



UNIVERSITY OF
GLOUCESTERSHIRE

This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document, Peters, Erin (2017) Commemoration and Oblivion in Royalist Print Culture, 1658-1667. ISBN 978-3319504742 Reproduced with permission of Palgrave Macmillan. This extract is taken from the author's original manuscript and has not been edited. The definitive, published, version of record is available here: <https://www.palgrave.com/de/book/9783319504742> and is licensed under All Rights Reserved license:

Peters, Erin ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8128-234X> (2017) Remembering the Civil Wars: Royalist Print Culture in Early Restoration England. In: Commemoration and Oblivion in Royalist Print Culture, 1658-1667. Palgrave Studies in the History of the Media . Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-17. ISBN 9783319504742

Official URL: <https://www.palgrave.com/de/book/9783319504742>

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50475-9>

EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/4981>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

Introduction

Remembering the Civil Wars: Royalist Print Culture in Early Restoration England

Every society reconstructs its past in the present, with one eye on the future. As Jacques Le Goff reminds us, there is “no unmediated, raw collective memory”.¹ Experiences which impact on the collective in the now become incorporated into cultural narratives and partisan versions of its history. Conversely, the cultural memories of past events and experiences constructed by a given society have a looming influence on the collective ideals that dominate its present. Thus, representations of the collective past rely on backward projections of current perceptions of identity and as such they are open to contention. Collective memory is rarely fixed: as socio-political circumstances and demands shift, so representations of the past are modified accordingly.² With this in mind, this book conducts a concentrated history of cultural memory by exploring the significance of collective remembering and forgetting in Restoration England’s efforts to come to terms with the Civil Wars, Regicide, and Interregnum years. Appropriating a range of concepts associated with twentieth-century Memory Studies for a seventeenth-century context, its aim is to investigate how and why the Restoration regime and its supporters utilised widely distributed, inexpensive pamphlets and broadsides to prescribe which aspects of the Civil Wars and Interregnum were to be remembered, how they were to be remembered, and which aspects were to be forgotten. What will become apparent in the course of this study is that the delayed collective re-processing of Civil War trauma reveals an inability to control the tensions between the official conciliatory policy of forgetting past deeds and an insistent popular demand for war offenses to be publically remembered and atoned for. Ultimately, I will suggest that early Restoration England was characterised, in an intriguing paradox, by a simultaneously commemorative and oblivious culture of considerable complexity, especially at the intersection of individual and collective memory.

In making this claim, this book has two objectives: firstly, it seeks to uncover aspects of early modern collective memory construction through examining popular print from the period 1658-1667 in England. It is therefore not concerned with the past as such, but rather with acts of producing the past and how the past was depicted during this particular historical period by a particular section of society. Following from this, it is less concerned with what individuals in this period remembered or forgot about the past as it is with the ruling regime’s, and its supporters’, use of the past for their present purposes. Put simply, this book explores pamphlets and broadsides that were produced by royalists, and for what purpose. The second objective that underlies this study is an examination of various efforts made by the early Restoration monarchy, government, and other royalist supporters to use print and representations of the collective past to overcome distressing memories of civil war

and religious and political upheaval, and to establish itself as the new 'old regime'. The focus is thus on the efforts made by royalists to influence how the collective past was to be perceived, rather than a focus on how that past actually was perceived. In other words, this is not a study on the success of royalist propaganda to influence people's opinions but rather a study of the forms and approaches that propaganda took in popular print.

A fundamental premise for the present study of collective memory is the recognition that the ways in which people organise, interpret, and narrate memories is socially, culturally, and historically determined. Collectively, therefore, the population at large accedes to the structures of remembering and forgetting promoted by the dominant group. Certainly there are always individuals who reject those structures, but, on the whole, the majority is usually content to remember in the manner prescribed by the dominant frames of reference. Early Restoration England was a society that was profoundly preoccupied with the uses and representations of the collective past. The returning regime shared this preoccupation, indeed encouraged it, and was heavily reliant upon disseminating prescribed varieties of remembering and forgetting in order to influence the way the past was put to use. As a result, the nation subsequently endured regular and repeated acts of remembering, forgetting, amnesia, and nostalgia in the regime's pursuit to influence the forms that communal reflection upon the nation's past would take. These acts took many forms indeed, and one of the most prevalent was the use of popular and cheap print, under official license, and in mass circulation. This study interrogates this aspect of seventeenth-century print culture in order to recover aspects of the contemporary experience and expose the ways in which memory can be seen as the persistence and manipulation of the past in the present.

The chronological limits of this book are determined by two events: first, the death of Oliver Cromwell in 1658, which marked the end of the Protectorate period, and second, the disasters of 1666-7 which arguably represented the end of the early Restoration years.³ This period saw a rush of cultural memory production as the initiation of the Restoration brought an urgent need to reinterpret the past on a national level. The extraordinary and unprecedented return to the old order with the reinstitution of the monarchy, and the considerable influence of cheap print, also prompted widespread instances of collective remembering and forgetting. It has been argued that the Restoration government, in its early attempts to deal with the nation's difficult past, "had neither the time nor energy to indulge in...a constructive policy", but nevertheless had to develop a way to "survive each crisis as it broke upon them".⁴ In the main, the initial crisis concerned how best to represent the periods of the Civil Wars and Interregnum to a still troubled nation. The Restoration regime had no official strategy for this; indeed, "no account of its policies, no blueprint of its preferred solution" has been left behind for historians to scrutinise.⁵ Instead, we must trace the manner in which

the troubled past was depicted to early Restoration readers in widely disseminated and affordable print materials. However, before we do so, it is necessary to discuss in more detail the extent to which theories associated with twentieth- and twenty-first-century Memory Studies can plausibly be adapted and applied to a seventeenth-century context.

Over the last two decades, Memory Studies has enjoyed an explosion of attention, or a ‘memory boom’, causing interest in it to become both interdisciplinary and international.⁶ Cultural memory, sometimes also termed ‘collective’ memory or ‘social’ memory, centers around the fundamental proposition that memory is a social construct and that remembering is a social process.⁷ Accordingly, memory has also become of significant interest to historical scholarship. However, in turning their attention to memory as a field of inquiry, historians are not simply displaying interest in a new subject matter, but also in new ways of organising the study of history itself and the different forms of understanding of the past that can be produced through it. By the mid-1990s the idea of memory as an investigational tool had become “the leading term in cultural history”.⁸ As a result, cultural history has been able to demonstrate the ways in which a sense of the past was shaped in previous societies, making a significant contribution to our historical knowledge.⁹

This is not to suggest that the early modern state was capable of asserting such effective control over the past that no degree of personal reflections found expression; even during periods such as the Restoration, when the governing regime was largely successful in imposing its approved and hegemonic version of the past, official histories were occasionally challenged. Edward Legon’s study on seditious memories after 1660, for example, demonstrates ways in which official memory could be contested through records of seditious speech.¹⁰ Indeed, Andy Wood has recently pointed out that “ordinary people might be able to deploy memory in the making of their own cultural world”, but even that personal use of memory would likely be heavily influenced by prevailing ideas disseminated by the dominant regime and its ideology.¹¹ While there are various explanations and definitions offered for the term collective memory, for the purposes of this investigation, collective memory is understood in terms defined by Wood as the “processes of remembrance that cut across social divisions to articulate national, religious or ethnic interpretations of the past”.¹² As this study is concerned with national, cultural memories it makes use of the term ‘collective’ in this sense.

It is important to stress that episodes of significant national division, such as civil wars, have a particularly strong impact on the subsequent framing of remembrance; English society in the 1660s was not exempt from the occasionally overwhelming impact of its recent traumatic past. Early Restoration royalist accounts were thus heavily influenced by the experiences and requirements that their uniquely selective remembering demanded. They were also based, to a significant extent, on preexisting and inherited cultural memories of their own pasts. It is an interrogation of precisely those

demands that can shine a light on the significance of the cultural memory constructions of the time and thus expand our vision of Restoration history.

Most studies of collective memory have concerned themselves with the period after circa 1800, when nationalism was a strong force in Europe and so commemoration of selected episodes of the collective past were a frequent occurrence. However, long before the nineteenth century and the arrival of modern nationalism, memory was already a deeply political issue in all areas and on all levels of early modern European society and, indeed, the politics of memory in early modern Europe were “much more modern than is often acknowledged”.¹³ This is hardly surprising as the period was one of rapid and dramatic transformation. Communities across early modern Europe were experiencing widespread change and reform, as economic, religious, and social revolutions produced new considerations of how the concept of the nation was to be understood, as confessional identities were disputed and redirected, and as relations between local and national, urban and rural, rich and poor were restructured. Perceptions of individual identity, and the individual’s relation to wider collective communities were similarly reorganised. Memory was central to these changes and ideas about the past were positioned both to establish and to challenge the new societies that were developing, as well as to influence the formation of emerging collective identities. Thus the politics of memory were applied, in the early modern period as in modernity, to establish a collective identity in the present through a connection to a shared past.

One of the most striking aspects of early modern collective memory that connects it to memory practices of modernity is that it was, or could be, a genuinely multimedia affair.¹⁴ Ranging from commemorative pageants, plays, plaques, and parades, and from print, oral, and musical communication to statues and monuments, there were many variations for the carriers and sites of collective memory. Indeed, it seems clear that early modern memories had the potential to be as pervasive and persuasive as they are in our modern age.¹⁵ Discussing the mediation of early modern memories, Judith Pollman explains that, “early modern societies had both the means and the motives to shape and celebrate collective memories and did so with enthusiasm. Moreover, it is also clear that memories moved and were transmediated across space with considerable ease”.¹⁶ A recognition of the similarities of mediation is useful when assessing the extent to which modern theories of cultural memory are applicable to the early modern period.

Although the politics of early modern memory are comparable to those of modern memory, in applying theories and methodologies associated with twentieth and twenty-first century Memory Studies to the Restoration period, some variables do need to be considered. To begin with, the frame of reference for seventeenth-century writers was different to those of the modern day. When faced with the task of commemorating a troubled past, early modern chroniclers usually set out concepts

of good and evil, truth and falsehood, and systems of relevance that differed from the ways in which a troubled past would be described from a modern standpoint. Similarly, the early modern writer held a set of beliefs and knowledge about nature and religion, life and death, society and order, and justice and authority that does not readily correspond to modern beliefs and ideas. For instance, the innate early modern belief in divine providence reflects early modern experiences and management of trauma, but it is largely absent from modern, more secular worldviews. These conceptual differences are most prominent in the ways in which early modern writers depicted distressing or shocking events.

In contrast, clear similarities are discernible between modernists and early modernists in their recognition of the key catalyst for the deployment of the politics of collective memory, namely crisis and rupture. This shared understanding may be summarised as follows: episodes of social or political upheaval induce a sense of temporal change and uproot traditional notions of connections to the past. These experiences of crisis and change engender the perception of a break, or gap, between past and present. This gap causes a transformation in how the collective views their present identity, which then alters the current perception of the collective identity in the past. In other words, the present no longer seems to reproduce what had come before, but is now perceived to be different. It is that difference that affects the ways in which the collective past is positioned in the present.¹⁷ Many theorists of memory have pointed to the late eighteenth century as the period in which this transformation was most evident.¹⁸ In so doing, they have stressed this so-called Age of Revolutions as “a period of change so breathtaking that it forever changed people’s perceptions of the relationship between past, present and future” and that “writings of the period testify to a heightened awareness of change”.¹⁹ It is this awareness that typifies what Richard Terdiman has termed a “memory crisis”; the rupture of the conscious link between the present’s connection to the past.²⁰ Yet scholars who point to the late eighteenth century as a unique moment of “memory crisis” have failed to consider evidence from the period before 1800. It is impossible, for example, to overstate the enormity of change wrought by the Reformation when considering moments of “memory crisis” pre-1800.²¹ Indeed, Keith Thomas has stressed that the rupture with the medieval past caused by the Reformation induced widespread nostalgia for the pre-Reformation period.²² Equally, as this study will demonstrate, analysing evidence from the Restoration period reveals that those who lived through the Civil Wars and Interregnum experienced a rupture and memory crisis that was as profound as those of the late eighteenth century, with similar consequences: tensions between remembering and forgetting, impulses to mythologize the past, struggles with collective trauma, and melancholic nostalgia.

In this book, therefore, modern theories derived from the study of collective memory are employed to trace the forms and efforts made by the ruling elite to manage an early modern crisis of

memory. Here, an assessment of the primary source material that forms the evidentiary basis of this study is crucial. Mid-seventeenth-century contemporaries were very conscious of the central role that cheap print played in the development of popular politics. In the turbulent 1640s, observers recognised the novelty and importance of the phenomenon that historians have termed the ‘explosion of print’. During the Civil Wars there had been a vigorous growth of cheap print owing to the collapse of censorship in 1641. The ability of popular print to influence present perceptions of the past, and therefore impact public opinion, was not lost on Charles II, his government, and supporters. The early Restoration regime quickly attempted to harness this medium and control it. Official censorship was the first step and the 1662 Act for Preventing the frequent Abuses in printing seditious treasonable and unlicensed Bookes and Pamphlets and for regulating of Printing and Printing Presses provided a framework for control of the press through pre-publication censorship until its final lapse in 1695. Ordinances against the printing of seditious material were issued repeatedly, and the prosecution of people under the laws of sedition reflected anxieties about the growing influence of print on public opinion during this time. From the earliest days of the Restoration, Charles and his government sought to control any potential opposition: in November 1660 Sir John Berkenhead was appointed official licenser for the press. He was succeeded by the far more effective Roger L’Estrange, who, on 24 February 1662, became Surveyor of the Presses. Regulating what could and could not be expressed in the public sphere was thus a central area of activity of the Restoration regime.

Due to their particular format and characteristics, the chief source materials explored in this study of print culture and collective memories are cheaply produced and widely distributed pamphlets, broadsides, and printed ballads. Relatively small in format and brief in length, pamphlets were quickly and easily produced and transported, inexpensive to purchase and share, and covered a wide range of themes and topics. More importantly for the aims of this study, pamphlets are especially well-suited for issues that require a lesser investment from its readers, both in terms of cost and time available for reading, as well as reading ability.²³ With regard to the intellectual accessibility of pamphlets, they were “more or less susceptible to being understood and appreciated by a broad cross-section of the literate population”.²⁴ It was precisely this latter characteristic of the pamphlet that appealed to royalist writers and printers, who intended to construct a version of the past that would reach as many people as possible. As an inexpensive, popular, and easily distributed form of print, pamphlets and broadsides had the ability to influence the widest of audiences and the vast number of pamphlets produced between 1658-1667 illustrates the cultural dominance of this form of print.

Although the focus is predominantly on pamphlets and broadsides, the dissemination of collective memories in early Restoration newspapers is also referenced, where possible. This is more restricted than the pamphlet literature as only two newspapers were allowed to continue after the

Restoration - *The Parliamentary Intelligencer* (re-named *The Kingdomes Intelligencer*) and *Mercurius Publicus* - their official, or semi-official, status was reflected in the stamp 'Published by Order'. However, the king and his ministers were suspicious of newspapers and their dislike led to the imposition of tight restrictions.²⁵ The 1662 Licensing Act was the first step to their eventual suppression and, until the end of August 1663, these two newspapers provided the only printed news that the people of England were permitted to buy or to read. By the autumn of 1666 the only approved newspaper was the official *London Gazette*, and from this periodical readers could learn only what the government considered permissible to print.²⁶ The government had thus shown that it was determined to exercise its authority in the arena of public print, and so, as Joad Raymond has explained, the "power of printed news as a tool of memory, persuasion, and entertainment had been realized".²⁷ Pamphlets, on the other hand, were the early modern equivalent of modern supermarket tabloids, or, yet more recently, Internet blog posts, and were distributed amongst a countrywide audience for whom "distinctions among qualities of journalism rarely existed".²⁸ Furthermore, the circulation of this form of print was vastly more popular, and as a consequence arguably more directly influential, than that of the more sophisticated publications. As a result, the more refined literature of the period, along with most cases of the popular literature (such as the lengthy 'histories', 'memoires', and 'biographies' in circulation during the early years of the Restoration) are not included in this study; neither are printed sermons or other forms of didactic material. While these sources are of great importance to the history of the period, they have been studied extensively elsewhere and are less helpful with regard to this study's aims.²⁹ Moreover, as Jerome Friedman has pointed out with regard to the highbrow literature of the period, it was generally inaccessible to most people and, equally, most people were simply uninterested in it. As he explains, it "hardly touched the lives or consciousness of the overwhelming number of Englishmen".³⁰

The sheer volume of print challenged the autonomy of personal and smaller community memories by expanding the contents of collective cultural memories due to its wide reach and proliferation, as well as its capacity to endure past the lifespan of one person. An early modern acknowledgement of the impermanent nature of memory can be found in a pamphlet by Sir Thomas Craig, who observed: "It is certain that there can be no preservation of the memory of things past, nor continuation of the remembrance of things present, without the help of letters, seeing the memory of man is terminated by the space of one age".³¹ Print also allowed for the construction of more deliberate and organised collective memories of the national past, around which pre-existing individual and local community memories were then made to fit.³² Adam Fox asserts, "It is clear that many people's attitudes and opinions were conditioned or provoked by what they knew from printed sources".³³ It is important to keep in mind that cultural memories are not always congruent, and

indeed are often contested. In fact, they can consist of highly controversial, changeable, and disjointed stories.³⁴ Individuals of a common age who have lived through the same events may have strikingly diverse perceptions of the way those events took place and allocate different values to them based on their individual beliefs and circumstances. This can be understood by positing the various ways the Civil Wars were likely to be remembered by those whose allegiances differed at the time. Those with royalist sympathies would be likely to view the entire period of the wars and republic as an utter tragedy. A moderate Cavalier would have a different view, whereas Republicans would see the events as a natural development eventually ruined by Cromwell.³⁵ In this way, present circumstances acquire a defining authority over perceptions of the past. However, print material, usually officially sanctioned at this point, could serve better to standardise and transmit widespread national cultural memories over local or community memories. On a national scale, the officially endorsed version of the past plays an important role in the creation of the nation's present identity. It is important to emphasise, at this point, that, although "no plausible British identity capable of engaging the affections of the various British peoples emerged under the Stuart dynasty", the Restoration marked a return to a national, English rather than British or Commonwealth, identity and a "strong sense of Englishness".³⁶ While the local level was the most important site within which individual memory was constructed, as Andy Wood has recently argued, those local memories both influenced and were subsumed by broader national collective cultural memories.³⁷

With regard to Restoration England's national identity, the vast majority of print material functioned to justify its current, royalist presence and shape its post-civil-war character while rejecting the republican regime and identity that went before. This is helpfully illustrated by considering the introduction to the popular *Rump* ballad collection of 1662. This best-selling post-Restoration collection introduces itself by first abusing the previous regime, whose "whole Carcase was so odious and bloody a Monster, that *every man* has a Stone or rotten Egge to cast at it".³⁸ While not every man (or woman) in 1662 felt this way, the introduction to the collection of ballads is, nevertheless, informing and advising the public not only of the new regime in power, but also of the method of remembering – and forgetting – engaged in support of it. To clarify this, the introduction goes on to warn its readers and audience:

but he that does not blot out all that's past, and frankly embrace their New Allegiance, or remembers ought but what shall preserve Universal Peace and Charity, let him be Anathema; For he were a strange man that should now be unsatisfied, when those that writ against the King do now write for Him, and those who wrote for Him, need now write no more.³⁹

This example shows not only active remembering, but also forgetting. It instructs the reader to 'blot out' and not remember aspects of the Civil Wars past that do not support the regime-approved use of

the past, however it also prescribes the way advocates of the previous regime *were* to be remembered. Those who did not subscribe to the social amnesia as it was promoted in the introduction to this collection of ballads were denounced by it as opponents to the Restoration and the new society that was being established under it.

Similarly, a further example of the approved manner of remembering the troubled past can be found in the newly re-titled newspaper *The Kingdomes Intelligencer*, published to 'prevent false news'. This claim itself is telling as it speaks to a general level of uncertainty with regard to identifying 'truth' in printed news.⁴⁰ The legacy of Civil War print culture and the reintroduction of censorship are important factors here. Additionally, this claim bluntly demonstrates that the official (indicated by the license 'Published by Authority') version of the news was to be considered true. The issue dated Monday, December 31, to Monday, January 7 1661, offers a description of a speech given by the King to both Houses, in which the King is reported to have stated "how religiously He himself would observe the Act of Indemnity, and would exact the observation of it from all others". The newspaper goes on to describe the "the joy of all good men, and the Terror of all that refuse their own happiness by thoughts of embroyling the Kingdom in Blood".⁴¹ Thus remembering, in certain forms, was not only politically treasonous but also personally dangerous. Indeed, here is a perfect example of Ernest Renan's assertion that "forgetting is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation".⁴²

As with most studies on print from the mid seventeenth-century, this book makes no claim to have surveyed the complete range of royalist pamphlets and printed ballads produced between 1658-1667. Doing so would be simply unmanageable, as it was, in the words of George Savile, Marquis of Halifax, "an Age overrun with Scriblers".⁴³ For this reason, the pamphlets and ballads that do appear in this book have been selected due to the fact that they are either well known to scholars of this decade and are therefore reinterpreted in this study; have proved to be popular with contemporaries due to numerous reprints; or else contain some importance or relevance to the topics and themes under investigation. In discussing the sources, a few more comments do need to be made. To begin with, this book is concerned with production, rather than consumption. That is, the focus of this study of royalist print is on exploring what was produced, why, and, where possible, by whom, rather than an attempt to gauge public or personal impact and reader response. This is because the latter aspect is, quite honestly, mostly out of the historian's reach and, in any case, beyond the remit and aims of this study. Nevertheless, in exploring production there remain some complications that need to be acknowledged.

The representativeness of the sources is difficult to gauge in any absolute way. The frequent occurrence of anonymously published pamphlets as well as the use of pseudonyms contribute to this difficulty. In addition, it is difficult to assess how unified various groups of royalists were in their

approach. One of the repercussions of the Civil Wars was that they widened the sphere of allegiance so that, even within the respective 'royalist' or 'parliamentarian' groupings, there was a variety of political identities present. While we habitually use the terms above to describe the socio-political positions and allegiances of seventeenth-century men and women, they are vague, catch-all terms that describe relations rather than individual beliefs. Furthermore, during this period and into the early years of the Restoration, the allegiance of different groups of royalists, whether Protestant or Catholic, English or Scottish, "operated strategically within a realm of shifting understandings of allegiance itself".⁴⁴ Thus, the royalist print sources included in this study should not be viewed as representative of a single strand of royalism in the early Restoration years, but rather should be understood as representing various approaches to royalist support found in popular print.

Furthermore, while print runs are important indicators of popularity, and therefore could be considered a sign of the representativeness of a particular source, it is impossible to claim the popularity of any one source with any certainty based solely on its print runs. Successive recipients of individual items as well as repeated onward circulation ensured that there were many more readers than texts.⁴⁵ All this said, it is possible to make some general comments on the production and intended audiences of popular publications. Firstly, one of the major legacies of Civil-War-era print culture was the geographical reach that cheap print material had gained. Though London remained the center of the print industry, no area of the nation remained untouched by the rapid circulation of pamphlets and newspapers. Consequently, the ideas circulating in early Restoration royalist print were spread far and wide and familiar to people around the country. Secondly, publications that do provide the author's name indicate that they have been produced from a wide variety of social backgrounds, ranging from gentlemen and other members of the social elite (John Evelyn and Sir Edmund Pierce, for example), to members of the army (George Wither and Andrew Cooper), to members of the regime and government itself (Charles II and Roger L'Estrange), and finally journalists and paid writers (Richard Atkyns and Alexander Brome). Additionally, numerous sources from more humble backgrounds are also analysed in this study. It might be noted that from among the sources that provide information about authorship, there is only one pamphlet that is acknowledged to be written by a woman. All that is known about this author, Rachel Jevon, is that she was the daughter of a Worcestershire clergyman, and that she wrote two Restoration Odes.⁴⁶ Jevon is an example of an ordinary person, not affiliated with the regime, disseminating common royalist ideas and rhetoric. Overall, all of these sources, whether detailing the sanctification of Charles I, demonizing Cromwell and the other Regicides, recounting the experiences of the Civil Wars, or celebrating Charles II, are representative of early Restoration royalist ideas and propaganda.

Whatever the socio-political backgrounds of their authors, all pamphlets and newspapers had one thing in common – they were intended to influence the minds of those who read them and reflected the immediate concerns of the time in which they were printed. Consequently, a pamphlet discussing a royal restoration printed in the early to mid-1650s was quite a different thing to a pamphlet discussing this issue in 1659 or 1660. Similarly, royalist pamphlets printed before the Restoration needed to argue for monarchy, while those printed after 1660 needed to defend it.⁴⁷ That pamphlets had social influence can be determined merely from acknowledging the enormous amount of cheap and popular print in circulation at the time. Popular pamphlets and printed ballads became powerful tools of communication and, in effect, pamphlet culture worked to reconstitute collective memories after the return to monarchical government. Indeed, pamphlets had the capacity to act as repositories of collective cultural memory through their ephemeral and malleable nature, and through the relative ease of their distribution and circulation, as well as their form and readability. Thus, Restoration pamphlets, in the words of Joad Raymond, were “sharp-edged weapons” which utilized memory as a political tool.⁴⁸ An analysis of the deployment of these ‘weapons’ in relation to the use of the past is especially productive in a mid-seventeenth-century context, as this period was one of drastic and unprecedented violence and change. Consequently, this study is also an analysis of the narrative forms that were used to construct and convey the difficult past in an ever-changing present that constantly required it to be reinterpreted. Pamphlets, newspapers, broadsides, and printed ballads had the ability to reflect the immediate concerns of the decade, in a language and form that reflected specific attitudes while targeting a wider audience than the more lengthy, expensive, or abstruse publications of the times. They can be seen as sites of memory - or *lieux de memoire* - and indeed reveal a functioning public narrative of early Restoration cultural memory.⁴⁹ As Jan Assmann has explained, it is through the excavation of its cultural memories that a society becomes perceptible.⁵⁰ Which past becomes evident in the process of memory construction and which values emerge in its identity appropriation process tells us much about the structures, tendencies, and control of a given society, as well as revealing the politics and strategies of remembering and forgetting at play.

This study has clear boundaries. No endeavour will be made to consider either the ‘truth’ or ‘impact’ of the deliberate or inadvertent uses of the past and manipulation of cultural memories by the Restoration regime and other royalist supporters, in terms of the extent to which they were believed, changed attitudes, or influenced behaviour.⁵¹ Interesting though these subjects are, they lie outside the remit of this study and would require a shift in focus to the practices of early modern reading and reception of texts. Another important point to be stressed here is that, although print sources undoubtedly played an important role in shaping collective cultural memories, they were not

the only factor to have influence. Personal and social background, religious views and sermons, rumour and gossip, and public demonstrations all contributed to the growth and development of cultural memories at the time.⁵² Consequently, this book is not attempting to trace the progress of collective memories but rather the variety of versions of the past which were constructed by the regime and its supporters, and subsequently suggested to the public. In other words, at issue in the present study are the precise techniques, depicted in print, of remembering and forgetting applied by the Stuart regime and its supporters in its effort to establish itself. As Tim Harris has pointed out, the Restoration regime felt “desperately insecure” and this desperation is apparent in royalist print.⁵³ It will become clear that there were many contradictions in terms of the strategy of the regime, and both remembering and forgetting were applied when convenient for their purposes. On the one hand, the return of the king was depicted as a founding moment and the Interregnum years were a period to be forgotten, while, on the other hand, the Civil Wars and Interregnum were deliberately evoked in order to be used in an authorised interpretation. The merging of these conflicting efforts blurred the division between past and present, and between remembering and forgetting.⁵⁴

Chapter One provides an analysis of the Restoration regime’s preferred version and use of the past. In other words, this chapter interrogates the “what/how” to remember and the “what/how” to forget as prescribed by the returning regime and its supporters. It observes the formative role of forgetting and focuses on forgetting and remembering as strategic elements in the royalist efforts to manipulate cultural memories, in particular those of the recent events of the 1640s and 1650s. The paradox evident between officially and publically banishing all remembrances of the collective past while still sustaining it in the forefront of people’s minds through persistent reference to it further attests to the simultaneously commemorative and oblivial culture of early Restoration England. Through an engagement with three types of forgetting (repressive erasure, prescriptive forgetting, and forgetting that is constitutive in the formation of a new identity), this chapter demonstrates that Restoration society was underwent frequent and repeated acts of deliberate remembering and forgetting.⁵⁵ In addition, this chapter’s analysis speaks to the broader history of cultural forgetting and its uses in the formation, transmission, and manipulation of early modern collective memories. In a society such as the early Restoration, that is, a newly re-established social order preoccupied with a legacy of war and rupture, the application of strategically selected versions of the past tells us much about the significance and wider social function ascribed to memory in the formation of early modern nationhood. An exploration of the ways in which that society made, or, more accurately, was instructed to make sense of its present through recourse to selective reconstructions of its past allows important insights into how collective memory operated in late seventeenth-century cultural and political contexts.

In the course of this investigation, the chapter also examines how the Restoration regime, as well as the writers and publishers who worked in support of it, endeavoured to harness the influential power of cheap print in order to attempt to shape public memories about the past. It examines the forms, justifications and rationales used in the propaganda to defend the return of the monarchy and preserve its legitimacy once it had been reinstalled. Finally, this chapter examines the ideology of form in early Restoration polemical rhetoric and illustrates the capacity of seventeenth-century pamphlets and broadsides to act as repositories of cultural memories.

Building on the analysis offered in Chapter One, the rest of the book, which incorporates Chapter Two and Three, analyses and maps the main contours that the print sources evidence of the nature of memory in early Restoration England. In order to do so, these chapters make use of modern theories and topics of Memory Studies and apply them to the analysis of print sources of the Restoration period in recognition that this period endured a 'memory crisis' as profound as those post 1800, and that the print material extant from the early Restoration contains evidence that attests to this fact.⁵⁶ Each chapter engages with a topic or distinctive strand of cultural memory found in popular print sources. By examining them in turn, we may begin to form a preliminary sense of the nature of early Restoration cultural memory and ways in which early modern writers depicted experiences of crisis and rupture after the fact, and for very specific purposes.

Chapter Two identifies and analyses the ways in which the Civil War and Interregnum pasts were converted into cultural memory through the construction and propagation of royalist myths and legends. It considers the deliberate preservation and persistence of largely fictional or embellished versions of the past. The identification and analysis of these stories circulating in popular print during the early Restoration years is essential in order to demonstrate the politico-cultural usages of influencing and deploying memory as an ideological resource during the seventeenth century.

Chapter Three focuses on representations of collective trauma found in early Restoration popular print. Experiences of collective trauma are central to the understanding of cultural memory. Though the violence of the Civil Wars ended almost a decade before the Restoration, events and experiences have the ability to linger in the mind, sometimes undetectably, and can resurface long after the conditions that produced them have ostensibly ended. This is true for individuals as well as collectives. This chapter uncovers the ways in which the authors of these pamphlets made use of the fact that they were appealing to a traumatised society by discussing, emphasising, and reminding readers of their nation's distressing past. After the Restoration, this trauma manifested itself in the nation's inability to control the division between the official policy of forgetting, which sought to reconcile the divisions within the nation and maintain a sense of continuity with the earlier Stuart past, and the insistent emphasis placed on the need for past wrongdoings to be openly discussed and

atoned for.⁵⁷ The extreme contradiction between commemoration and oblivion speaks to the significant levels of cultural traumatisation in this decade.

Chapter Three also examines evidence of the ways in which nostalgic memory was employed in print sources to connect the present to a particular and highly idealised version of the past. The analysis in this chapter demonstrates that nostalgia functioned as a creative instrument of revision for the collective to make use of when commemorating selected fragments of their past, or else consigning those fragments to an enforced oblivion in a stint of deliberately incited cultural amnesia. The analysis further demonstrates that nostalgia was used in the popular print of the period as a response to the present's uncertainties, and also as a tool utilised by the returning regime. The key argument is that the manifestations of nostalgia in these print sources is not simply a means of expressing the collective loss of the past, as both a time and place, but also a rhetorical and remedial strategy used in an attempt to reshape history and deliberately construct a specific version of the past to support the needs of the Restoration present.

Together, these chapters work toward advancing the central claim of this book: that Restoration England was characterised by both a commemorative and oblivious culture, and that both selective remembering and forgetting were applied to the collective past in equal measure when deemed appropriate by the Restoration regime and the many writers and printers who worked in support of it. The analysis of a selection of cheap and widely accessible royalist and regime sponsored public print demonstrates that, through a combination of the use of commemoration and oblivion, these publications endeavoured to profoundly shape and influence collective cultural memories, not only of the Civil Wars and Interregnum, but also of the manner in which pre-civil war eras were commemorated. The approach taken is to study these print sources on their own terms, not as historical conclusions in themselves, but as printed, visual, and tangible evidence of both the deliberate and unintended manipulation of the collective past and the attempted formation of collective cultural memories in a tumultuous and significant period in seventeenth century English history.⁵⁸

Notes

¹ Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 59.

² Geoffrey Cubitt, *History and Memory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 200.

³ Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658-1667* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), also studies these years but emphasizes the first four and maintains that focusing heavily on them is due to the nature of the material. He points out, "both the issues and the events of public life were much more numerous in the earlier period than the later, and generated considerably more surviving evidence" (2). The present study takes 1667 as its end date as the disasters around that time, namely the plague and fire, represent the end of the early Restoration years. This notion is supported by Jonathan Scott in *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 2000), who claims that “By 1667...the party was over” and mass disillusionment with the Restoration regime had begun (166), and by Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1660-1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) who writes, “the year 1667 appeared to mark not just the end of an administration, or of a policy, but also the limits to the reconstruction of the old regime” (327).

⁴ Seaward, 4.

⁵ Ibid., 12.

⁶ The ‘memory boom’ is best exemplified by acknowledging the proliferation of terms associated with memory studies: “cultural memory, historical memory, local memory, official memory, popular memory, public memory, shared memory, social memory, custom, heritage, myth, roots, tradition”, Jacob J. Climo and Maria G. Cattell (eds.), *Social Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives* (Oxford: Altamira Press, 2002), 4.

⁷ In *History and Memory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), Geoffrey Cubitt suggested that these terms are not synonymous. He defines social memory as “a set of processes that are not necessarily neatly bound by the dividing lines between different human communities, and that within any community are likely to generate a diversity of understandings both of what pasts ought to be evoked or described or celebrated, and of the particular contents that representations or evocations of each of those pasts should incorporate or articulate”. Collective memory, on the other hand, is defined by Cubitt as “the species of ideological fiction, itself often generated by and within these processes of social memory, which presents particular social entities as the possessors of a stable mnemonic capacity that is collectively exercised, and that presents particular views or representations of a supposedly collective past as the natural expressions of such a collective mnemonic capacity” (Cubitt, 18). Cubitt’s definitions, while important in developing theories about memory, are very specific and do not always allow for the incorporation of various perspectives from other approaches to Memory Studies. Conversely, Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning (eds.), in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), combine the terms and acknowledge that, while they are “multifarious notions” due to their incorporation within a variety of academic fields which apply their own methodologies and perspectives, no clear distinction can be made between the terms (1-2). Correspondingly, discussing ‘social’ and ‘collective’ memory, Andy Wood, *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), explains that there is a “partial, creative overlap between the two concepts” (26).

⁸ Alon Confino, ‘Memory and the History of Mentalities’ in Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning (eds.), *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 79.

⁹ Ibid., 79.

¹⁰ Edward Legon, *Remembering Revolution: Seditious Memories in England and Wales, 1660-1685* (PhD thesis, University College London, 2015).

¹¹ Wood, *The Memory of the People*, 21.

¹² Ibid., 26.

¹³ Judith Pollmann and Erika Kuijpers, ‘Introduction: On the Early Modernity of Modern Memory’ in Erika Kuijpers, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Müller, and Jasper van der Steen (eds.), *Memory Before Modernity: Practices of Memory in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 6-10.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid., 11.

¹⁶ Ibid., 14.

¹⁷ Brecht Deseure and Judith Pollmann, ‘The Experience of Rupture and the History of Memory’ in Erika Kuijpers, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Müller, and Jasper van der Steen (eds.), *Memory Before Modernity: Practices of Memory in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 316.

¹⁸ For example: Richard Terdiman, *Present Past: Modernity and the Memory Crisis* (1993); Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (1989); Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory* (1988).

¹⁹ Deseure, 316.

²⁰ Terdiman, 3-4.

²¹ See: Alexandra Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Adam Fox, ‘Remembering the Past in Early Modern England: Oral and Written Tradition’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (sixth series)*, 9 (December 1999), 233-256; Keith Thomas, *The Perception of the Past in Early Modern England* (Creighton Lecture: University of London, 1985).

²² Keith Thomas, *The Perception of the Past in Early Modern England* (Creighton Lecture: University of London, 1985).

- ²³ Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 16-17.
- ²⁴ Jason Peacey, 'Pamphlets' in Joad Raymond (ed.), *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 455.
- ²⁵ James Sutherland, *The Restoration Newspaper and its Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), vii-5.
- ²⁶ Ibid.
- ²⁷ Joad Raymond, 'News' in Joad Raymond (ed.), *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 378.
- ²⁸ Jerome Friedman, *Miracles and the Pulp Press During the English Revolution: The Battle of the Frogs and Fairford's Flies* (London: University of London Press, 1993), xii.
- ²⁹ For examples, see: Chelsea Rice McKelvey, 'The 'Glorie, Might & Maestie' of Early Modern Sermons', *Literature and Theology* (2013), 1-15; Matthew Neufeld, *The Civil Wars After 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Sussex: Boydell, 2013); Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule: the Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (London: Yale, 2013); Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Authority and Representing Rule in Early Modern England* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013); Rosamund Oates, 'Sermon and Sermon-going in Early Modern England', *Reformation*, 17 (2012), 199-212; Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington and Emma Rhatigan (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Philip Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Christopher Ivic and Grant Williams (eds.), *Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2004).
- ³⁰ Friedman, xi.
- ³¹ Sir Thomas Craig, *Scotland's Sovereignty Asserted* (London: 1605).
- ³² Daniel Woolf, 'Memory and Historical Culture in Early Modern England', *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, 2:1 (1991), 307.
- ³³ Fox, 396.
- ³⁴ Harald Welzer, 'Re-Narrations: How Pasts Change in Conversational Remembering', *Memory Studies*, 3:1 (2010), 5.
- ³⁵ Woolf, 304-5.
- ³⁶ Colin Kidd, 'Protestantism, Constitutionalism and British Identity under the Later Stuarts' in Brendan Bradshaw and Peter Roberts (eds.), *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 321, 337.
- ³⁷ Wood, 12.
- ³⁸ Henry Brome and Henry Marsh (eds.), *Rump: or an Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times. By the most Eminent Wits, from Anno 1639-1661* (London: 1662), 1.
- ³⁹ Ibid.
- ⁴⁰ For more detail on the issues of 'truth' and 'falsity' in cheap print, see Jason Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 95-98.
- ⁴¹ *The Kingdomes Intelligencer of the Affairs now in agitation in England, Scotland, and Ireland: together with Foreign Intelligence: To prevent False Newes*, (London: Dec. 31-Jan.7 1661), 7-8.
- ⁴² Ernest Renan 'What is a Nation?' in Homi Bhabha (ed.), *Nation and Narration* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 11.
- ⁴³ George Savile quoted in J.P. Kenyon, *Halifax: Complete Works* (London: Penguin Books, 1969), 49.
- ⁴⁴ Rachel Weil, 'Thinking about Allegiance in the English Civil War', *History Workshop Journal*, 6:1 (2006), 183; Erin Murphy, 'I remain, an airy phantasm': Lucy Hutchinson's Civil War Ghost Writing', *English Literary History*, 82:1 (2015), 95.
- ⁴⁵ Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, 71.
- ⁴⁶ Jane Stevenson and Peter Davidson (eds.), *Early Modern Women Poets* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 317.
- ⁴⁷ Carolyn A. Edie, 'The Popular Idea of Monarchy on the Eve of the Stuart Restoration', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 39:4 (1976), 345-6.
- ⁴⁸ Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 380-381.
- ⁴⁹ The term '*lieux de memoire*' (or 'sites of memory') was developed by French historian Pierre Nora. It originated with the notion that there is no spontaneous memory and therefore we must deliberately create places where memory resides (archives, documents, museums, anniversaries, celebrations, etc.), as these activities do not

occur naturally. He further asserts that because history deforms and transforms memory, we must have sites of memory in order to remember. See Pierre Nora, 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire', *Representations*, 26 (spring 1989), 7-25.

⁵⁰ Jan Assmann and John Czaplicka, 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', *New German Critique*, 65 (spring/summer 1995), 133.

⁵¹ These limitations are considered in Jason Peacey's *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2004) and have also been applied in the current study.

⁵² Tim Harris, 'Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain' in Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (eds.), *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 142-143.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 146.

⁵⁴ Jonathan Sawday, 'Re-Writing a Revolution: History, Symbol, and Text in the Restoration', *The Seventeenth Century*, 7:2 (1992), 184.

⁵⁵ Paul Connerton, 'Seven Types of Forgetting', *Memory Studies*, 1:1 (2008), 57-71.

⁵⁶ I am not claiming here that the theories and approaches to memory studies that have been selected to apply to the analysis of collective cultural memory in early Restoration pamphlets and broadsides form an exhaustive list. Neither is the wealth of primary sources available and applicable for study under each theory exhausted.

⁵⁷ Cubitt, 211.

⁵⁸ This approach is taken from Peter Burke's *Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2001), introductory chapter. It is also applied in the introductory chapter to Peter Sherlock's *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008).