those that made possible the imagination of alternative future realities.[51] In the first of these chapters, claims of enduring allegiance to Parliament and the Republic are shown to have been accompanied regularly by physical and verbal abuse against former Royalists and those in positions of authority. This reveals how the Royalists' pursuit of mnemonic hegemony served to perpetuate the divisions between 'Cavaliers' and 'roundheads', and, more intriguingly, that it imbued statements of identification with Parliament and the Republic with a potency akin to what scholars of hegemony refer to as 'cultural resistance'.[52] Here, the book draws on the work of historians who have highlighted how 'popular' uses of history could be wielded as critiques of *contemporary* politics.[53] Indeed, the chapter concludes by examining how seditious memories, especially insofar as they referred to the future of the Stuart realms, were deployed as means of intimidating former Royalists and those in positions of authority by exploiting the very anxieties that drove the Royalists' pursuit of mnemonic hegemony in the first place. Finally, in chapter 5, these prospective memories are used as evidence that, when

circulated socially, sympathies for Parliament and the Republic could indeed inspire acts of rebellion after the Restoration, and that this continued into the reign of James II during the Monmouth Rebellion. Nonetheless, the chapter concludes by eschewing a straightforward synonymisation of shared prospective memories and radical or republican intent by drawing on studies that have highlighted the psychological potency of senses of collective hope.[54]

The first section of this book is confined to England and Wales, and the expression of seditious memories in oral, print, and scribal culture. Moreover, that memories and identities were bound up with each other is related to the fact that those who did the remembering had actually experienced the 1640s and 1650s, including as active Parliamentarians and republicans. In the second half of this book, I push against these self-imposed boundaries by considering alternative ways of articulating sympathies for opposition to, and resistance against, Crown and established church and the extent to which these sympathies, and seditious remembering more generally, existed in other geographical and generational contexts. Chapter 6 uses the methods of earlier chapters to explore the existence of equivalent forms of remembering in two of the Stuarts' other realms: namely, Scotland and Ireland. In Scotland, sympathies for the rebellion against the Crown and established church in the 1630s and 1640s are shown to have endured after the Restoration. These are identified in evidence of language which, like that in England and Wales, was deemed to be 'unlawful' by the government, but which incorporates additional evidence, such as scaffold speeches, and print and scribal cultures. Correspondingly, they are understood as means by which people legitimised opposition and resistance during the Scottish revolution, as well as means of negotiating, resisting, and subverting authority. The same is held for Ireland, where sympathies for the Oliverian conquest can be witnessed in legal records and state papers well into the 1680s. It also expands the definition of seditious memories to include sentiment that was favourable to the rebellion of Roman Catholics in 1641. By examining seditious memories in these two nations, the book hopes to draw an understanding of the extent to which the mnemonic landscapes of the four kingdoms diverged according to different experiences of the 1640s and 1650s, but also converged as result of related political and religious cultures.[55]

The boundaries that the book seeks to expand are not merely geographical. Drawing on studies of how memories can be embodied in physical movement, chapter 7 demonstrates that seditious memories were not only spoken and written, but also performed within a ritual culture.[56] Whereas historians have tended to see commemorative culture after the Restoration as defined by 'loyal' responses to the anniversaries of the regicide on 30 January and the Restoration itself on 29 May, this chapter demonstrates, and seeks to explain, the existence of 'mis-commemorative' activities. Rather than arguing that these activities comprised straightforward performances of alternative opinions about the regicide and the Restoration, however, I associate this

behaviour with a range of dissenting opinions about the Restoration settlements, including opposition to the use of the recent past as a stick with which to beat 'fanatics'. Finally, and drawing on studies of cultural, intergenerational, and post-memory, chapter 8 demonstrates that seditious memories were expressed by individuals whose formative political experiences were events that occurred after the Restoration in 1660.[57] In doing so, it suggests that one consequence, and indeed motivation, of the expression of seditious memories by those who had supported Parliament and the Republic was to convey these meanings to a new generation of British men and women.

Gleaning the significance of seditious memories from their oppositional position within the Restoration's politics of memory increases the danger of presenting those views as a homogenous body of opinion. Since the views examined in this book are defined by the 'threat' that they were held to pose to the restored kingdoms by accusers and governors, I refer throughout to 'the wars and revolutions', as well as 'sympathies' for 'Covenants' or 'Parliament' and the 'Republic' or for 'opposition' and 'resistance' to the Stuarts and established church. Nonetheless, I deploy these terms cautiously. That they conceal differences of opinion about a range of political, religious, and socio-economic objectives, as well as how these were to be achieved, is self-evident. So too are the varying degrees with which the 'Covenanter', 'Parliamentarian', and 'republican' causes were owned by people, and, by extension, the propensity of allegiances to shift rapidly and drastically during the wars and revolutions.[58] In what follows, I interrogate these nuances and explore differences of opinion about the significance of Parliamentarianism and republicanism among its confessionally and politically diverse proponents. However, I also explore the ways in which former proponents of these notably fissiparous movements were able to find common ground after the Restoration and how this relates to experiences of censorship and censure.

With these and other claims, a relationship between memory and identity is posited in this book that some historians have suggested could not exist before the modern era. David Lowenthal has argued that, prior to modernity, 'lives were conceived not as diachronic continuities but as instances of constant, universal principles. Individual identity was fixed, consistent and vested wholly in the present.'[59] Another has gone as far as suggesting that 'terms such as "national" or "social", "cultural" or "collective memory" remain anachronistic when used to describe the early modern'.[60] In contrast to these accounts, I draw inspiration from the important recent work of Judith Pollman in acknowledging that early modern identities were bound up inextricably with the events of the past, both within and beyond the horizon of lived experience.[61] In doing so, I offer in this book a response to the calls of early modern historians to bridge a gap with the field of social psychology,[62] and hope to answer Ann Hughes's appeal for seventeenth-century British historians 'to explore the more profound effects of war, revolution and regicide on personal and political identities.'[63] Finally, and perhaps most

importantly, by representing memory, authority, and identity as inextricably linked, I hope that this book will also explicate one of the ways in which people were able to actively resist, rather than merely 'negotiate', the terms of their marginalisation after the Restoration in a way that did not necessarily involve repeating the strategies of the 1640s and 1650s.

NOTES

1 M. Knights, 'The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of the Parties', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 58:1–2 (Mar., 2005), 353–373.

2 Aphra Behn, *Sir Patient Fancy: A COMEDY* (London, 1678), pp. 17–18.

3 Cited in P. Jenkins, '"The Old Leaven": The Welsh Roundheads after 1660', *Historical Journal*, 24:4 (1981), 822.

4 Thomas D'Urfey, *The Whig Rampant: OR, EXALTATION. Being a Pleasant New Song of 82* (London, 1682).

5 For notable exceptions, see I. Atherton, 'Remembering (and Forgetting) Fairfax's Battlefields', in A. Hopper and P. Major (eds), *England's Fortress: New Perspectives on Thomas, 3rd Lord Fairfax* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 95–119; M. Harris, 'The "Captain in Oliver's Army" and the Wixford Catholics: Clerical/Lay Conflict in South Warwickshire, 1640–1674', *Warwickshire History* 16:4 (Winter, 2015/16), 170–186; and M. Goldie, *Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), p. 161.

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

7 See J. Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677–1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 27–49; and J. Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 162–166.

8 J. P. Montaño, *Courting the Moderates: Ideology, Propaganda, and the Emergence of the Party, 1660–1678* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2002), *passim*.

9 T. Harris, 'The Legacy of the English Civil War: Rethinking the Revolution', *European Legacy*, 5:4 (2000), 505; and M. Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678–81* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 11. See also G. Tapsell, *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681–85* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), p. 11.

10 M. Zook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), pp. xix–xx.

11 C. Hill, *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (London: Penguin, 1985); and S. Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

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

13 S. Bardle, *The Literary Underground in the 1660s: Andrew Marvell, George Wither, Ralph Wallis, and the World of Restoration Satire and Pamphleteering* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); and D. Norbrook, 'Memoirs and Oblivion: Lucy Hutchinson and the Restoration', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 75:2 (Summer, 2012), 233–282.

14 B. Worden, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (London: Allen Lane, Penguin, 2001).

15 Notable exceptions here are Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent*; A. Hopper, *'Black Tom': Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 225–226; and T. Cooper, *John Owen, Richard Baxter and the Formation of Nonconformity* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), p. 296.

16 For the psychological impact of warfare, see M. Stoyle, 'Memories of the Maimed: The Testimony of Charles I's Former Soldiers, 1660–1730', *History*, 88:290 (2003), 204–226; M. Stoyle, 'Remembering the English Civil Wars', in P. Gray and K. Oliver (eds), *The Memory of Catastrophe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 19–30; and E. Peters, *Commemoration and Oblivion in Royalist Print Culture, 1658–1667* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Studies in the History of Media, 2017), especially ch. 4. For the psychological impact of dispossession on Royalist clergymen, see F. McCall, *Baal's Priests: The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013); and F. McCall, 'Children of Baal: Clergy Families and Their Memories of Sequestration during the English Civil War', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76:4 (Winter, 2013), 617–638.

17 'An Act of Free and Generall Pardon Indempnity and Oblivion', 12 Car. II, c. 11, *The Statutes of the Realm* (10 vols, n.p.: Great Britain Record Office, 1810–28), v, pp. 226–234 (hereafter 'Act of Indemnity and Oblivion').

18 M. Neufeld, *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013), p. 2.

19 *Ibid.*, p. 5.

20 *Ibid.*, pp. 98–120.

21 A. Milton, 'Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England', *Historical Journal*, 41:3 (Sept., 1998), 651.

22 P. Lake, 'Calvinism and the English Church, 1570–1635', *Past and Present*, 114 (Feb., 1987), 34.

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

24 This work thus responds to calls to engage with oral culture as measure of political opinion. See T. Harris, 'Introduction', in T. Harris (ed.), *The Politics of the Excluded, c.1500–1850* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 1–29; T. Harris, 'Understanding Popular Politics', p. 128; and L. Bowen, 'Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism, 1649–60', in J. McElligott and D. L. Smith (eds), *Royalists and Royalism during Interregnum* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), p. 45.

25 Andy Wood, 'Custom, Identity and Resistance: English Free Miners and their Law, c.1550–1800', in P. Griffiths, A. Fox, and S. Hindle (eds), *The Experience of*

Authority in Early Modern England (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 249–285; Andy Wood, *The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 209–264; Andy Wood, *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); and Andy Wood, 'Coda: History, Time and Social Memory', in K. Wrightson (ed.), *A Social History of England 1500–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 373–391. For another historian's work on popular alternative memories, see D. Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture: 1500–1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 339–342.

26 For the term 'articulation', see J. Fentress and C. Wickham, *Social Memory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988), pp. 26, 47–48.

27 P. K. Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688–1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 233.

28 See, for instance, T. Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

29 C. Hill, *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980), p. 15; C. Hill, 'Republicanism after the Restoration', in *England's Turning Point: Essays on 17th Century English History* (London: Bookmarks, 1998), p. 67; B. Sharp, 'Popular Political Opinion in England, 1660–1865', *History of European Ideas*, 10:1 (1989), 13–29; Scott, *England's Troubles*, p. 344; A. Hopper, 'The Farnley Wood Plot and the Memory of the Civil Wars in Yorkshire', *Historical Journal*, 45:2 (2002), 281–303; Andy Wood, *Riot, Rebellion and Popular Politics in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave: 2002), p. 176; and D. Cressy, *Dangerous Talk: Scandalous, Seditious, and Treasonable Speech in Pre-modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 203–222.

30 R. L. Greaves, *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660–1663* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986); R. L. Greaves, *Enemies under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664–1677* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990); and R. L. Greaves, *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688–1689* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992).

31 J. C. D. Clark, *Revolution and Rebellion: State and Society in England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 98; T. Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 51; and A. Marshall, *Intelligence and Espionage in the Reign of Charles II, 1660–1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 12–17.

32 Cressy, *Dangerous Talk*, p. 203.

33 Marshall, *Intelligence and Espionage*, p. 15.

34 T. Harris, 'The Leveller Legacy: From the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis', in M. Mendle (ed.), *The Putney Debates of 1647: The Army, the Levellers and the English State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 228; and T. Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms* (London: Allen Lane, 2005), p. 97.

35 Zook, *Radical Whigs*, p. xx.

36 Z. Gille, 'Postscript', in M. Todorova and Z. Gille (eds), *Post-Communist Nostalgia* (New York: Basic Books, 2010), p. 286.

37 P. Withington, 'Company and Sociability in Early Modern England', *Social History*, 32:3 (Aug., 2007), 301.

38 Helpful in the conceptual framing of this book have been the following: J. K. Olick and J. Robbins, 'Social Memory Studies: From "Collective Memory" to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24 (1998), 105–140; W. Kansteiner, 'Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies', *History and Theory*, 41:2 (May, 2002), 179–197; B. A. Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2003); G. Beiner, *Remembering the Year of the French: Irish Folk History and Social Memory* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007), especially ch. 1; and G. Cubitt, *History and Memory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

39 See J. Rydgren, 'Shared Beliefs about the Past: A Cognitive Sociology of Intersubjective Memory', *Frontiers of Sociology*, 11 (2009), 307–330.

40 Fentress and Wickham, *Social Memory*, *passim*; and J. Prager, *Presenting the Past: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Misremembering* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), ch. 3. On the nature of identity, the following work was particularly helpful: S. Stryker and P. J. Burke, 'The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63:4 (Dec., 2000), 284–297.

41 For state control over collective remembering, see J. Wertsch, *Voices of Collective Remembering* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002), ch. 4. On the 'promotion' of memories at particular times, see K. Hodgkin and S. Radstone, 'Introduction: Contested Pasts', in K. Hodgkin and S. Radstone (eds), *Memory, History, Nation: Contested Pasts* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2003), p. 5. Some of the earliest studies of remembering emphasised the extent to which control over how events were remembered lent itself to the reproduction of capitalist relations of production. See J. Le Goff, *History and Memory*, trans. S. Rendall and E. Claman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), p. 54; and E. Hobsbawm, 'Introduction: Inventing Traditions', in E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 1–14.

42 B. Molden, 'Resistant Pasts versus Mnemonic Hegemony: On the Power Relations of Collective Memory', *Memory Studies*, 9:2 (2016), 125–142.

43 S. Hall, *Cultural Studies 1983: A Theoretical Study* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016), p. 172.

44 Richard Terdiman describes memory as 'inherently contestatory': *Present Past: Modernity and the Memory Crisis* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 20. Barbara Misztal has incorporated these accounts into a broader backlash against the 'invention of tradition' analyses of Eric Hobsbawm and others; see Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, pp. 60–61. For an application of this mode of thinking to early modern Britain, see J. Greenberg and L. Martin, 'Politics and Memory: Sharnborn's Case and the Role of the Norman Conquest in Stuart Political Thought', in H. Nenner (ed.), *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain: Essays Presented to Lois Green Schwoerer* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1997), p. 121.

45 M. Foucault, 'An Interview with Michel Foucault', trans. M. Jordin, *Radical Philosophy*, 11 (Summer, 1975), 24–29; Popular Memory Group, 'Popular

Memory: Theory, Politics, Method', in R. Johnson, G. McLennan, B. Schwarz, and D. Sutton (eds), *Making Histories: Studies in History-Writing and Politics* (London: Hutchinson in association with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham, 1982), pp. 205–252; and J. Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).

46 My use of the phrase 'politics of memory' echoes that of Raingard Esser: 'the appropriation of a version of the past which could accommodate and support present politics and attitudes': *The Politics of Memory: The Writing of Partition in the Seventeenth-Century Low Countries* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), p. 10.

47 C. Hill, *Experience of Defeat*; and B. Adams, 'The Experience of Defeat Revisited: Suffering, Identity and the Politics of Obedience among Hertford Quakers, 1655–65', in C. Durston and J. Maltby (eds), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 249–268. On 'political memory' and experiences of defeat, see A. Assmann, 'Four Formats of Memory: From Individual to Collective Constructions of the Past', in C. Emden and D. Midgley (eds), *Cultural Memory and Historical Consciousness in the German-Speaking World since 1500: Papers from the Conference "The Fragile Tradition", Cambridge 2002*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2004), p. 27.

48 Woolf, *Social Circulation*, p. 297.

49 R. Macgillivray, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974); R. C. Richardson, *The Debate on the English Revolution* (London: Methuen, 1977), ch. 2; and Neufeld, *Civil Wars after 1660*, chs 1 and 3.

50 For uses of the term 'communities of memory', see R. N. Bellah, R. Madsen, W. M. Sullivan, A. Swidler, and S. M. Tipton, *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985); pp. 153–155; I. Irwin-Zarecka, *Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1994), ch. 3; and W. J. Booth, *Communities of Memory: On Witness, Identity, and Justice* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006).

51 See Fentress and Wickham, *Social Memory*, p. 51; and S. Boym, 'Nostalgia and Its Discontents', *Hedgehog Review*, 9:2 (2007), 13.

52 Hall, *Cultural Studies 1983*, especially 'Lecture 8: Culture, Resistance, and Struggle', pp. 180–206.

53 See D. Woolf, 'Two Elizabeths? James I and the Late Queen's Famous Memory', *Canadian Journal of History*, 20:2 (Summer, 1985), 167–191.

54 See C. R. Snyder and D. B. Feldman, 'Hope for the Many: An Empowering Social Agenda', in C. R. Snyder (ed.), *Handbook of Hope: Theory, Measures, and Applications* (San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 2000), pp. 389–412.

55 T. Harris, 'The British Dimension, Religion, and the Shaping of Political Identities during the Reign of Charles II', in T. Claydon and I. McBride (eds), *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650–c. 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 131–156.

56 P. Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), ch. 2.

57 E. Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), ch. 6; J. Assmann, 'Collective Memory and

Cultural Identity', trans. J. Czaplika, *New German Critique*, 65 (Spring–Summer, 1995), 125–133; and M. Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

58 A. Hughes, 'A "Lunatick Revolter from Loyalty": The Death of Rowland Wilson and the English Revolution', *History Workshop Journal*, 61 (Spring, 2006), 192–204; and A. Hopper, *Turncoats and Renegadoes: Changing Sides during the English Civil Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

59 D. Lowenthal, *The Past Is a Foreign Country* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 198.

60 H. Weber, *Memory, Print, and Gender in England, 1653–1759* (New York: Palgrave, 2008), p. 11.

61 J. Pollman, *Memory in Early Modern Europe: 1500–1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), especially ch. 1.

62 V. Glăveanu and K. Yamamoto, 'Bridging History and Social Psychology: What, How and Why', *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46:4 (2012), 431–439; and D. Woolf, 'Afterword: Shadows of the Past in Early Modern England', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76:4 (Winter, 2013), 650.

63 Hughes, 'Lunatick Revolter', 201.